

From: [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 11:33:53 AM

210595

Alisa Somera
Legislative Deputy Director
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
415.554.7711 direct | 415.554.5163 fax
alisa.somera@sfgov.org

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a “virtual” meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click [HERE](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

-----Original Message-----

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2021 9:57 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Laxamana, Junko (BOS) <junko.laxamana@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?

-----Original Message-----

From: info@baykeeper.org <info@baykeeper.org> On Behalf Of Casey via San Francisco Baykeeper
Sent: Sunday, October 3, 2021 1:48 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,
Casey Harper
Oakland, CA

From: [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Thursday, September 23, 2021 11:29:50 AM

210595

Alisa Somera
Legislative Deputy Director
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
415.554.7711 direct | 415.554.5163 fax
alisa.somera@sfgov.org

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a “virtual” meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click [HERE](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

-----Original Message-----

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2021 11:29 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Laxamana, Junko (BOS) <junko.laxamana@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?

-----Original Message-----

From: info@baykeeper.org <info@baykeeper.org> On Behalf Of Daron via San Francisco Baykeeper
Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2021 10:55 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,
Daron Ravenborg
San Francisco, California

From: [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Tuesday, September 21, 2021 11:43:54 AM

210595

Alisa Somera
Legislative Deputy Director
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
415.554.7711 direct | 415.554.5163 fax
alisa.somera@sfgov.org

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a “virtual” meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click [HERE](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

~~~~~

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

-----Original Message-----

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
Sent: Tuesday, September 21, 2021 11:19 AM  
To: BOS-Supervisors <[bos-supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:bos-supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <[angela.calvillo@sfgov.org](mailto:angela.calvillo@sfgov.org)>; Laxamana, Junko (BOS) <[junko.laxamana@sfgov.org](mailto:junko.laxamana@sfgov.org)>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <[eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org](mailto:eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org)>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <[wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org](mailto:wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org)>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <[alisa.somera@sfgov.org](mailto:alisa.somera@sfgov.org)>  
Subject: FW: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?

-----Original Message-----

From: [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) <[info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org)> On Behalf Of Gabriel Fondaras via San Francisco Baykeeper  
Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2021 6:07 PM  
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,  
Gabriel Fondaras Goffman CFA  
San Francisco, CA

**From:** [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?  
**Date:** Thursday, September 9, 2021 1:01:55 PM

---

210595

Alisa Somera  
Legislative Deputy Director  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
415.554.7711 direct | 415.554.5163 fax  
[alisa.somera@sfgov.org](mailto:alisa.somera@sfgov.org)

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a “virtual” meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click [HERE](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

~~~~~

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

-----Original Message-----

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, September 1, 2021 9:14 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; Laxamana, Junko (BOS) <junko.laxamana@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?

-----Original Message-----

From: info@baykeeper.org <info@baykeeper.org> On Behalf Of Tim via San Francisco Baykeeper
Sent: Wednesday, September 1, 2021 7:23 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,
Tim Mooney
San Carlos , Ca

From: [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Thursday, September 9, 2021 1:01:42 PM

210595

Alisa Somera
Legislative Deputy Director
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
415.554.7711 direct | 415.554.5163 fax
alisa.somera@sfgov.org

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a “virtual” meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click [HERE](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

~~~~~

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

-----Original Message-----

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
Sent: Wednesday, September 1, 2021 9:15 AM  
To: BOS-Supervisors <[bos-supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:bos-supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <[angela.calvillo@sfgov.org](mailto:angela.calvillo@sfgov.org)>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <[eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org](mailto:eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org)>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <[alisa.somera@sfgov.org](mailto:alisa.somera@sfgov.org)>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <[wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org](mailto:wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org)>; Laxamana, Junko (BOS) <[junko.laxamana@sfgov.org](mailto:junko.laxamana@sfgov.org)>  
Subject: FW: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?

-----Original Message-----

From: [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) <[info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org)> On Behalf Of Tim via San Francisco Baykeeper  
Sent: Wednesday, September 1, 2021 7:23 AM  
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,  
Tim Mooney  
San Carlos , Ca

**From:** [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: FILE NO. 210577 - support.  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 8, 2021 1:33:52 PM

---

*Alisa Somera*

Legislative Deputy Director  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
415.554.7711 direct | 415.554.5163 fax  
[alisa.somera@sfgov.org](mailto:alisa.somera@sfgov.org)

**(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS)** To schedule a “virtual” meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

*Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.*

Click [HERE](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

~~~~~

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, September 1, 2021 2:17 PM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; Laxamana, Junko (BOS) <junko.laxamana@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: FILE NO. 210577 - support.

From: Kathy Howard <kathyhoward@earthlink.net>
Sent: Wednesday, September 1, 2021 1:24 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

Subject: FILE NO. 210577 - support.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

Please support this resolution urging the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause its litigation against the California State Water Resources Control Board and instead heed the beneficial input of a diverse and inclusive group of stakeholders.

Katherine Howard

District 4

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, July 16, 2021 11:31:46 AM

-----Original Message-----

From: info@baykeeper.org <info@baykeeper.org> On Behalf Of Mary via San Francisco Baykeeper
Sent: Friday, July 16, 2021 11:08 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Mary Spicer
Alameda, CA

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Thursday, July 15, 2021 12:13:53 PM

-----Original Message-----

From: info@baykeeper.org <info@baykeeper.org> On Behalf Of Roger via San Francisco Baykeeper
Sent: Tuesday, July 13, 2021 1:40 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Roger Brown
Berkeley, CA

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Thursday, July 15, 2021 12:14:20 PM

-----Original Message-----

From: info@baykeeper.org <info@baykeeper.org> On Behalf Of Roger via San Francisco Baykeeper
Sent: Tuesday, July 13, 2021 1:40 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Roger Brown
Berkeley, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Valérie via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Tuesday, July 6, 2021 1:44:37 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Valérie Showa

San Francisco , CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [D via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?](#)
Subject: [San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?](#)
Date: Saturday, June 26, 2021 6:55:57 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

D SARKA

UNION CITY, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Cathleen via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 25, 2021 10:13:13 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Cathleen O'Connell

Boulder Creek, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Rita via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Tuesday, June 8, 2021 1:14:52 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Rita Rodriguez

San Francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Billy via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Sunday, June 13, 2021 12:39:49 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Billy Butler

Daly city, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Billy via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Sunday, June 13, 2021 12:39:49 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Billy Butler

Daly city, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Suzanne via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Monday, June 14, 2021 1:52:17 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Suzanne Dodd

San Rafael , CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Peggy via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Monday, June 14, 2021 7:06:02 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Peggy Lopipero-Langmo

San Francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Andrea via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 3:10:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Andrea Kopecky

Sacramento, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Andrea via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 3:10:43 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Andrea Kopecky

Sacramento, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Freda via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 3:22:20 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed:

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

As SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Freda Hofland
Los Altos Hills, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Freda via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 3:22:21 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed:

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

As SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Freda Hofland
Los Altos Hills, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Paul via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 3:35:52 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Paul Johnson

San francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Paul via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 3:35:53 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Paul Johnson

San francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Joan via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 3:37:49 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Joan Steele

San francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Joan via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 3:37:50 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Joan Steele

San francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Joseph via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 3:42:56 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Joseph Illick

San Francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Joseph via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 3:43:00 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

joseph Illick

San Francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Reetta via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 4:13:32 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Reetta Raag

Orinda, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Reetta via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 4:13:32 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Reetta Raag

Orinda, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Angela via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 4:31:35 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Angela Rando

San Francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Angela via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 4:31:36 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Angela Rando

San Francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Angela via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 4:31:51 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Angela Rando

San Francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Angela via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 4:31:52 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Angela Rando

San Francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Susan via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Susan via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 4:32:44 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Susan Moore

Santa Rosa, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Susan via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Susan via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 4:32:54 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Susan Moore

Santa Rosa, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Charles via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 4:34:12 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Charles Hammerstad

San Jose, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Charles via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 4:34:14 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Charles Hammerstad

San Jose, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Kathleen via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 4:40:00 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Kathleen Clarke

San Francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Kathleen via San Francisco Baykeeper](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 4:40:02 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Kathleen Clarke

San Francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Kathleen via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 4:40:02 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Kathleen Clarke

San Francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Kathleen via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 4:40:09 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Kathleen Clarke

San Francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Randall via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 4:43:07 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Randall Tom

San Ramon , CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Randall via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 4:43:11 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Randall Tom

San Ramon , CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Janet via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 4:56:22 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Janet Eyre

San Francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Janet via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 4:56:32 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Janet Eyre

San Francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Parley via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 5:17:24 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Parley Gagne

San Francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Parley via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 5:17:24 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Parley Gagne

San Francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Kirsten via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 5:27:03 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Kirsten Holmquist

Sunnyvale, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Kirsten via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 5:27:10 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Kirsten Holmquist

Sunnyvale, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Gretchen via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 5:33:31 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Gretchen Whisenand

Santa Rosa, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Gretchen via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 5:33:32 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Gretchen Whisenand

Santa Rosa, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Nina via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 5:34:21 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Nina Bell

Palo Alto, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Nina via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 5:34:21 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Nina Bell

Palo Alto, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Sharon via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 5:34:22 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Sharon Hagen

Pacific uu, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Sharon via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 5:34:22 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Sharon Hagen

Pacific uu, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Lindsay via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 5:41:01 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Lindsay Mugglestone

Berkeley, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Lindsay via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 5:41:10 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Lindsay Mugglestone

Berkeley, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [James via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 5:46:01 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

James DuPont

Alameda, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [James via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 5:46:08 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

James DuPont

Alameda, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Katherine via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 6:13:38 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Katherine Mcstravick

Berkeley , CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Katherine via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 6:13:39 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Katherine Mcstravick

Berkeley , CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [William via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 6:24:00 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

William Filler

El Sobrante, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [William via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 6:24:06 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

William Filler

El Sobrante, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Christopher via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 7:34:02 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Christopher Lish

San Rafael, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Christopher via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 7:34:02 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Christopher Lish

San Rafael, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Jenifer via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 8:11:30 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Jenifer Steele

Berkeley, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Jenifer via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 8:11:31 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Jenifer Steele

Berkeley, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Fred via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 9:14:12 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Fred Rinne

San Francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Fred via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Friday, June 18, 2021 9:14:13 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Fred Rinne

San Francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Dean via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?](#)
Subject: [San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?](#)
Date: Saturday, June 19, 2021 12:11:43 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Dean Griswold

Fair Oaks, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Dean via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?](#)
Subject: [San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?](#)
Date: Saturday, June 19, 2021 12:11:48 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Dean Griswold

Fair Oaks, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Ann via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Saturday, June 19, 2021 7:12:57 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Ann Gubser

Moraga, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Ann via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Saturday, June 19, 2021 7:13:06 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Ann Gubser

Moraga, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Kim via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Saturday, June 19, 2021 2:25:47 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Kim Harley

Berkeley, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Kim via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Saturday, June 19, 2021 2:25:48 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Kim Harley

Berkeley, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Tani via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Saturday, June 19, 2021 2:53:26 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Tani Doles

El Cerrito, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Tani via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Saturday, June 19, 2021 2:53:26 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Tani Doles

El Cerrito, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [toni via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Saturday, June 19, 2021 4:37:27 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

toni cohn

Corte Madera, Ca

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [toni via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Saturday, June 19, 2021 4:37:27 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

toni cohn

Corte Madera, Ca

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Karen via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?](#)
Subject: [San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?](#)
Date: Sunday, June 20, 2021 9:20:13 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Karen Rath

Oakland, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Karen via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Sunday, June 20, 2021 9:20:14 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Karen Rath

Oakland, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Gerald via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Monday, June 21, 2021 8:58:31 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Gerald Smith

Walnut creek, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Gerald via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Monday, June 21, 2021 8:58:33 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Gerald Smith

Walnut creek, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Ashley via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Monday, June 21, 2021 5:46:51 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Ashley Overhouse

San Jose, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Ashley via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Monday, June 21, 2021 5:46:52 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Ashley Overhouse

San Jose, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Sandra via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Monday, June 21, 2021 7:34:46 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Sandra Stewart

San Francisco, California

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Sandra via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Monday, June 21, 2021 7:34:46 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Sandra Stewart

San Francisco, California

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Donald via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Monday, June 21, 2021 8:06:43 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Donald Coyne

San Mateo, California

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Donald via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Monday, June 21, 2021 8:06:43 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Donald Coyne

San Mateo, California

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [JP via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?](#)
Subject: [San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?](#)
Date: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 8:44:01 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

JP Stephenson

Emeryville, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [JP via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?](#)
Subject: [San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?](#)
Date: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 8:44:03 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

JP Stephenson

Emeryville, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Steven via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 9:16:38 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Steven Middleton

San Francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Steven via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 9:17:56 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Steven Middleton

San Francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [irma via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 9:44:57 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

irma liberty

vallejo, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [irma via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 9:44:57 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

irma liberty

vallejo, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Ruth via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 12:39:00 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Ruth Burman

San Carlos, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Ruth via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 12:39:12 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Ruth Burman

San Carlos, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Robin via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 8:41:13 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Robin Mayforth

Pacifica, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Robin via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 8:41:16 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Robin Mayforth

Pacifica, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Keri via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Wednesday, June 23, 2021 12:40:16 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Keri Brooke

San Francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Keri via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Wednesday, June 23, 2021 12:40:16 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Keri Brooke

San Francisco, CA

From: [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Legislation
Date: Monday, June 21, 2021 11:04:56 AM

210595

Alisa Somera
Legislative Deputy Director
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
415.554.7711 direct | 415.554.5163 fax
alisa.somera@sfgov.org

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a “virtual” meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click [HERE](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

~~~~~

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

-----Original Message-----

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
Sent: Wednesday, June 16, 2021 8:17 AM  
To: BOS-Supervisors <[bos-supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:bos-supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <[angela.calvillo@sfgov.org](mailto:angela.calvillo@sfgov.org)>; Laxamana, Junko (BOS) <[junko.laxamana@sfgov.org](mailto:junko.laxamana@sfgov.org)>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <[eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org](mailto:eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org)>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <[wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org](mailto:wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org)>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <[alisa.somera@sfgov.org](mailto:alisa.somera@sfgov.org)>  
Subject: FW: Legislation

-----Original Message-----

From: Lesley Stansfield <[lesleys460@gmail.com](mailto:lesleys460@gmail.com)>  
Sent: Tuesday, June 15, 2021 9:49 PM  
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <[board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org](mailto:board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org)>  
Subject: Legislation



This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I support Aaron Peskin's Resolution urging the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause its litigation against the California State Water Resources Control Board San Francisco should not be fighting this urgent plan for proper water use in California!

Lesley Stansfield  
San Francisco resident

**From:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?  
**Date:** Monday, June 14, 2021 10:56:00 AM

---

-----Original Message-----

From: info@baykeeper.org <info@baykeeper.org> On Behalf Of Billy via San Francisco Baykeeper  
Sent: Sunday, June 13, 2021 12:39 AM  
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>  
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Billy Butler  
Daly city, CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Suzanne via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?  
**Date:** Monday, June 14, 2021 1:52:23 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Suzanne Dodd

San Rafael , CA

**From:** [info@baykeeper.org](mailto:info@baykeeper.org) on behalf of [Peggy via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?  
**Date:** Monday, June 14, 2021 7:06:02 PM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Peggy Lopipero-Langmo

San Francisco, CA

**From:** [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?  
**Date:** Monday, June 14, 2021 1:16:14 PM

---

210595

Alisa Somera  
Legislative Deputy Director  
San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
415.554.7711 direct | 415.554.5163 fax  
[alisa.somera@sfgov.org](mailto:alisa.somera@sfgov.org)

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a “virtual” meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.

Due to the current COVID-19 health emergency and the Shelter in Place Order, the Office of the Clerk of the Board is working remotely while providing complete access to the legislative process and our services.

Click [HERE](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form.

The Legislative Research Center provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

~~~~~

Disclosures: Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.

-----Original Message-----

From: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Sent: Monday, June 14, 2021 10:57 AM
To: BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Ng, Wilson (BOS) <wilson.l.ng@sfgov.org>; Laxamana, Junko (BOS) <junko.laxamana@sfgov.org>; Mchugh, Eileen (BOS) <eileen.e.mchugh@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?

-----Original Message-----

From: info@baykeeper.org <info@baykeeper.org> On Behalf Of Billy via San Francisco Baykeeper
Sent: Sunday, June 13, 2021 12:39 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Billy Butler
Daly city, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Eliet via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Monday, June 7, 2021 10:56:04 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Eliet Henderson

San Francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Fiona via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?](#)
Subject: [San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?](#)
Date: Monday, June 7, 2021 1:38:44 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Fiona Baker

Kensington, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Howard via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Monday, June 7, 2021 5:42:47 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Howard Rosenfield

San Francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Tim via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Monday, June 7, 2021 10:41:19 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

As a long time resident and ratepayer of San Francisco I urge you to protect San Francisco Bay and withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today. San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, while SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River. This SFPUC policy does not represent the citizens of San Francisco.

The city should not be joining forces with Trump policy supporters by filing expensive and misguided litigation to continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has is causing the demise of Chinook Salmon and low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to hypocritically pursue Trump era policies and shirk its responsibilities to preserve San Francisco Bay. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent. Other cities are doing it why can't we instead of taking anti-environmental positions.

Thank you,

Tim Eichenberg
San Francisco, CA

From: info@baykeeper.org on behalf of [Greg via San Francisco Baykeeper Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco can avoid a water crisis. Why isn't SFPUC on board?
Date: Tuesday, June 8, 2021 5:31:41 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Mayor Breed,

I urge you to withdraw the City's litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board and direct SFPUC to start investing aggressively in water recycling today.

I am writing to you in the early days of yet another punishing drought. While San Franciscans are doing their part to save water at the household level, SFPUC is mismanaging San Francisco's main water source, the Tuolumne River, and it isn't doing nearly enough to prepare for drought this year—or in the decades to come.

Other cities have learned the lessons of California's unpredictable climate and are quickly adopting water recycling to reduce their burden on rivers, while increasing the reliability of their supply. Orange County gets more than 75 percent of its water through its water reuse program. Las Vegas recycles nearly all of its water used indoors. And Los Angeles is on the path to reusing 100 percent of its wastewater by 2035.

But, as SFPUC's draft Urban Water Management Plan recently revealed, San Francisco currently has no plans to make recycled water widely available in the next 25 years. Instead, the city is pursuing multiple expensive and misguided lawsuits so that it can continue to rely, almost exclusively, on the Tuolumne River—one of the state's most overtapped rivers—for the next several decades. San Francisco and large agribusiness water districts divert four out of every five gallons of water that flow in the Tuolumne River during a typical year.

This overuse has caused the river's once mighty Chinook Salmon populations to crash. Meanwhile, low river flows from the Tuolumne contribute to deteriorating water quality—including toxic algae blooms—downstream, in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.

It's unacceptable for the city with the nation's greenest reputation to shirk its responsibilities to preserve California's precious and unpredictable water supply. We support increasing river flows to uphold San Francisco Bay's fisheries, water quality, and recreation. San Franciscans want the city to do its part to protect the Bay and its rivers—water recycling is a common-sense way to limit the city's water use, increase the reliability of its supply, and protect the Bay from harmful wastewater treatment plant effluent.

Thank you,

Greg Reis

San Geronimo, CA

From: [Cindy Charles](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support Supervisor Peskin's Resolution--Stop Litigation against the State Water Board--Let's Save the Tuolumne River instead
Date: Monday, June 7, 2021 5:23:57 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I am Cindy Charles, San Francisco native and property owner. I am a long time fly fisher and have participated for over 20 years in issues related to the Tuolumne River including attending countless SFPUC meetings, and have standing with many years on the FERC relicensing of Don Pedro & La Grange dams. I have a zoology degree from UC Berkeley and have had a career in finance. I am on the Board of Directors of the Tuolumne River Trust, the Golden West Women Flyfishers and the California Sportfishing Protection Alliance.

I am writing to urge you to definitely support Supervisor Peskin's resolution:

“urging the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause its litigation against the California State Water Resources Control Board and instead heed the beneficial input of a diverse and inclusive group of stakeholders, including subject matter experts in environmental protection, habitat restoration, and the diversification of water supplies based on credible science.”

I am extremely appalled at the new lows the SFPUC is going in fighting the science which indicates we will lose our native salmon and steelhead from the Tuolumne River. It needs to have flows restored in order to bring back the few fish that struggle there.

I have fished the Tuolumne River all my life, and have seen how degraded the fishery in both the lower and upper river have become. In the lower Tuolumne, the biggest negative impact is the loss of flows, in the upper river, is the unnatural daily up and down flows due to the HH power operations.

Furthermore, what the SFPUC is doing is against the environmental values of the citizens of the City. If the citizens were better informed, they would understand what is being lost on the Tuolumne and there truly be an outcry of the terrible treatment of the Tuolumne River for some many years.

The SFPUC has been dragging its feet on developing other sources of water so that more water can be kept in the river They are not progressive at all. I find it very wrong that the SFPUC is now continually aligned with the Turlock and Modesto Irrigation Districts who never give an inch when it comes to a more balance approach to how the Tuolumne River water is used.

You should all take a drive out to the lower river, if you can find it buried in the almond orchards, to see where the bulk of the Tuolumne water is going. You probably won't see any fish though.....

Cindy Charles
1140 Rhode Island St.
SF CA 94107

From: [Melinda](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors - BOD](#)
Subject: Bay/Delta emergency
Date: Saturday, June 5, 2021 7:37:28 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

San Francisco PUC should drop the lawsuit over releasing Tuolumne River water. Voluntary agreements lead to dead fish and crashed ecosystems and you haven't got time to re-learn that lesson. Save the delta. Follow the science. Drop the lawsuit.

I am not from San Francisco but live a few miles from the Tuolumne River near Groveland. It is incredibly disturbing to see leaders that we thought we're knowledgeable and enlightened, such as Mayor Breed, fall for fake science and trumpian ridiculousness. San Francisco should be better than that.

Sincerely,

Melinda Wright
PO Box 225
Groveland, CA 95321

Sent from my iPad

Sponsored by https://url.avantam.click/v2/...https://www.aeswiser.com?utm_source=part&utm_medium=us&utm_campaign=rs_taglines_more...YXAaOnNmZHQyOmE6bn03M2Y1NmJkYWE2NmIMGMwODk3Mjg2NjQsMDU3OTg3MDorOjM2NGE6NWM3Y2M0TESY40YjI2NWFnN2JjZjBmYk3ZmNhYzASZWBjN2M5ZTVjNDI8NTM2ZDQyZDQ3YzdkZTVhMwQ0OQ

Government Flips on Seizure of Reporters' Phone Records

<https://url.avantam.click/v2/...http://thirdpartyoffers.juno.com/TGL3131608c349c4136f491023f602vac1...YXAaOnNmZHQyOmE6bn03M2Y1NmJkYWE2NmIMGMwODk3Mjg2NjQsMDU3OTg3MDorOjM2NGE6NWM3Y2M0TESY40YjI2NWFnN2JjZjBmYk3ZmNhYzASZWBjN2M5ZTVjNDI8NTM2ZDQyZDQ3YzdkZTVhMwQ0OQ>
A Cryptocurrency CEO Died at 30. Then Things Got Weirder

<https://url.avantam.click/v2/...http://thirdpartyoffers.juno.com/TGL3131608c349c4136f491023f602vac2...YXAaOnNmZHQyOmE6bn03M2Y1NmJkYWE2NmIMGMwODk3Mjg2NjQsMDU3OTg3MDorOjM2NGE6NWM3Y2M0TESY40YjI2NWFnN2JjZjBmYk3ZmNhYzASZWBjN2M5ZTVjNDI8NTM2ZDQyZDQ3YzdkZTVhMwQ0OQ>

Plane Drops Off Passenger Screaming 'Stop the Plane'

<https://url.avantam.click/v2/...http://thirdpartyoffers.juno.com/TGL3131608c349c4136f491023f602vac3...YXAaOnNmZHQyOmE6bn03M2Y1NmJkYWE2NmIMGMwODk3Mjg2NjQsMDU3OTg3MDorOjM2NGE6NWM3Y2M0TESY40YjI2NWFnN2JjZjBmYk3ZmNhYzASZWBjN2M5ZTVjNDI8NTM2ZDQyZDQ3YzdkZTVhMwQ0OQ>

From: [Melinda](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors - BOD](#)
Subject: Bay/Delta emergency
Date: Saturday, June 5, 2021 7:37:28 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

San Francisco PUC should drop the lawsuit over releasing Tuolumne River water. Voluntary agreements lead to dead fish and crashed ecosystems and you haven't got time to re-learn that lesson. Save the delta. Follow the science. Drop the lawsuit.

I am not from San Francisco but live a few miles from the Tuolumne River near Groveland. It is incredibly disturbing to see leaders that we thought we're knowledgeable and enlightened, such as Mayor Breed, fall for fake science and trumpian ridiculousness. San Francisco should be better than that.

Sincerely,

Melinda Wright
PO Box 225
Groveland, CA 95321

Sent from my iPad

Sponsored by https://url.avantam.click/v2/...https://www.aeswiser.com?utm_source=part&utm_medium=us&utm_campaign=rs_taglines_more...YXAaOnNmZHQyOmE6bn03M2Y1NmJkYWE2NmIMGMwODk3Mjg2NjQsMDU3OTg3MDorOjM2NGE6NWM3Y2MzOTESY40YjI2NWFnN2JjZjBmYk3ZmNhYzASZWBjN2M5ZTVjNDI8NTM2ZDQyZDQ3YzdkZTVkMWQ0OQ

Government Flips on Seizure of Reporters' Phone Records

<https://url.avantam.click/v2/...http://thirdpartyoffers.juno.com/TGL3131608c349c4136f491023f602vac1...YXAaOnNmZHQyOmE6bn03M2Y1NmJkYWE2NmIMGMwODk3Mjg2NjQsMDU3OTg3MDorOjM2NGE6NWM3Y2MzOTESY40YjI2NWFnN2JjZjBmYk3ZmNhYzASZWBjN2M5ZTVjNDI8NTM2ZDQyZDQ3YzdkZTVkMWQ0OQ>
A Cryptocurrency CEO Died at 30. Then Things Got Weirder

<https://url.avantam.click/v2/...http://thirdpartyoffers.juno.com/TGL3131608c349c4136f491023f602vac2...YXAaOnNmZHQyOmE6bn03M2Y1NmJkYWE2NmIMGMwODk3Mjg2NjQsMDU3OTg3MDorOjM2NGE6NWM3Y2MzOTESY40YjI2NWFnN2JjZjBmYk3ZmNhYzASZWBjN2M5ZTVjNDI8NTM2ZDQyZDQ3YzdkZTVkMWQ0OQ>

Plane Drops Off Passenger Screaming 'Stop the Plane'

<https://url.avantam.click/v2/...http://thirdpartyoffers.juno.com/TGL3131608c349c4136f491023f602vac3...YXAaOnNmZHQyOmE6bn03M2Y1NmJkYWE2NmIMGMwODk3Mjg2NjQsMDU3OTg3MDorOjM2NGE6NWM3Y2MzOTESY40YjI2NWFnN2JjZjBmYk3ZmNhYzASZWBjN2M5ZTVjNDI8NTM2ZDQyZDQ3YzdkZTVkMWQ0OQ>

From: [Alison Goh](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Roberta Borgonovo](#); [LWVSF Advocacy](#)
Subject: File # 210577 and 210595 Urging the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to Pause Litigation Against the State Water Resources Control Board
Date: Thursday, June 3, 2021 4:51:36 PM
Attachments: [5.27.21 LWVC Letter to San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.pdf](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The League of Women Voters of San Francisco encourages the Board of Supervisors to take steps to pass the resolution urging the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause its litigation against the California State Water Resources Control Board and instead heed the beneficial input of a diverse and inclusive group of stakeholders, including subject matter experts in environmental protection, habitat restoration, and the diversification of water supplies based on credible science (File # 210577 and 210595) with all appropriate speed.

Attached to this email is a copy of the League of Women Voters of California's letter to the Commissioners of the SFPUC regarding our request to increase flows in the Tuolumne River. The letter is very much in line with the resolution (File # 210577 and 210595). In this year of drought and changes in the climate regime in California, it is imperative that San Francisco joins other diverters in the Tuolumne River basin to increase flows that will reach the Bay-Delta.

Sincerely,

Alison Goh

Alison Goh
President
president@lwvsf.org
pronouns: she/her

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
582 Market Street, Suite 615, San Francisco, CA 94104
415-989-8683 • [Facebook](#) • [Twitter](#)
Empowering voters. Defending democracy. Learn more at lwvsf.org.



May 27, 2021

VIA Email

President Sophie Maxwell and Commissioners
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)
525 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Request to Increase Flows in the Tuolumne River

Dear President Maxwell and Commissioners:

The League of Women Voters of California urges you to work with the State Water Board (SWB) to increase flows in the Tuolumne River. The League believes that increasing flows in the tributaries of the San Joaquin and Sacramento rivers is critical to protecting the Bay-Delta Estuary.

As background, the League supports the efforts of the State Water Board to adopt scientifically based instream flow standards that will increase unimpaired flow in the San Joaquin River and its tributaries. We support high water quality standards and protection of fisheries, habitat, and instream uses without enabling continued unsustainable levels of reliance on exports from the Delta.

We believe increased flow is necessary for the survival of salmon and other species in the San Joaquin and Sacramento River ecosystems. Further, we believe all diverters from the San Francisco/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary should contribute to the flows necessary to sustain the health of the Estuary.

We make these comments in the hope that stakeholders will be encouraged to work together to reach agreements to increase unimpaired flows. We also encourage the staff of the SWB to continue working with local entities to fashion a standard that will protect all beneficial uses in the watershed. We note that the unimpaired flow proposal has an adaptive management approach so that the standard does not require rigid adherence to a fixed percent of unimpaired flow. This flexibility is necessary, especially as tributary watersheds struggle to meet requirements of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act. Implementation of non-flow measures could reduce the flows needed. Such

May 27, 2021

measures could include restoring gravel-spawning beds, improving native fish habitat, and suppressing predatory fish habitat.

Because the Tuolumne River is the most impacted, leaving only 21% of unimpaired flow in the river from February through June, we specifically encourage the San Francisco Public Utility Commission (SFPUC) to study various options in partnership with the Modesto and Turlock Irrigation Districts to increase flows in the river. Exploring groundwater banking, enhanced conservation projects, and other innovative approaches to water management could benefit all and lessen the economic impacts to both agricultural and urban users. Leadership, a strong commitment, and financial resources are required.

We recognize that San Francisco's main water supply comes from the Tuolumne River. However, the League believes San Francisco can reduce water diversions and still sustain its local economy by increased investments in local and regional water supply projects, such as water recycling and improved conservation projects. In this year of drought and changes in the climate regime in California, it is imperative that San Francisco joins other diverters in the Tuolumne River basin to increase flows that will reach the Bay-Delta.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



Carol Moon Goldberg
President

From: [mark.rockwell](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Letter to SF Board of Supervisor - Peskin"s Resolution
Date: Thursday, June 3, 2021 3:16:37 PM
Attachments: [Letter to SF Supervisors - Peskin Res. 6321.pdf](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear SF Board of Supervisors: I am sending this letter on behalf of our Northern California Council, Fly Fishers International, 23 regional fly fishing clubs, & our 6,000+ members. We request your attention to this important request, and ask it be distributed to all Board members.

Thank You,

C. Mark Rockwell, President
Northern California Council, Fly Fishers International

--

Dr. Mark Rockwell, D.C.
President & VP Conservation,
Northern Calif. Council,
Fly Fishers International
5033 Yapple Ave.
Santa Barbara, CA 93111
mrockwell1945@gmail.com
530 559-5759 (cell)

From: C. Mark Rockwell, President, Northern California Council, Fly Fishers International

To: S.F. Board of Supervisors@sfgov.org

Subject: Support Supervisor Peskin's water resolution Date: June 3, 2021 at 2:56:41 PM PDT

I am writing to ask that you support Supervisor Peskin's resolution, "Urging the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to Pause Litigation Against the State Water Resources Control Board".

I write on behalf of the Northern California Council, Fly Fishers International, our 23 member fly fishing clubs and our shared 6,000+ members. It's important to know that all of these clubs & members reside within the S.F. Bay-Delta watershed, and several of them (14) are directly impacted by decisions the SFPUC makes on how to manage the Tuolumne River water. Several of our clubs are located in your service area - San Mateo, San Francisco & Santa Clara County. They all have been very clear with me to ask the SFPUC to make decisions that will improve the health of the S.F. Bay-Delta, including the San Francisco Bay. I have participated in SFPUC meetings to express their concern and suggestions. Their current disappointment with SFPUC over the litigation against the State Water Board is voiced to me daily. They want you to support Supervisor Peskin's resolution immediately, and join the State Water Board in

improving the biggest watershed on the west coast of the Americas.

I lived 50 years of my life in either Redwood City or Portola Valley, enjoying water service through customers of SFPUC. It was always felt by residents that San Francisco was a city on the leading edge of environmental fairness, and caring for the health of the S.F. Bay-Delta watershed. Our members who live there no longer feel this way. They are realizing that instead of responding to Climate Change with a caring attitude, SFPUC has shifted to a “take care of us, forget the rest” attitude. It certainly does not make decisions to protect the salmon the City is known for, and the fisherman connected to them. Fisherman’s Wharf is an historical place, visited by 10’s of thousands annually. You are throwing away this legacy by not being part of the solution in the Bay-Delta, and helping salmon recover to their historical greatness.

It’s important to realize that the water in the Tuolumne River belongs to all Californians, and San Francisco is allowed to use it based upon the reality that downstream users can live in a healthy watershed. That is not the case in the Stockton region and elsewhere. Polluted and toxic water now exists from agrochemicals & blue-green algae problems. It is clear from the science done by the State Water Board that flows into and through the Delta need to increase to benefit all inhabitants - people, fish, birds & wildlife. Reducing SFPUC water diversions to meet the Water Board’s regulatory change is the appropriate action, not suing them to block it. This is not the San Francisco we all love & know. It’s not

consistent with your customer's desires, nor is it consistent with the biological needs of the Bay-Delta.

Lastly, it's clear that San Francisco has enough storage to get through almost any drought with only limited restrictions on water users. It's also clear that SFPUC has let fear of drought distort planning by using data that is not consistent with past droughts nor consistent with historical water use and impacts of moderate restrictions. Mr. Drekmeier of the Tuolumne River Trust has shared that in SFPUC meetings I have attended. Simply stated, they use data in a way to prove their pre-existing conclusion - "we can't afford to increase flows in the Tuolumne without disaster". That is simply not the case. Mr. Drekmeier has offered several options on how to work with other diverters on the Tuolumne to make the new flows possible, and there are more accurate data sets he's recommended to show more valid outcomes. Instead of SFPUC suing the Water Board you need to look inward and be determined to help the Bay-Delta watershed and manage your water better. It can be done.

So, for the sake of your customers, the wonderful salmon fishery San Francisco is known for, and the people in the central valley negatively impacted today, support Supervisor Peskin's resolution. Additionally, SFPUC should invest in the future by working with Mr. Drekmeier & others on the Tuolumne River to meet the Water Board's regulatory flow standard. You can do it!

Sincerely,

C. Mark Rockwell, President

Northern California Council, Fly Fishers International
mrockwell1945@gmail.com 530 559-5759

From: [Margaret MacNiven](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please follow Peskin's lead
Date: Friday, June 4, 2021 11:04:16 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

My name is Margaret MacNiven and I live in San Mateo County. The California landscape is unique and should be protected to the nth degree for future generations of humans, plants and animals. It is our duty. The Bay Delta needs a minimum of water flow to sustain its ecology. NOT a lawsuit. And definitely not human interference such as power washing spawning gravel and building unnatural fish barriers.

Thank you, Supervisor Peskin, for introducing a resolution to pause the lawsuit and follow the science on water flow and water needs, and I am writing to urge your fellow supervisors to support his clear minded and practical resolution.

Sincerely,
Margaret MacNiven

From: [Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Hepner, Lee \(BOS\)](#); [Angulo, Sunny \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: commission@sfwater.org
Subject: Resolution 210577 - SFPUC's Litigation Against Environmental Protections
Date: Monday, June 7, 2021 1:08:56 PM
Attachments: [Letter re. Peskin Resolution 6-1-21.pdf](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To Whom It May Concern:

Please find attached our letter supporting Supervisor Peskin's resolution urging the SFPUC to pause their litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

Sincerely yours,

Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla

--

Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla

Executive Director

Restore the Delta

509 E Main St
Stockton, CA 95202
(209) 479-2053

pronouns: *she/her/hers*



[Website](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#)

The content of this email is confidential and intended for the recipient specified in message only. It is strictly forbidden to share any part of this message with any third party, without a written consent of the sender. If you received this message by mistake, please reply to this message and follow with its deletion, so that we can ensure such a mistake does not occur in the future.



Restore the Delta
509 E Main Street
Stockton, CA 95202

June 7, 2021

Supervisor Aaron Peskin
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Resolution 210577 - SFPUC's Litigation Against Environmental Protections

Dear Supervisor Peskin:

We are writing to express our support for your resolution urging the SFPUC to pause their litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board. That litigation is another step in the SFPUC's ongoing efforts to prevent the State of California from adopting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River, the Bay-Delta and the communities that are affected directly by pollution and the decline of this ecosystem.

Our organization represents the Delta, which has suffered enormously from the lack of freshwater inflow and the lack of scientifically driven State Board flow standards. This is a primary cause of the dramatic increase in harmful algae blooms (HAB) in the Delta. Those HAB outbreaks represent a significant threat to public health. During these blooms, merely swimming in Delta waterways can be harmful to public health, and they potentially threaten drinking water supplies. Those blooms have become so intense that they also result in the degradation of air quality - in a community that already has among the highest asthma rates in the nation. Recently, HABs have also been linked with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, also known as Lou Gehrig's disease.

The HAB problem has been growing worse for years and has become a public health crisis. In addition to threatening public health, this crisis also undermines efforts to rebuild the economy in our communities. This crisis represents a particular threat to economically disadvantaged communities of color.

Unfortunately, for years, the SFPUC has been fighting against science-based new flow standards to improve this situation. They have developed a proposed "voluntary agreement" that would fail to significantly improve flows that a NMFS peer review has revealed to be without a credible scientific foundation. That proposal offers nothing to improve the crisis facing our communities. The SFPUC has now sued the State Board twice in an effort to block desperately needed new flow standards. The SFPUC's positions completely ignore the HAB crisis and its impacts on our communities.

Their latest litigation, challenging the State Board's 401 certification for the Tuolumne River FERC licensing process, ignores the solid scientific foundation for the State Board's action. It also embraces a Trump era interpretation of Section 401 of the Clean Water Act in an effort to muzzle State efforts to protect State rivers in this federal process. The suit even claims that the State Board's efforts violate the state constitution. These claims are not merely incorrect, they undermine San Francisco's reputation as a leader in protecting the environment and disadvantaged communities.

The SFPUC has, for years, worked to block the adoption of environmental protections that are needed to protect public health, as well as the economic health of our communities. Their current litigation against the State Board is a clear example of this pattern. We urge the Board of Supervisors to support your resolution and encourage the SFPUC to change direction.

Thank you for introducing this resolution. We look forward to continuing to work with you to ensure that the SFPUC changes direction and supports water policies that reflect San Francisco's values.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla". The signature is fluid and cursive, written over a light blue horizontal line.

Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla
Executive Director
Restore the Delta

Cc: SF Board of Supervisors

From: [Denise Louie](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution to support the Bay Delta Plan
Date: Friday, June 4, 2021 11:50:50 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi SF Supervisors,

I urge you to support Supervisor Peskin's Resolution, FILE NO. 210577, urging the SFPUC to withdraw its lawsuit against the State Water Resources Control Board.

The SWRCB spent more than a decade drafting and vetting its Bay Delta Conservation Plan. Scientists said we need up to 60% unimpaired flows along the Tuolumne River to save iconic species like salmon from going extinct and to save entire ecosystems from collapsing. The Plan is already a compromise at 40%, halfway between what scientists say is needed and our historic 20%.

SF must let the SWRCB do its job to ensure healthy ecosystems, which are a benefit to San Franciscans. The Voluntary Agreements proposed by the SFPUC have not, cannot and will not yield desired results. The SFPUC is blocking the SWRCB from doing its job, in direct opposition to San Franciscans, who care about the environment. Staff have provided the commission with unending, obfuscating reports not based on science, history or objective review.

SF is named for St. Francis, patron saint of ecology. It is our moral and ethical duty to care for species other than our own and to wisely steward our resources.

Meanwhile, SF is allowing more development, which increases water demand. UCSF, for example, is planning a huge expansion at Parnassus, even after we've allowed their huge development at Mission Bay. At a May 18, 2021 community outreach Zoom meeting, I asked UCSF's architects whether they will incorporate water conservation, water recycling and rooftop rainwater capture. No answer. The City must reduce and limit development and freshwater demand. Rooftop rainwater capture, recycling and conservation must be applied, in my opinion.

During the pandemic, my average household water use has been 10-14 gallons per day per person. 25 GPD is excellent, but my household savings shows how much we want more water directed to fish. You can do your part by at least supporting Supervisor Peskin's Resolution.

Thanks in advance for your attention and
Happy World Environment Day tomorrow,
Denise Louie
Native San Franciscan, taxpayer and voter
Member, Center for Biological Diversity
D7

From: [Judy Schriebman](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for Aaron Peskin's resolution to pause the lawsuit
Date: Friday, June 4, 2021 3:14:54 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear SF Board of Supervisors:

As a lifelong environmentalist and lover of Yosemite, Hetch Hetchy and the Rivers that flow from them, I would strongly encourage you to not side with Trumpian anti-environmental half-measures to protect the fish that need this water to survive. Following the science is vital, and with a peer review commissioned by the National Marine Fisheries Service debunking the science behind the SFPUC's proposal, it is

The SF PUC has shown great leadership in the design of their water-conserving main office building, in managing recycled water for irrigation in Golden Gate Park vs using the city's underground aquifer for that purpose and many other visionary approaches to conserve city stormwater and prevent sewage overflows.

It is time for that Vision to extend upstream, and protect and enhance the critically important flows that are needed for fish and wildlife survival that we all depend upon.

Judy Schriebman

From: [Toni Kiely](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: You must act to restore our Rivers!
Date: Friday, June 4, 2021 6:12:39 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Our ecosystem is collapsing all around us and you **MUST** use your positions to stop the ridiculous lawsuit Herrera is promoting.
The pacific Orcas are **STARVING!** Our fishing industry is in jeopardy and we **MUST** do everything within our abilities to restore our rivers to the flows necessary to sustain life!
Sincerely,
LaVive Kiely
Lifelong San Francisco Resident (and voter)

From: [aeboken](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Subject: SUPPORTING BOS Agenda Item #40 [Urging the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to Pause Litigation Against the State Water Resources Control Board] File #210577
Date: Sunday, May 23, 2021 6:08:12 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

TO: Board of Supervisors members

I am strongly supporting urging the SFPUC to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

Eileen Boken

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods*

*For identification purposes only.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Administrative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: BAWSCA Correspondence with SFPUC re: Support of TRVA
Date: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 10:21:00 AM
Attachments: [21_May_25_BAWSCA_Letter_to_SFPUC_BOS_FINAL.pdf](#)
[image002.png](#)

From: Nicole Sandkulla <NSandkulla@bawasca.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 10:19 AM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Cc: Somera, Alisa (BOS) <alisa.somera@sfgov.org>; Carlin, Michael (PUC) <mcarlin@sfgwater.org>; bud.wendell <bud.wendell@gmail.com>; aschutte@hansonbridgett.com; Nathan Metcalf (nmetcalf@hansonbridgett.com) <nmetcalf@hansonbridgett.com>; Tom Francis <tfrancis@bawasca.org>
Subject: BAWSCA Correspondence with SFPUC re: Support of TRVA

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors (c/o Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board),

This email transmits a copy of my letter to the Commissioners of the SFPUC regarding BAWSCA's support of the Tuolumne River Voluntary Agreement as an alternative to the Bay-Delta Plan. This letter is particularly timely given the item on your meeting agenda today.

By copy of this email to Ms. Calvillo, I am requesting for her distribution of the letter to members of the Board of Supervisors.

Please call me directly if you have any questions or comments.

Respectfully,
Nicole Sandkulla

Nicole M. Sandkulla
Chief Executive Officer/General Manager
Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency
155 Bovet Road, Suite 650
San Mateo, CA 94402
Ph: (650) 349-3000
Cell: (650) 743-6688
EMail: NSandkulla@BAWSCA.org
Website: www.BAWSCA.org

Every drop counts. Use water wisely.



Make the change to
California native plants
and use less water.



SaveOurWater.com

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Administrative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: City of SF Board Meeting - Agenda Item #40 Comments
Date: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 12:19:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[City of SF to SFPUC item #40 2021-5-25.pdf](#)

Hello Supervisors,

Please see attached correspondence for Item 40 on today's Board of Supervisors meeting agenda.

Regards,

Jackie Hickey
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Direct: (415) 554-7701
jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Sherri Norris <sherri@cieaweb.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 11:15 AM
To: BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: 'Marcus Sorondo' <marcuss.ciea@gmail.com>; 'Irenia Quitiquit' <iaqquit@gmail.com>; 'Meyo Marrufo' <meyo.marrufo@gmail.com>; 'Faith Gemmill' <redoilone@gmail.com>
Subject: City of SF Board Meeting - Agenda Item #40 Comments

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Good morning,

Attached are our comments for Agenda item #40 for today's City and County of San Francisco Board Meeting. This letter is in support of proposed Resolution #210577, which urges the SFPUC to pause litigation with the SWRCB.

Please also confirm this attachment was received.

Thank you and have a very good meeting!

Respectfully,

Sherri Norris
Executive Director



California Indian Environmental Alliance (CIEA)

Mailing address: PO Box 2128, Berkeley, CA 94702

Physical address: 6323 Fairmount Avenue, Suite #B, El Cerrito, CA 94530

Office: (510) 848-2043 Cell: (510) 334-4408

www.cieaweb.org

 Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Administrative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Letter re. Supervisor Peskin's Resolution re. the SFPUC's Resolution
Date: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 1:47:00 PM
Attachments: [NGO Support for Resolution re. SFPUC Litigation 5-25-21.pdf](#)

-----Original Message-----

From: Barry Nelson <barrynelsonwws@gmail.com> On Behalf Of Barry Nelson
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 1:16 PM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Subject: Letter re. Supervisor Peskin's Resolution re. the SFPUC's Resolution

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Angela - Can you share this letter with the Supervisors? The letter supports Supervisor Peskin's resolution re the SFPUC's recent litigation. It's before the supervisors today as agenda item #40.

Barry Nelson
Western Water Strategies
510 340 1685

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Administrative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Please pause the litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board
Date: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 1:51:00 PM

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the following correspondence for Item 40 on today's Board of Supervisors meeting agenda.

Regards,

Jackie Hickey
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Direct: (415) 554-7701
jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Carol Steinfeld <carol@carol-steinfeld.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 11:43 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Please pause the litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

At today's meeting, please pause the litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

There is no risk in this action.

Even with unimpaired flows in the Tuolumne River, the service area will have sufficient water supply.

The biggest user of this water source is the upper end of the wholesale purchase area (San Mateo County). It recently recognized that it must reduce dependence on Hetch Hetchy water.

At the same time, the state will either accept the SFPUC's staff's proposed "voluntary plan" (Tuolumne River Voluntary Agreement or TRVA) or reject it on the basis of its poor modeling. Note that the SFPUC commissioners appear to doubt the basis of the TRVA. The current litigation will not influence this, so it is unnecessary.

The City can also reduce its unnecessary costs associated with this litigation.

Thanks.

Carol Steinfeld

Sierra Club Water Committee member

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Administrative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Comment for Item 40 (210577) at Board of Supervisor"s meeting May 25, 2021
Date: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 1:55:00 PM

Hello Supervisors,

Please see the following correspondence for Item 40 on today's Board of Supervisors meeting agenda.

Regards,

Jackie Hickey
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Direct: (415) 554-7701
jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Jo Coffey <coffey.jo@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 12:12 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Comment for Item 40 (210577) at Board of Supervisor's meeting May 25, 2021

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Honorable Supervisors,

I support this resolution urging the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause its litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

Water is life. It's a political slogan, but it's true. All living things - ourselves, the plants and animals we raise, the plants and animals in the wild - we all need water to survive. We're in a drought, so there's less water to go around. I was very disappointed to see that the SFPUC's first reaction to the California State Water Resource Board's proposed allocation was to file suit demanding more water for San Francisco. Less water flowing down the rivers has a particularly bad impact on species, salmon, for instance, who live part of their lives in the rivers, and part in the ocean, and that impacts the diverse groups, including us, that depend on those species, upstream in the river, and downstream in the ocean. I'm sure I'm not alone in saying I'm willing to settle for fewer showers if it helps make for healthier rivers, filled with more abundant life.

This sensible resolution urges the SFPUC to consider the input of the diverse group of stakeholders on this matter, and come to a decision based on credible science.

I urge you to adopt it.

Jo Coffey
248 Dublin Street
San Francisco, 94112
District 11

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Administrative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Letter re. Supervisor Peskin's Resolution re. the SFPUC's Resolution
Date: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 1:56:00 PM
Attachments: [NGO Support for Resolution re. SFPUC Litigation 5-25-21.pdf](#)

Hello Supervisors,

Please see attached correspondence for Item 40 on today's Board of Supervisors meeting agenda.

Regards,

Jackie Hickey
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Phone: (415) 554-5184 | Direct: (415) 554-7701
jacqueline.hickey@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

From: Barry Nelson <barrynelsonwws@gmail.com> **On Behalf Of** Barry Nelson
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 1:27 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: Fwd: Letter re. Supervisor Peskin's Resolution re. the SFPUC's Resolution

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Please share this letter with the Supervisors, regarding agenda item 40 today.

Barry Nelson
Western Water Strategies
510 340 1685

Begin forwarded message:

From: Barry Nelson <barry@westernwaterstrategies.com>
Subject: Letter re. Supervisor Peskin's Resolution re. the SFPUC's Resolution
Date: May 25, 2021 at 1:16:17 PM PDT

To: angela.calvillo@sfgov.org

Angela - Can you share this letter with the Supervisors? The letter supports Supervisor Peskin's resolution re the SFPUC's recent litigation. It's before the supervisors today as agenda item #40.

Barry Nelson
Western Water Strategies
510 340 1685

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Administrative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Item 40, BAWSCA and the SFPUC
Date: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 4:21:00 PM
Attachments: [TRT Letter to BAWSCA re-TRVA.pdf](#)

From: Peter Drekmeier <peter@tuolumne.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 11:19 AM
To: Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>
Subject: Item 40, BAWSCA and the SFPUC

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors:

Today you received a letter from the CEO of the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency (BAWSCA) regarding the Tuolumne River Voluntary Agreement (TRVA). BAWSCA and the SFPUC are misleading others about the potential efficacy of the TRVA. Attached is a letter we sent to BAWSCA in response to a presentation the CEO gave to her Board. BAWSCA was unable to respond to our comments. The National Marine Fisheries Service commissioned a peer review that debunked the “science” behind the TRVA, yet the water agencies continue to claim it would produce more fish with less water. In fact, it would likely lead to the extinction of Central Valley salmon.

I point this out to encourage you to hear from both sides of the issue. The SFPUC continues to inflate the potential impact of the Bay Delta Plan on our water supply. For example, a few months ago the SFPUC provided information to the BAWSCA agencies to help them prepare their Urban Water Management Plans. That information used contractual obligations to represent current and future demand, inflating it by 25%. We caught them trying to cook the books, and they were forced to correct the information using actual demand projections. This simple, honest change reduced potential future rationing by 27%.

There are a number of other ways the SFPUC and BAWSCA mislead leaders like you. We would welcome the opportunity to address these issues alongside the SFPUC and allow you to serve as judges. You won't be disappointed.

In the meantime, I invite you to view a presentation I gave to Sustainable Silicon Valley. It's posted at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NkY5alrIEQo&feature=youtu.be&t=1> (I start at 31:55).

I look forward to continuing this conversation, and encourage you to support Supervisor Peskin's resolution.

Thank you.

-Peter Drekmeier

Peter Drekmeier
Policy Director
Tuolumne River Trust
peter@tuolumne.org
(415) 882-7252

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#); [BOS-Administrative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: SFBOS 5/25 Regular Meeting Agenda Item #40 Public Comment
Date: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 6:30:00 PM

From: Jessie Rodriguez <jessier@americanindianculturaldistrict.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 5:49 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Sharaya Souza <sharayas@americanindianculturaldistrict.org>
Subject: SFBOS 5/25 Regular Meeting Agenda Item #40 Public Comment

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

My name is Jessie Rodriguez, I am writing on behalf of the American Indian Cultural District on [Agenda Item #40](#), 210577 [Urging the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to Pause Litigation Against the State Water Resources Control Board] from today's Board Of Supervisors Regular Meeting.

We need to prioritize clean water in San Francisco and the protection of our California Salmon. The May 13th lawsuit filed by the SFPUC and SF City Attorney Dennis Herrera has a disproportionate negative impact on American Indian people who rely on salmon as a traditional food source and medicine for their people, including Tribes from the SF Bay and Bay Delta, along with millions of Californians that get their water below San Francisco's diversion. This lawsuit and Mr. Herrera's views do not reflect the environmental values of the American Indian community or the San Francisco Bay Area. These positions directly undermine needed reform of the SFPUC regarding environmental protections, use of credible science including Indigenous knowledge, and diversifying San Francisco's water supply.

Thank you,

--

Jessie Rodriguez
Community Engagement Coordinator
American Indian Cultural District
934 Brannan St, San Francisco, CA 94103
Phone: (415) 651-3480
JessieR@AmericanIndianCulturalDistrict.org
[LinkedIn](#) | [Website](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - This email is intended only for the person(s) or entity identified above. Unless otherwise indicated, it contains information and or attachments that are confidential, privileged and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender of the error and delete the message.

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: It's Time to Pause the Litigation against the State Water Control Board
Date: Wednesday, May 26, 2021 9:31:00 AM

From: Deborah Garfinkle <dhgarf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 5:04 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: It's Time to Pause the Litigation against the State Water Control Board

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Supervisors,
I'm a resident of District 6 and the litigation by the against the State Water Control Board. This litigation has not been well thought out and alternatives have not been well studied. What's more disturbing is the fact that the SFPUC's alternative plan, the TRVA, is based on unproven models. Given the recent move by Mayor Breed to nominate Dennis Herrera, in the wake of the corruption scandal, to head the SFPUC, someone who has no experience in this field, I worry that politics are taking precedent over the critical environmental concerns that impact all of us in the City and State. Please pause the litigation so that the policy is guided by science and environment, not politics.
With respect,
Deborah Garfinkle
400 Beale St. Apt 613
SF 94105

From: [Dennis Whitaker](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 5:29:12 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Dennis Whitaker
927 Kingwood St
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

From: [Gilbert Munz](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 5:55:54 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Gilbert Munz
610 Galerita Way
San Rafael, CA 94903

From: [Mark Hewell](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 5:56:23 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Mark Hewell
9208 Vista del Monte Ct.
Gilroy, CA 95020

From: [Mayo Shattuck](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 5:57:01 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Mayo Shattuck
2957 Divisadero St.
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: [Brad Doran](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 5:57:58 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Brad Doran
50 Conrad Street
San Francisco, CA 94131

From: [Steve Bicknell](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 6:07:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Steve Bicknell
53 Oak knoll ave
San Anselmo, CA 94960

From: [Phil Kennett](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 6:24:20 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Phil Kennett
539 Navajo Place
Danville, CA 94526

From: [Mark Ortega](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 6:31:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Mark Ortega
522 Westmoor Ave
Daly City, CA 94015

From: [warren woo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 6:44:32 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

warren woo
105 Knoll Cir
South San Francisco, CA 94080

From: [Fred Rinne](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 6:46:59 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Fred Rinne
642 Cayuga Ave
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: [Michael McGowan](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 6:48:30 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Michael McGowan
1423 Scenic Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94708

From: [Frank Parcell](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 6:56:34 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Frank Parcell
2935 Eaton Avenue
San Carlos, CA 94070

From: [Dom Yazzolino](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 7:03:39 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Dom Yazzolino
28 Jordan Ave
San Anselmo, CA 94960

From: [Richard Angelis](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 7:11:32 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Richard Angelis
916 Leroy Lane
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

From: [Charles Ferguson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 7:18:24 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Charles Ferguson
4056 Castlewood Ct.
Concord, CA 94518

From: [Brian Spigelman](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 7:31:34 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Brian Spigelman
35 Cranham Ct
Pacifica, CA 94044

From: [Frank Rescino](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 8:11:52 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Frank Rescino
218 Hazelwood Drive
South San Francisco, CA 94080

From: [Ed Olson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 8:25:30 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Ed Olson
2872 Greenwich St
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: [Paul Simpson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 9:03:04 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Paul Simpson
95 Linares Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94116

From: [Kenneth Baccetti](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 9:17:42 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Baccetti
1818 Grant Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: [Kathleen Baccetti](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 9:18:33 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Baccetti
1818 Grant Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94133

From: [Robert Cameron](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 9:35:23 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Robert Cameron
1200 Majilla Ave
Burlingame, CA 94010

From: [Gerald Oranje](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 9:44:22 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Gerald Oranje
2525 Railroad Ave
Pittsburg, CA 94565

From: [scott.mathews](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021 9:49:31 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

scott mathews
4 Crater Lake Way
Pacifica, CA 94044

From: [kevin leary](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 1:21:19 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

kevin leary
126 highland ave.
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94110

From: [Tom Mattusch](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 5:14:00 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Tom Mattusch
P O Box 957
El Granada, CA 94018

From: [David Esparza](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 6:32:18 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

David Esparza
box 45
Fairfax, CA 94978

From: [Bill Corkery](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 7:30:51 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Bill Corkery
3701east Laurel creek dr
San mateo, CA 94403

From: [Larry Anderson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 8:40:13 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Larry Anderson
403 Tropicana Way
Union City, CA 94587

From: [Brian Kyono](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 9:06:17 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Brian Kyono
1695 25th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: [Ray Grech](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 9:13:12 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Ray Grech
220 verano dr
South San Francisco, CA 94080

From: [Bryan Eckert](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 9:21:05 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Bryan Eckert
772 Oak Street
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: [William D Lambert](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 9:21:09 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

William D Lambert
519 Frumenti Ct
Martinez, CA 94553

From: [Anja Eckert](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 9:22:00 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Anja Eckert
772 Oak St
San Francisco, CA 94117

From: [Tim Cannon](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 10:09:19 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Tim Cannon
980 Ventura Ave
Albany, CA 94707

From: [Steve D'Amico](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 10:21:53 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Steve D'Amico
293 Angelita Ave
Pacifica, CA 94044

From: [Vincent Accurso](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 11:23:28 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Vincent Accurso
85 Geldert Dr
Belvedere Tiburon, CA 94920

From: [Ronald Trainer](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 11:42:15 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Ronald Trainer
423 Garretson Ave
Rodeo, CA 94572

From: [DEREK COOTE](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 11:57:33 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

DEREK COOTE
1370 47TH AVE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94122

From: [JOHN MIKULIN](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 1:13:25 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

JOHN MIKULIN
444 Persia Ave
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: [Robert Love](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 1:19:30 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Robert Love
360 Fair Oaks St.
San Francisco, CA 94110

From: [Jeanette Cool](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 2:06:34 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Jeanette Cool
71 Hartford
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: [Jay Brunner](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 2:59:27 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Jay Brunner
4476 23rd St
San Francisco, CA 94114

From: [Robert Del Secco](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 4:08:43 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Robert Del Secco
12 Dell Ln
Mill Valley, CA 94941

From: [Dennis Whitaker](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 4:18:42 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Dennis Whitaker
927 Kingwood St
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

From: [Jose Rocha](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 4:48:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Jose Rocha
104 Knight Ct
Windsor, CA 95492

From: [Carolyn McNulty](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 4:54:16 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Carolyn McNulty
221 Justin Dr
San Francisco, CA 94112

From: [William D Lambert](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 5:07:59 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

William D Lambert
519 Frumenti Ct
Martinez, CA 94553

From: [jeffrey.ansley](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 5:12:02 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

It is hard to believe that San Francisco attempts to position itself as a progressive city yet

destroys our fishing resources in this manner.

Sincerely,
jeffrey ansley
1123 sanders drive
moraga, CA 94556

From: [Stephanie Hausle](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 7:07:41 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Hausle
110 Bayview Dr
San Rafael, CA 94901

From: [John Atkinson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 8:03:53 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

John Atkinson
42 Seawolf Passage
Corte madera, CA 94925

From: [Peter Douglas](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 8:05:18 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Peter Douglas
81 West Santa Inez Ave
San Mateo, CA 94402

From: [Peter Douglas](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 9:03:04 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Peter Douglas
81 W Santa Inez Ave
San Mateo, CA 94402

From: [Brian Johnson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 10:14:12 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Brian Johnson
414 Kirkham St.
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: [Albert Larcina](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 6:51:25 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Albert Larcina
50 Oxford Drive
San Rafael, CA 94903

From: [Randall Patterson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 6:59:30 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Randall Patterson
816 Fairfield Road
Burlingame, CA 94010

From: [ryan Zander](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 7:48:40 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

ryan Zander
2112 easton drive
Burlingame, CA 94010

From: [Mike Calegari](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 7:54:58 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Mike Calegari
2647 mandeville way
West Sacramento, CA 95691

From: [christy.holloway](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support Peskin's resolution to pause the lawsuit
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 8:26:24 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

Please let the science prove itself, pause the lawsuit against the State Water Board regarding the release of water into the Tuolumne. Let science tell us what is necessary to balance and save important ecosystems. That takes time...

Thank you for your consideration,

Christina Holloway
730 Santa Maria Ave
Stanford, CA 94305

From: [Judy Irving](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Herrera"s lawsuit is disgraceful
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 8:39:34 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Please support Supervisor Peskin's resolution urging the city to pause the lawsuit against the State Water Board, which does not represent the values of San Franciscans, and is, frankly, an embarrassment. Herrera should not head the SFPUC; we need someone who will help restore the Tuolumne River while ensuring water supplies for our city by aggressively developing alternative water resources.

It can be done!

Don't sell out to Central Valley agribusiness lobbyists!

Thank you,

Judy Irving
"The Wild Parrots of Telegraph Hill"
"Pelican Dreams"

From: [Richard Pool](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 8:51:56 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Richard Pool
1343 Summit Road
Lafayette, CA 94549

From: [Carol Fields](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Supervisor Peskin's Resolution
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 9:02:41 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Friends,

As I am sure you are aware, we are playing a long-game in California with the availability of water. Thanks to the eloquent SF Chronicle editorial by Peter Drekmeier, we have a terse summary of where we have arrived. It is discouraging that we tend to rely on unsubstantiated opinions, rather than facts when dealing with water, which is necessary for all plants, animals, and people--namely, for the planetary ecosystem as we have known it. If a jet fighter pilot did this, they would lose skirmishes and crash, at terrific expense. We are not protecting our own population in California with our current over-drafting of our Sierra streams, though we have a number of skillful and effective other paths to follow. To be frank, it is a blatant lie to claim that we provide "water security" when we threaten the ecosystem, by both causing and reacting half-heartedly to the climate effects of global warming. I cannot suggest strongly enough that we follow the proven science as Peter Drekmeier has outlined in detail many times, and to add my own wish: start (way) offshore wind-powered desalination of seawater NOW as our security blanket until we climb out of our deepening global climate catastrophe.

Sincerely,
Carol Fields, Berkeley, CA

From: [Tom](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support Supervisor Peskin's Resolution
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 9:39:16 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I urge you to support Supervisor Peskin's Resolution to pause the lawsuit against the State Water Board. Do NOT side with Trump to block the state's ability to protect the environment. Give the six fish species listed as endangered or threatened as a result of insufficient freshwater inflow the water they need to survive and thrive.

Thank you.

Thomas Patterson
Palo Alto

From: [Bill Gray](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please protect our rivers and stop Dennis Herrera's lawsuit
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 10:06:28 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Supervisors,

Please protect our rivers and stop Dennis Herrera's lawsuit.

We cannot continue to satisfy our needs by pillaging the natural environment.

The bills for previous pillaging are coming due. Continuing this short sighted behavior will certainly destroy our land for our future selves and our children.

A healthy environmental system is crucial to our future. This is true globally, but is even more true locally! One of the major reasons that our city is one of the most desirable places to live in the world is because of the beautiful surrounding environment.

Mismanagement of these resources in the short term will surely undermine the long term value of living in the bay area.

As a community, we must learn to live with the water resources we have. Robbing the helpless natural environment to satisfy our short term needs is the path to disaster.

Sincerely,

Bill Gray

From: [Eric Hansen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please Support Supervisor Peskin's Pause for Science - We Need to Change Past Practice
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 10:28:08 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Peter Drekmeier's article in today's Chronicle illustrates the need for change to address climate change and prepare for future droughts. We must start recycling our water supplies and follow the State's Water Policy to become self reliant and develop locally sustainable water supplies, including potable reuse. We have the technology, local support, and the reservoir at Crystal Springs to fill with purified water. Southern California had no choice. We have a choice now to do the right thing and reduce our unnecessary pressure on the environment. As former chair of the State Water Board, Felicia Marcus said so eloquently, let's start with a 50:50 split on water and share this increasingly scarce resource with the environment before it's too late. Doing less is carelessly short sighted and an unnecessary abuse of power.

Eric

From: [paul chestnut](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Don't fight the lawsuit
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 10:28:57 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To the Board of Supervisors:

Please support Supervisor Peskin's resolution encouraging the City to pause San Francisco's recent lawsuit against the State Water Board. "It should be San Francisco's policy that the SFPUC and the City Attorney don't fight protections for the Tuolumne River and our treasured Bay Estuary."

Paul Chestnut
Pallo Alto, CA

From: [Brendan Bouey](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 11:01:47 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Brendan Bouey
1278 Funston Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94122

From: [Tom Battle](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Pause the Lawsuit against the State Water Board
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 11:03:35 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dennis Herrera's editorial in the SF Chronicle discusses how "SFPUC modeling" predicts a near-total depletion of SF water supplies in 2021. What he fails to explain is that the model has been shown to be outdated and erroneous. Anyone can create a doomsday model with a spreadsheet, but the model is only as useful as the veracity of the data. His editorial would carry more weight if based on fact rather than being used to stoke irrational fear in support of political gain.

The damage California's existing water policies have done to the environment are so severe that it's now become cliché to talk about "tipping points". But still the old, tired policies are seldom scientifically reviewed. The Tuolumne River Trust has pursued an independent study, which has arrived at verifiable and opposing conclusions to Mr. Herrera's.

Mr. Herrera points to San Francisco's gradual adoption of conservation measures. Though change comes at a snail's pace, indeed, SF requires less water from the Tuolumne than in years past, and this is despite its growing population. The current drought could extend multiple years into the future before his dire predictions would come to pass. Even then, measures exist to maintain a viable supply for Bay Area cities.

The steps most urgently needed are in support of new policies aimed at reuse and conservation. Don't allow our environment to pay the price for lazy thinking and out-dated models.

It is imperative to the future of California's environment and water management that the SF Board of Supervisors support Supervisor Peskin's resolution to pause the lawsuit filed by Mr. Herrera.

Regards,
Thomas Battle
Los Altos Hills, CA
650-242-2681

From: [Marty Mackowski](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: water solutions
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 11:07:19 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,
It's time to support Mr. Peskins resolution and stop Mr. Herraras lawsuit re water policy and the Tuolumne River. It smacks of Trump's assault on environmental issues. Let's leave politics to the politicians and scientific positions to the scientists.

Sincerely,
Marty Mackowski
Portola Valley

From: [Chris Lawson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 11:48:08 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Chris Lawson
4000 Dillon Beach Rd. P.O. Box 237
Dillon Beach, CA 94929

From: [Cheryl Weiden](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support Supervisor Peskin's resolution regarding pausing suit against State Water Board
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 11:51:39 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors:

It is time for California to be innovative about water management, and for San Francisco to show leadership to do so. Suing the State Water Board to get more water for San Francisco at the detriment of the environment is not demonstrating such leadership. Please support Supervisor Peskin's resolution (FILE NO.210577) to pause the suit.

"Instead of litigating, The City should show its environmental leadership by expanding alternative water resources. It's possible to keep our taps and our salmon running, even during droughts." ([Robyn Purchia, SF Examiner](#)) The engineers at the UC systems, for instance, have many innovative solutions for alternative water sources from both technology and policy perspectives, and San Francisco should be taking note and making use of this research.

Please do not allow San Francisco to move backwards. Support Supervisor Peskin's resolution and show that San Francisco is still a technical, policy and environmental leader.

Thank you.

Cheryl Weiden

--



From: [Rush Rehm](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support Supervisor Peskin's resolution
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 12:11:56 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a forty-year resident of the Bay Area, I write to urge you to support Supervisor Peskin's resolution encouraging the City to pause the lawsuit against the State Water Board. I follow the issue, and I was greatly moved by the recent editorial in the SF Chronicle on the issue, authored by Peter Dreke, a man extremely well-informed on the subject. This passage from the editorial struck me as particularly relevant, and you should consider it when asking the city to pause the lawsuit:

"The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, meanwhile, wants a "voluntary agreement" for the Tuolumne River. Instead of providing the river with desperately needed flow, the city is proposing power-washing spawning gravel, building a fish barrier that would somehow block undesired fish, but allow "good" fish to pass unmolested, and restoring a small amount of floodplain habitat for baby fish. These half-measures are doomed to fail. Floodplains without enough water to inundate them are useless. ..."

Please do all you can to stop this lawsuit against the State Water Board.

Sincerely,

Rush Rehm
Professor, Theater and Performance Studies, and Classics, Stanford University
Artistic Director, Stanford Repertory Theater (SRT) <http://stanfordreptheater.com/>

Stanford Repertory Theater will present *Voices of the Earth - from Sophocles to Rachel Carson and Beyond*, at the Henry Miller Memorial Library in Big Sur, California, at some future date, TBA. **If you would like to use the script, full-length audio/visual presentation, and/or radio broadcast quality passages - any and all free of charge, provided it is for non-commercial purposes (education, environmental awareness, arts and activism, theater programs), please visit our Stanford Repertory Theater website at <https://stanfordreptheater.com/> and click on the Voices of the Earth Tab.** Registration takes 20 seconds, and you will receive a password that give you free access to all the material.

A".J. Muste was picketing the White House in opposition to the Vietnam War, and a journalist asked him, "Why do you demonstrate in the rain? Do you think you will change the country?" "No," replied Muste, "I don't do this to change the country. I do this so the country doesn't change me."

From: pol1@rosenblums.us
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Supervisor Peskin's Resolution regarding SFPUC lawsuit
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 12:20:39 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear SF Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to you today in support of the resolution by Supervisor Peskin,

(FILE NO. 210577 Supervisors Peskin; Mandelman **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**
[Urging the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to Pause Litigation Against the
State Water Resources Control Board])

asking the SFPUC to pause its lawsuit against the State Water Resources Control Board which mandated minimum flows on the Tuolumne River. Recent expert testimony at SFPUC workshops on the issue have unequivocally shown that the Voluntary Agreements by themselves are no substitute for the minimum flows needed to support viable chinook salmon habitat. The SFPUC has generated a false sense of alarm by proposing an 8 year "design drought" that has never happened in recorded history, which would require unprecedented high levels of rationing. This falsehood was recently demonstrated, when in 2017, the SFPUC had captured up to 12 years of water consumption and then had to dump 88% of it because the reservoirs were too full. As a result, many chinook salmon died over the preceding years with NO benefit to humans. The SFPUC must re-focus its efforts towards advanced water treatment and re-use and less on reservoir storage as California will likely be facing regular droughts followed by a few monsoon years in our climate damaged future.

As customers of the SFPUC, we have willingly complied with past requests for rationing in the expectation that the Commission would act in the interests of the environment as well. Their current lawsuit shows them to be out of touch with their constituency. The recent resignation of the executive director under charges of corruption further tarnishes their image. The Board of Supervisors needs to exercise their power to bring the SFPUC to its senses.

Dr. Stephen Rosenblum
Palo Alto

From: [Carol SFPUC water user via CalWater Steinfeld](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 1:09:59 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Carol SFPUC water user via CalWater Steinfeld
910 Oregon Ave
San Mateo, CA 94402

From: [Kristen Tucker](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support pausing the Lawsuit against the State Water Board
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 1:56:40 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I am writing to urge you to support Supervisor Peskin's resolution to pause the City's lawsuit against the State Water Board. San Francisco has long had an ample supply of pristine water and we have shown that we can conserve more and therefore allow more water to flow more freely in the Tuolumne. Preserving this fragile ecosystem and the life cycle of the salmon is worth any inconvenience we might experience.

Thank you for considering my opinion in your deliberations.

Kristen Tucker
62 Marston Ave
San Francisco
94112

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Richard Montgomery](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: peskin res.
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 2:43:42 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board

Please support Supervisor Peskin's resolution encouraging the City of SF to either drop or pause the lawsuit against the State Water Board.

-sincerely,

--

Richard Montgomery
Professor, Mathematics,
UC Santa Cruz
rmont@ucsc.edu

From: [Harrison Dunning](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: BayDelta Plan lawsuit
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 3:07:23 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Please pause the BayDelta Plan lawsuit as requested by Supervisor Peskin! Support the environment!!!

Sent from my iPhone

Professor of Law Emeritus
UC Davis School of Law

From: [William Reller](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support there Peskin resolution regarding the lawsuit against the State Water Board
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 3:58:12 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Thank you.

Sent from my iPad

From: [Bruce Hodge](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Leadership, not litigation
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 4:19:21 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Honorable Supervisors,

I write today urging you to support Supervisor Peskin's resolution encouraging the City to pause the lawsuit against the State Water Board.

With climate change, we will increasingly be facing drought conditions statewide. Instead of litigation and protection of what should be obsolete rights based on brass knuckle tactics in the past, the City should be follow the lead of other large state municipalities and employ more conservation, alternative resources, and water recycling technologies.

San Francisco likes to call itself the "greenest" city, but the SFPUC is a glaring example of going in the exact opposite direction. This has been going on for way too long. It's time for the City to drop the regressive approaches and show some real leadership in solving the challenges ahead.

Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Bruce Hodge
Founder, Carbon Free Palo Alto

From: [Geri](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Daily Post](#); [Mike Bechler](#); [Peter Drekmeier](#); [Geri Mc Gilvray](#); [IMOGENE AND ROCHARD HILBERS](#)
Subject: RIVER PROTECTION
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 5:23:31 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

PLEASE pause the lawsuit.

Read about our River, and our precious delta once again.

They support California, all species and nearby life which is needed for a thriving state.

“ EVERY LIVING THING IS ALL CONNECTED TO EVERY SINGLE THING IN IT’s OWN WAY”. (Mike Bechler song.)

Mr. HERRERA, 42 gallons per person a day is not really sharing much at all.

Why can’t WE ALL conserve? THE RIVER GIVES UP THREE OF EVERY FOUR GALLONS all the time.

We need not be so FEAR BASED and killing off our water species so San Franciscans don’t have to think. We can all win when we protect our earth.

Geri Sigler Mcgilvray
everyday safety and walkability
Palo Alto
Geriart.net
650-328-2416

From: [Brian Browne](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Peter Drekmeier](#); [Paul Simpson](#)
Subject: Letter to Board of Supervisors Opposing Dennis Herrera as GM of the SFPUC
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 7:24:21 PM
Attachments: [l2eChron.docx](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Opposing Dennis Herrera for GM of the SFPUC

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors.

Dennis Herrera's SF Chronicle editorial (5/28/2021) reads like another uninformed PR exercise by the SFPUC as he pursues the well-paid job of SFPUC-GM. A position he is eminently unqualified to hold.

The SFPUC's Regional water system has seen a decline in demand. From 1985 to 2014, its sales averaged 246 million gallons a day (MGD). From 2014 to 2020, this average was down to 189 MGD. The reason being that wholesale or city-gate rates have increased at an annualized rate of 8 percent. Since 2009 wholesale rates have increased at an annualized rate of 12 percent. These escalating rates have primarily caused demand decreases. Demand decreases will continue unless the SFPUC mitigates these rate increases through cost-cutting and the implementation of an efficient business model.

City Attorney Herrera disqualified himself as a manager of scarce water resource issues when the city signed the Water Supply Agreement in 2009 (updating the 1984 Agreement) with BAWSCA (peninsula wholesalers). The 2009 agreement gave BAWSCA an *ad infinitum* guarantee of 184 MGD and San Francisco 81 MGD (including possibly 4 MGD from aquifer water) from the Hetch Hetchy Regional Water system. San Francisco averaged approximately 88 MGD and BAWSCA customers 162 MGD from pristine Hetch Hetchy supplies between the two agreements (1985 to 2008). This 2009 allocation makes no statistical or economic sense.

Before the 2009 Agreement, debt-service costs were embedded in water rates using the traditional utility method. The utility method made it easy to identify rates and current delivery costs. The 2009 Agreement switched to the cash method. A technique wherein determining debt-service costs with current rates is near impossible. The passage of the 1996 Proposition mandates only costs for current deliveries can be in the rates. A rate challenge under Proposition 218 (also California Constitution XIII c and d) would have a high probability of success.

When I represented the BoS on the RBOC (2003-2012), I worked long and hard to get a truly independent audit. UCLA and UCB put forward a great proposal. After months of intense negotiations, UCB-UCLA (professor and PhD. students) presented an outstanding proposal. When the signing arrived, it was "disappeared" by the chair and vice-chair and with committee assent. I could not get an answer as to why? The chair substituted an innocuous and hitherto not seen before alternative. Shortly after that, the RBOC entered into a pay-for-play MOU contract with the Controller. As an aside I personally had to write UCB-UCLA

Professors for wasting their valuable time and giving expectations to their brilliant PhD. students. A blot for CCSF. My own supervisor remained aloof and would not help.

I requested the RBOC hire an independent lawyer to check the legal validity of this MOU before entering into such. Not one member would second my motion for an independent review of the MOU. The attorney representing Dennis Herrera said nothing. The Controller has a voting seat on the RBOC, and I believe he voted for the MOU with the Controller. I thought this an insult to the independent clauses of 2002 Proposition P (I proposed and coauthored P) and a possible conflict of interest.

Not only did this MOU ignore the independent mandates of its enabling legislation (Proposition P 2002/November), the Controller had a voting seat on the RBOC. This fact seemed to me to be a possible conflict of interest? My experience on the nullified RBOC representing the BoS made me lose confidence in the City Attorney. The Board must oppose Dennis Herrera from being GM of the SFPUC. This one episode is just the tip of the iceberg in those nightmare years of enduring member nullification.

Deceased City resident and Nobel Prize winner Milton Friedman said there are no free lunches even in Paris. This no-free lunch concept applies even more so to San Francisco. But do not tell anyone in our government system. The SFPUC requires a suitably skilled and qualified person.

Brian Browne

From: [Brian Browne](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Peter Drekeimer](#); [Paul Simpson](#)
Subject: Re: Letter to Board of Supervisors Opposing Dennis Herrera as GM of the SFPUC
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 7:26:49 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

PS Ignore the attachment on my earlier sending.

On 5/29/2021 7:23 PM, Brian Browne wrote:

Opposing Dennis Herrera for GM of the SFPUC

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors.

Dennis Herrera's SF Chronicle editorial (5/28/2021) reads like another uninformed PR exercise by the SFPUC as he pursues the well-paid job of SFPUC-GM. A position he is eminently unqualified to hold.

The SFPUC's Regional water system has seen a decline in demand. From 1985 to 2014, its sales averaged 246 million gallons a day (MGD). From 2014 to 2020, this average was down to 189 MGD. The reason being that wholesale or city-gate rates have increased at an annualized rate of 8 percent. Since 2009 wholesale rates have increased at an annualized rate of 12 percent. These escalating rates have primarily caused demand decreases. Demand decreases will continue unless the SFPUC mitigates these rate increases through cost-cutting and the implementation of an efficient business model.

City Attorney Herrera disqualified himself as a manager of scarce water resource issues when the city signed the Water Supply Agreement in 2009 (updating the 1984 Agreement) with BAWSCA (peninsula wholesalers). The 2009 agreement gave BAWSCA an *ad infinitum* guarantee of 184 MGD and San Francisco 81 MGD (including possibly 4 MGD from aquifer water) from the Hetch Hetchy Regional Water system. San Francisco averaged approximately 88 MGD and BAWSCA customers 162 MGD from pristine Hetch Hetchy supplies between the two agreements (1985 to 2008). This 2009 allocation makes no statistical or economic sense.

Before the 2009 Agreement, debt-service costs were embedded in water rates using the traditional utility method. The utility method made it easy to identify rates and current delivery costs. The 2009 Agreement switched to the cash method. A technique wherein determining debt-service costs with current rates is near impossible. The passage of the 1996 Proposition mandates only costs for current deliveries can be in the rates. A rate challenge under Proposition 218 (also California Constitution XIII c and d) would have a high probability of success.

When I represented the BoS on the RBOC (2003-2012), I worked long and hard

to get a truly independent audit. UCLA and UCB put forward a great proposal. After months of intense negotiations, UCB-UCLA (professor and PhD. students) presented an outstanding proposal. When the signing arrived, it was “disappeared” by the chair and vice-chair and with committee assent. I could not get an answer as to why? The chair substituted an innocuous and hitherto not seen before alternative. Shortly after that, the RBOC entered into a pay-for-play MOU contract with the Controller. As an aside I personally had to write UCB-UCLA Professors for wasting their valuable time and giving expectations to their brilliant PhD. students. A blot for CCSF. My own supervisor remained aloof and would not help.

I requested the RBOC hire an independent lawyer to check the legal validity of this MOU before entering into such. Not one member would second my motion for an independent review of the MOU. The attorney representing Dennis Herrera said nothing. The Controller has a voting seat on the RBOC, and I believe he voted for the MOU with the Controller. I thought this an insult to the independent clauses of 2002 Proposition P (I proposed and coauthored P) and a possible conflict of interest.

Not only did this MOU ignore the independent mandates of its enabling legislation (Proposition P 2002/November), the Controller had a voting seat on the RBOC. This fact seemed to me to be a possible conflict of interest? My experience on the nullified RBOC representing the BoS made me lose confidence in the City Attorney. The Board must oppose Dennis Herrera from being GM of the SFPUC. This one episode is just the tip of the iceberg in those nightmare years of enduring member nullification.

Deceased City resident and Nobel Prize winner Milton Friedman said there are no free lunches even in Paris. This no-free lunch concept applies even more so to San Francisco. But do not tell anyone in our government system. The SFPUC requires a suitably skilled and qualified person.

Brian Browne

From: [George Cattermole](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Tuolumne River.
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 7:35:34 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Members, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.

My hope is that you will prevent the PUC from ignoring the science and proposing a hair-brained scheme that will allegedly save the endangered fish in the Tuolumne River by providing them with LESS water and a bunch of gimmicks. Listen to the scientists, not the technocrats and scare mongers. George Cattermole, owner/operator San Gregorio General Store.

From: [Alta Lowe](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 9:18:09 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Alta Lowe
120 Cuvier St.
S. F., CA 94112

From: markr2121@aol.com
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support Supervisor Peskin's resolution encouraging the City to pause the lawsuit
Date: Saturday, May 29, 2021 10:41:19 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Please take a stand for environmental protection, habitat restoration and diversification of water supplies based on credible science by supporting Supervisor Peskin's resolution encouraging the City to pause the lawsuit. Thank you.

Mark Reedy

From: [Phil Kennett](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Sunday, May 30, 2021 10:22:42 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Phil Kennett
539 Navajo Pl
Danville, CA 94526

From: [Ellen Wilkinson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support Peskin's resolution
Date: Sunday, May 30, 2021 11:11:03 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors Members,

As an environmentalist who had watched the water policies affecting the Bay Area play out for the last 25 years, I feel strongly that San Franciscans deserve a water policy plan that represents their environmental values, and the city's suit against the state Water Board undermines that goal.

Supervisor Aaron Peskin has introduced a resolution encouraging the city to pause its suit against SFPUC and to follow the science. It doesn't take much of your time to review and see where and how the city's lawsuit and voluntary agreement proposal misses the mark. The problem is that the suit, if successful: would seriously jeopardize critical fish species that undergird the health of the entire Tuolumne River ecosystem; would continue unsustainable water diversions whose negative impacts would ripple throughout the Bay-Delta; increase the likelihood we will experience a mass extinction in the not too distant future; increases the risk that the commercial salmon fishing industry at Fisherman's Wharf will be relegated to the history books and makes it increasingly likely that delta communities will continue to suffer from toxic algae blooms tied to insufficient river flows.

Ridiculous!

Please do the right thing and side with science and sustainability goals to protect this water system responsibly. Support Peskin's resolution.

Sincerely,
EM Wilkinson

From: [Harriet Moss](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Pleas support Sup. Peskin"s Resolution! [To Pause Litigation Against the State Water Resources Control Board]
Date: Sunday, May 30, 2021 11:41:06 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to support Supervisor Peskin's resolution to pause SF's lawsuit against the CA Water Resources Control Board. Climate change is real and we are seeing its effects. It is way past the time for antiquated environment-killing bandaids to systemic water problems that require both conservation measures and technology upgrades — NOT draining every last drop out of our streams and rivers as the SFPUC seems to want to do. Thank you.

Harriet Moss
7 Yellow Ferry Harbor
Sausalito, CA 94965
415-331-8901

From: [Gary Patton](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Lawsuit Against The State Water Board
Date: Sunday, May 30, 2021 11:47:35 AM
Attachments: [TRT Opinion - SFC 5-29-21.pdf](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board Members:

This is just a quick note to urge you to support Supervisor Peskin's resolution encouraging the City to pause its pending legislation against the State Water Resources Control Board. I feel certain you are familiar with this proposed resolution, but I have linked here, just to be clear:

<https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9420698&GUID=FF54FE51-0746-4395-AE02-93E8A93956BF>

The recent opinion editorial by Peter Drekmeier, attached, makes a very convincing case for what Supervisor Peskin is urging, and I hope you will take heed!

I am a San Francisco native, visit the City frequently, and still read the *Chronicle* every morning. The entire state, not just current residents, have a huge stake in how the state's water resources are managed. I am convinced that there is an approach that protects city water users while providing much better protection to the natural environment on which we all rely.

Thank you for taking my views seriously.

Yours truly,

Gary A. Patton, Attorney at Law

P.O. Box 1038

Santa Cruz, CA 95061

Telephone: 831-332-8546

Email: gapatton@mac.com

Website / Blog: www.gapatton.net

Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/gapatton>

From: [Rick Lanman](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: San Francisco's lawsuit against the State Water Board is shameful
Date: Sunday, May 30, 2021 11:53:10 AM
Attachments: [Drekmeier 2021 Opinion- San Francisco doesn't have a sustainable drought plan San Francisco Chronicle.pdf](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I'm a physician trained at University of California San Francisco. There are myriad alternative solutions to San Francisco PUC's build dams and hoard water strategy. I hope you will support Supervisor Peskin's resolution to halt/pause your lawsuit and follow the science. SF should urgently adopt a credible and science-based water supply strategy based on conservation as well as purification of waste and sewage water (as Orange County does).

This is the path forward versus hoarding water behind dams and destroying our environment. How can 21st century and progressive-minded city rely on late 19th century dam-building mentality?

Thanks for your consideration,

Rick

Richard Lanman MD
650.776.9111
[Bio](#) and [Pubs](#)

From: [Rea Inglesis](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Drop the lawsuit against the State Water Board
Date: Sunday, May 30, 2021 12:29:24 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing in support of Supervisor Peskin's resolution to drop the lawsuit against California's Water Board. The measures outlined in the State's plan will help protect salmon, wildlife and the State's natural resources. Resiliency for San Franciscans comes from striking a balance and the science shows that the State's plan is a step in the right direction.

Instead of fighting the State, San Francisco should expand incentives for graywater reuse and other conservation measures and lead the State in environmental protection.

Respectfully,
Rea Inglesis
Diamond Heights
San Francisco, CA 94131

--

Rea Inglesis
rea.inglesis@gmail.com

From: [O Mandrussow](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SUPPOT--Supervisor Peskin's resolution to pause SFPUC litigation against the State Water Board
Date: Sunday, May 30, 2021 1:36:25 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

Please support pausing Herrera's litigation against the State Water Board. Herrera is not listening to the science. We need to emphasize grey water, and additional sources of water. There is no need to endanger Tuolumne River salmon.

Kind regards,
Olga Mandrussow
District 8 (Thanks for co-sponsoring, Supervisor Mandelman!)

From: [Gar Smith](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SF V. the State Water Board
Date: Sunday, May 30, 2021 1:59:42 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We share the concerns expressed in Peter Dreke's recent *Chronicle* op-ed regarding SF's lawsuit challenging the State Water Board's oversight of California's waters in this extreme drought year.

We urge you to support [Aaron Peskin's resolution](#) calling on the City to reconsider its lawsuit.

Gar Smith, co-founder, Environmentalists Against War
Editor Emeritus, Earth Island Journal
Editor, Pesticide Action Network
Editor, Common Ground magazine
Author, Nuclear Roulette, The War and Environment Reader

From: [Craig Stephen](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support Sup. Peskin's resolution re CA Water Resources Control Board
Date: Sunday, May 30, 2021 2:33:37 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear SF Board of Supervisors:

Please support Supervisor Peskin's "Resolution urging the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause its litigation against the California State Water Resources Control Board."

I am proud of San Francisco's track record of taking thoughtful, science-driven, lead-the-nation positions on matters of public health, the environment, and well-being — throughout the three decades I've lived in our city, from the AIDS crisis right through the current pandemic.

This lawsuit, however, is simply a retrograde "I've got mine" reaction to a reasonable, science-driven directive from the State of California.

Please put the lawsuit on hold, and hear out the scientific community on this one.

Thank you,

Craig Stephen
50 Forest Side Ave
San Francisco

From: [Steve Merlone](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SFPUC lawsuit on Tuolumne Flows
Date: Sunday, May 30, 2021 3:51:24 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

As a concerned citizen of Menlo Park and SFPUC water user I am concerned with the SF city attorneys lawsuit against the State Water Board. Ignoring available scientific reports and unwillingness to discuss water use issues, the SFPUC seems to have hidden agenda that needs to be addressed in a public forum.

Mayor Breed has appointed Dennis Herrera as the new SFPUC. SFPUC has also failed to discuss in an open meeting the logic of these decisions. Other very well qualified candidates that are willing to look at the available water availability science were overlooked for the new SFPUC manager position.

I ask you to reconsider the choice of Dennis Herrera as SFPUC chief and consider into Supervisor Peskin's resolution into this matter.

Steve Merlone

From: [Eugene C. Cordero](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support Supervisor Peskin's proposal to pause lawsuit
Date: Sunday, May 30, 2021 4:12:29 PM
Attachments: [Please support Supervisor Peskin's proposal to pause lawsuit.msg](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

From: [laura Peterhans](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Peter Drekeimer](#)
Subject: Water Concerns
Date: Sunday, May 30, 2021 5:06:31 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I encourage you to support Supervisor Perkins' Resolution to pause the lawsuit against the SW Board.

There is an adequate supply of water for San Francisco and the Peninsula from current sources. Of course, the population should be encouraged to conserve water during the drought; there are many steps that can be taken by individuals, cities, counties, and companies. Laura Peterhans, 2011 Belle Monti Ave., Belmont, CA. who is watering her garden using cold water gathered when accessing warm water for various home purposes.

From: [Rae](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution to Pause Litigation - Trust Science
Date: Sunday, May 30, 2021 5:48:28 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To the Board of Supervisors:

Please support the Resolution urging the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause its litigation against the California State Water Resources Control Board and instead heed the beneficial input of a diverse and inclusive group of stakeholders, including subject matter experts in environmental protection, habitat restoration, and the diversification of water supplies based on credible science.

Here are three reasons:

1. It's important to base decisions on the best science available, and avoid being swayed by fearful exaggerations or political gain. Trump tried to show the nation that science can't be trusted. Please show us otherwise: Trust the best science available and it's sensible and logical conclusions.
2. The SFPUC has overestimated the demand for water, and clearly underestimated their customers' ability and desire to prove themselves capable of further conservation and reuse. The SFPUC lawsuit is an insult to their customers but it is dressed up as a gift.
3. Please don't doubt that Salmon are the "canary in the coalmine". We can't foresee the full impact of environmental collapse until we're in it, until all modes of survival require an engineered response. Who would take the risk of Californians ultimately living in an engineered world where critical responses in nature must be continuously fabricated? The SFPUC lawsuit wants to take us in that direction.

An ordinary SFPUC customer,
Rae Collins

From: [Leslie Peterson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Advocacy
Date: Sunday, May 30, 2021 8:36:28 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I support Supervisor Peskin's resolution to pause on the lawsuit against the State Water Board. I read an editorial by Peter Dreckmeier that states that our reservoirs on the Tuolumne River currently have enough water for around 4 years, and one year the SF Public Utilities, which can take out more than it needs, had to release 88% of the water because the reservoirs were already too full to receive new water. Not good.

Thanks for your consideration.

Leslie Peterson
1921 Rock St, Apt 23
Mountain View, CA 94043

From: [Paul Simpson](#)
To: brian@h2oecon.com
Cc: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Peter Drekmeier](#)
Subject: Re: Letter to Board of Supervisors Opposing Dennis Herrera as GM of the SFPUC
Date: Sunday, May 30, 2021 8:45:20 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

As a 68 year San Franciscan I wholeheartedly concur with Mr. Browne. The City Attorney under Mr. Herrera has become a bloated legal bureaucracy costing taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars without providing a commensurate benefit. Last year the City paid a record whistleblower settlement based on credible and substantial evidence of City Attorney retaliation against a whistleblower. The PUC needs a professional with a strong public works background who can restore the integrity of this vital City agency.

Respectfully,
Paul Simpson
San Francisco

Sent from my iPhone

On May 29, 2021, at 7:26 PM, Brian Browne <brian@h2oecon.com> wrote:

PS Ignore the attachment on my earlier sending.

On 5/29/2021 7:23 PM, Brian Browne wrote:

Opposing Dennis Herrera for GM of the SFPUC

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors.

Dennis Herrera's SF Chronicle editorial (5/28/2021) reads like another uninformed PR exercise by the SFPUC as he pursues the well-paid job of SFPUC-GM. A position he is eminently unqualified to hold.

The SFPUC's Regional water system has seen a decline in demand. From 1985 to 2014, its sales averaged 246 million gallons a day (MGD). From 2014 to 2020, this average was down to 189 MGD. The reason being that wholesale or city-gate rates have increased at an annualized rate of 8 percent. Since 2009 wholesale rates have increased at an annualized rate of 12 percent. These escalating rates have primarily caused demand decreases. Demand decreases will continue unless the SFPUC mitigates these rate increases through cost-cutting and the implementation of an efficient business model.

City Attorney Herrera disqualified himself as a manager of scarce water resource issues when the city signed the Water Supply Agreement in 2009 (updating the 1984 Agreement) with BAWSCA (peninsula wholesalers). The 2009 agreement gave BAWSCA an *ad infinitum* guarantee of 184 MGD and San Francisco 81 MGD (including possibly 4 MGD from aquifer water) from the Hetch Hetchy Regional Water system. San Francisco averaged approximately 88 MGD and BAWSCA customers 162 MGD from pristine Hetch Hetchy supplies between the two agreements (1985 to 2008). This 2009 allocation makes no statistical or economic sense.

Before the 2009 Agreement, debt-service costs were embedded in water rates using the traditional utility method. The utility method made it easy to identify rates and current delivery costs. The 2009 Agreement switched to the cash method. A technique wherein determining debt-service costs with current rates is near impossible. The passage of the 1996 Proposition mandates only costs for current deliveries can be in the rates. A rate challenge under Proposition 218 (also California Constitution XIII c and d) would have a high probability of success.

When I represented the BoS on the RBOC (2003-2012), I worked long and hard to get a truly independent audit. UCLA and UCB put forward a great proposal. After months of intense negotiations, UCB-UCLA (professor and PhD. students) presented an outstanding proposal. When the signing arrived, it was “disappeared” by the chair and vice-chair and with committee assent. I could not get an answer as to why? The chair substituted an innocuous and hitherto not seen before alternative. Shortly after that, the RBOC entered into a pay-for-play MOU contract with the Controller. As an aside I personally had to write UCB-UCLA Professors for wasting their valuable time and giving expectations to their brilliant PhD. students. A blot for CCSF. My own supervisor remained aloof and would not help.

I requested the RBOC hire an independent lawyer to check the legal validity of this MOU before entering into such. Not one member would second my motion for an independent review of the MOU. The attorney representing Dennis Herrera said nothing. The Controller has a voting seat on the RBOC, and I believe he voted for the MOU with the Controller. I thought this an insult to the independent clauses of 2002 Proposition P (I proposed and coauthored P) and a possible conflict of interest.

Not only did this MOU ignore the independent mandates of its enabling legislation (Proposition P 2002/November), the Controller had a voting seat on the RBOC. This fact seemed to me to be a possible conflict of interest? My experience on the nullified RBOC representing the BoS made me lose confidence in the City Attorney. The Board must oppose Dennis Herrera from being GM of the SFPUC. This one episode is just the tip of the iceberg in those nightmare years of enduring member nullification.

Deceased City resident and Nobel Prize winner Milton Friedman said there are no free lunches even in Paris. This no-free lunch concept applies even more so to San Francisco. But do not tell anyone in our government system. The SFPUC requires a suitably skilled and qualified person.

Brian Browne

From: [Brian Browne](#)
To: [Paul Simpson](#)
Cc: [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#); [Peter Drekmeier](#)
Subject: Re: Letter to Board of Supervisors Opposing Dennis Herrera as GM of the SFPUC
Date: Sunday, May 30, 2021 9:00:07 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Thank you Paul. You are unique. Brian-

On 5/30/2021 8:44 PM, Paul Simpson wrote:

As a 68 year San Franciscan I wholeheartedly concur with Mr. Browne. The City Attorney under Mr. Herrera has become a bloated legal bureaucracy costing taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars without providing a commensurate benefit. Last year the City paid a record whistleblower settlement based on credible and substantial evidence of City Attorney retaliation against a whistleblower. The PUC needs a professional with a strong public works background who can restore the integrity of this vital City agency.

Respectfully,
Paul Simpson
San Francisco

Sent from my iPhone

On May 29, 2021, at 7:26 PM, Brian Browne <brian@h2oecon.com> wrote:

PS Ignore the attachment on my earlier sending.

On 5/29/2021 7:23 PM, Brian Browne wrote:

Opposing Dennis Herrera for GM of the SFPUC

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors.

Dennis Herrera's SF Chronicle editorial (5/28/2021) reads like another uninformed PR exercise by the SFPUC as he pursues the well-paid job of SFPUC-GM. A position he is eminently unqualified to hold.

The SFPUC's Regional water system has seen a decline in demand. From 1985 to 2014, its sales averaged 246 million gallons a day (MGD). From 2014 to 2020, this average was down to 189 MGD. The reason being that

wholesale or city-gate rates have increased at an annualized rate of 8 percent. Since 2009 wholesale rates have increased at an annualized rate of 12 percent. These escalating rates have primarily caused demand decreases. Demand decreases will continue unless the SFPUC mitigates these rate increases through cost-cutting and the implementation of an efficient business model.

City Attorney Herrera disqualified himself as a manager of scarce water resource issues when the city signed the Water Supply Agreement in 2009 (updating the 1984 Agreement) with BAWSCA (peninsula wholesalers). The 2009 agreement gave BAWSCA an *ad infinitum* guarantee of 184 MGD and San Francisco 81 MGD (including possibly 4 MGD from aquifer water) from the Hetch Hetchy Regional Water system. San Francisco averaged approximately 88 MGD and BAWSCA customers 162 MGD from pristine Hetch Hetchy supplies between the two agreements (1985 to 2008). This 2009 allocation makes no statistical or economic sense.

Before the 2009 Agreement, debt-service costs were embedded in water rates using the traditional utility method. The utility method made it easy to identify rates and current delivery costs. The 2009 Agreement switched to the cash method. A technique wherein determining debt-service costs with current rates is near impossible. The passage of the 1996 Proposition mandates only costs for current deliveries can be in the rates. A rate challenge under Proposition 218 (also California Constitution XIII c and d) would have a high probability of success.

When I represented the BoS on the RBOC (2003-2012), I worked long and hard to get a truly independent audit. UCLA and UCB put forward a great proposal. After months of intense negotiations, UCB-UCLA (professor and PhD. students) presented an outstanding proposal. When the signing arrived, it was “disappeared” by the chair and vice-chair and with committee assent. I could not get an answer as to why? The chair substituted an innocuous and hitherto not seen before alternative. Shortly after that, the RBOC entered into a pay-for-play MOU contract with the Controller. As an aside I personally had to write UCB-UCLA Professors for wasting their valuable time and giving expectations to their brilliant PhD. students. A blot for CCSF. My own supervisor remained aloof and would not help.

I requested the RBOC hire an independent lawyer to check the legal validity of this MOU before entering into such. Not one member would second my motion for an independent review of the MOU. The attorney representing Dennis Herrera said nothing. The Controller has a voting seat on the RBOC, and I believe he voted for the MOU with the Controller. I thought this an insult to the independent clauses of 2002 Proposition P (I proposed and coauthored P) and a possible conflict of interest.

Not only did this MOU ignore the independent mandates of its enabling legislation (Proposition P 2002/November), the Controller had a voting seat on the RBOC. This fact seemed to me to be a possible conflict of interest? My experience on the nullified RBOC representing the BoS made me lose confidence in the City Attorney. The Board must oppose Dennis Herrera from being GM of the SFPUC. This one episode is just the tip of the iceberg in those nightmare years of enduring member nullification.

Deceased City resident and Nobel Prize winner Milton Friedman said there are no free lunches even in Paris. This no-free lunch concept applies even more so to San Francisco. But do not tell anyone in our government system. The SFPUC requires a suitably skilled and qualified person.

Brian Browne

From: [William Smith](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 3:47:04 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

William Smith
1169 davis st
redwood city, CA 94061

From: [Tim](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: State water board lawsuit
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 7:11:10 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I am a resident of San Francisco and encourage you to put a pause on the your pending lawsuit against the state water board for their action on water distribution restrictions.

Thank you,

Timothy Duff
1483 Sutter St.
SF, 94109

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Nina Rescino](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 7:20:44 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Nina Rescino
218 Hazelwood Dr
South San Francisco, CA 94080

From: [Frank Rescino](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 7:22:18 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Frank Rescino
218 Hazelwood Dr
South San Francisco, CA 94080

From: [Ross Melvin](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 8:14:17 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Ross Melvin
310 PORTOLA WAY
TRACY, CA 95376

From: [Ross Melvin](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 8:14:32 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Ross Melvin
310 PORTOLA WAY
TRACY, CA 95376

From: [Fred Tempas](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 8:15:27 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Do the right thing!

Sincerely,
Fred Tempas
761 Dorothy Ct
Arcata, CA 95521

From: [Amy Meyer](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: continue to support the 2018 update of the Bay-Delta Plan
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 9:41:16 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

The SF PUC is suing the State of California to overturn the Bay-Delta Plan. That Plan supports everything dependent on the waters of the Bay and Delta from people to salmon.

It has a good and sufficient scientific basis.

I urge that you support Supervisor Peskin's resolution to protect the full range of necessary uses of our water and allow for "deliberate public engagement on the underlying issues and negotiation among the interested parties."

Sincerely,
Amy Meyer

--

www.amywmeyer.com

From: [D and M Morten](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Mar. Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Dick Morten](#)
Subject: Oppose the SFPUC litigation against California State Water Resources Control Board
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 10:26:25 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

- > Supervisor Aaron Peskin.
- >
- > I strongly support the 2018 Board of Supervisors Resolution to enforce a 40% unimpaired flow for the Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced Rivers.
- >
- > Obviously, the SFPUC and its legal advisers ignored the Resolution when it unilaterally and without appropriate public review filed litigation violating the Resolution.
- >
- > In the draft state mandated Urban Water Management the SFPUC was forced by public analysis to reduce their estimate of Hetch Hetchy system water use. This is only one example where the SFPUC has proposed faulty analysis. It is likely their faulty analysis underpins their rogue litigation.
- >
- > I agree the litigation should be halted.
- >
- > Thank you for your effort.
- >
- > Dick Morten
- >
- > Sent from my iPhone

From: [Rodger Silvers](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 11:17:39 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Rodger Silvers
56 Westlake Avenue
Daly City, CA 94014

From: [Paul Dubow](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 11:19:58 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Paul Dubow
88 King Street, Unit 318
San Francisco, CA 94107

From: [Gabbie Burns](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for Supervisor Peskin's resolution urging SFPUC to pause litigation against State Water Board
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 11:57:34 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello,

I want to begin by acknowledging that I am not a resident of San Francisco, but I am a resident of the Bay Area and am impacted by the ongoing legal debate between SFPUC and the State Water Board. I have been reading the recent news coverage and editorials about this conflict and the impacts on the Tuolumne River and the greater Bay-Delta.

I support Supervisor Peskin's resolution and hope that it will be adopted. Thorough research, including consulting with diverse stakeholders, went into the state's requirements. I hope that San Francisco will look beyond its own borders and unnecessary fears of avoiding scarcity at all costs to the environment and external stakeholders.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

~Gabbie Burns

From: [Barbara Folger](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Pause Litigation and support Bay Delta Plan
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 12:41:19 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

To: The Members of the Board of Supervisors

From: Barbara Folger, SF resident of 52 years

Re: Please pause Herrera's litigation against the California State Water Board and support the Bay Delta Plan

The SFPUC still doesn't understand the water issues that will affect the City and the entire SF Bay. San Francisco will still have plenty of water after more water is released this year into the Tuolumne River. Please follow the science and not scare tactics.

If this Board is serious about saving water, and, at the same time tax payers dollars, do some simple things like repairing the leaky water supply system throughout the City. Just this year the sewer lines were replaced on our street **but not the 1917 water supply pipes** that have so deteriorated the workers replacing the sewer lines have to take extra time to work around these pipes for fear of breakage. After the sewer replacement, the street was filled with concrete and paved with macadam. When the City finally decides to replace the water supply lines the streets will be dug up yet again, the debris hauled away, and the streets once again paved. This is a terrible misuse of City funds not to coordinate these kinds of repairs - not to mention the overuse of the Earth's dwindling resources like concrete.

I further hope you will oppose Mayor Breed's intention to appoint Dennis Herrera as General Manager of the SFPUC. He does not understand the issues and is backing a Trump-era rule that is likely to be changed by the Biden administration.

From: [LIBBY HIGGS](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Supervisor Peskin's recommendation and Dennis Herrera
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 3:05:10 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I am not a scientist. I am retired and almost 70 years old. I live in Modesto and spent my childhood around and in the Tuolumne. I spent many summers with my siblings and friends swimming, catching tadpoles and frogs in the Tuolumne. And if any of you have spent any time in Modesto during the summer you know how hot it gets and the Tuolumne was where we underserved kids of Modesto went to cool off.

Beginning in 2019, I started taking my two granddaughters, now 4 and 6, to the Tuolumne River Regional Parks in Modesto. They loved hearing my stories of my adventures of the river. And they loved the river. In 2020 we sheltered in place due to the pandemic until my daughter's family dog of 8 year died very suddenly. They were all very depressed including their dog who lost her partner. One day my daughter asked me about going down to the part of the TRRP that is the airport area. We started going their almost every week and I could see all of them getting better. There are many different kinds of birds, squirrels and we even saw a grey fox. I have continued to take my granddaughters to the river this year.

What they didn't realize is the condition of the river and the surrounding parks. The water is so shallow in some parts you couldn't swim much less get a canoe down the river. The water was very warm. There were very few living species of any kind in the river. We saw a few ducks and geese. We also visit Dry Creek which is part of the river. My heart ached at the number of very old dying trees. I think about the river often with a heavy heart and fear that the river I am teaching my grandchildren about may be a dry bed when they grow up.

I have joined the Tuolumne River Trust. I attended the 12/2018 meeting of the water board. I have spoken at SFPUC meetings and follow the politics of the "water wars" closely. I have seen the statistics and believe the city and County of San Francisco don't need as much water as they claim they do. I strongly urge the Mayor to withdraw her support for Dennis Herrera as the General Manager of the SFPUC. I also urge her to have him remove his lawsuits regarding the state's authority to oversee the water rights of CA. We don't need more litigation. We need more cooperation to find resolutions to very complicated water issues. The Mayor claims that she will address climate change. This can't be done without reducing San Francisco's water levels and improving the flows to the Tuolumne. Instead of appointing Dennis Herrera she should let the SFPUC continue to search for a GM who is more closely aligned to the problems

of climate change and the restoration of our beloved Tuolumne River. Our lives depend on it. So does the life of the salmon and the myriad of animals and birds whose lives depend on the return of the salmon and the water of "OUR" river.

Thank you,
Libby Higgs

From: [Don Weiden](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SFPUC Lawsuit
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 3:10:55 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I urge the Supervisors to pause the SFPUC litigation against the State of California and the State Water Resources Board to allow for deliberate public engagement on the underlying issues and negotiation among the interested parties.

Don Weiden

From: elizabeth.heilman-espinoza
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: our future
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 3:21:09 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,
Please take the responsible step and protect our scarce water resources with research, care and thoughtfulness. Please support Supervisor Peskin's resolution encouraging the City to pause the lawsuit.
Sincerely,
Elizabeth Heilman, MD

From: [Roberta Borgonovo](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Peskin Resolution on Litigation against the State of California
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 4:31:57 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors:

I write to encourage the Board to accept the Peskin Resolution that supports the 2018 Update to the Bay-Delta Plan and calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause its litigation against the State of California. I believe this action will give the State Water Board the time it needs for public engagement and negotiation on the underlying issues among the interested parties.

Thank you for your attention to this crucial matter.

Sincerely,
Roberta Borgonovo
2480 Union Street
San Francisco, CA 94123

From: [Shannon Rose](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Time to Stop
Date: Monday, May 31, 2021 7:54:13 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

San Franciscans can be proud of the fact that they use less water per capita than many other cities in California, yet San Francisco does have a more sustainable path: Continue your decades-long trend of using less water, invest much more in alternative water supplies such as recycled water, and partner with the San Joaquin Valley irrigation districts to bring agriculture into the 21st Century.

San Francisco can meet the state's co-equal goals of restoring the Bay-Delta and Tuolumne River ecosystems while ensuring a reliable water supply well into the future. LA and Orange County turned in this direction years ago and it's time now for the SFPUC to catch up.

We are the state with strong environmental values. Supervisor Aaron Peskin has introduced a resolution encouraging the city to pause its suit and to follow the science. Please drop the lawsuit. We must protect our delicately balanced ecosystems. Humans aren't the only beings who depend on deserve adequate water.

Sincerely,

Shannon Rose McEntee
410 Sheridan Avenue
Palo Alto, CA

From: [Virginia VanKuran](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: SUPPORT - Resolution urging the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause its litigation against the California State Water Resources Control Board
Date: Tuesday, June 1, 2021 8:21:24 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

I urge you to support the Resolution urging the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause its litigation against the California State Water Resources Control Board.

As a lifelong resident of the Bay Area and current resident of Palo Alto I have watched our area grow and flourish and as a retired computer software project manager I benefited from that growth. It's important to me to be a part of the Bay Area's continuing success and now that means taking care of our whole environment. There are multiple groups, cities and counties working towards a truly livable Bay Area and the health of our Bay Delta ecosystem is a very important part of our future.

The science behind the recommendations of the Bay Delta Water Quality Plan are clear. We need to increase the water flow in the rivers during the winter months to benefit the keystone salmon species and to slow increasing invasion of salt water into the delta.

Studies also show that careful water management by the City of San Francisco is a win-win - for the environment and for the City. I worry the SFPUC is afraid they can't move successfully to the future of water management. I say have courage and do it. As a water user I support increased flow and I support all of San Francisco's work to conserve water, use recycled water and other measures you are doing to ensure a steady water supply and save our local environment. San Francisco has a huge amount of power over the water supply. Please set a positive example for the Bay Area and the world. You are "influencers".

Thank you.

Virginia Van Kuran
Palo Alto, CA 94303

From: [don.howard](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Tuesday, June 1, 2021 8:29:35 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

don howard
1927 San Marcos Dr
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

From: [Kathleen Tarlow](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support Supervisor Peskin's resolution to pause lawsuit
Date: Tuesday, June 1, 2021 8:55:34 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board,

I am writing to ask that you join Supervisor Peskin in trying to halt San Francisco's lawsuit against the state water board. The rivers draining into the San Francisco Bay are crucial ecosystem corridors, sustaining life from the Bay, through the Central Valley, and into the Sierra Nevada. Without sufficient flows, these ecosystems, already threatened, may fail entirely.

In terms of water efficiency, the Bay Area is far behind southern California. Please support the natural resources of our beautiful state by allowing the state water board to continue to protect our river ecosystems.

Thanks for your time,
Kathleen

--

Kathleen Tarlow, Education Director

logo.png



3921 East Bayshore Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303-4303
Phone: 650-419-9880
grassrootsecology.org

From: [Lance Powell](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Pause the lawsuit!
Date: Tuesday, June 1, 2021 8:57:02 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear SF Supervisors- I urge you to pause the lawsuit against the California State Water Resources Control Board regarding the flow of water from the Delta. Please include more voices in the process for this high-stakes policy decision.

Thanks for your consideration.o

--

Lance Powell
Menlo-Atherton High School
APES & Env. Chemistry Instructor
Dept. Chair

From: [Jack Yee](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Tuesday, June 1, 2021 9:56:22 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Jack Yee
348 CHICAGO WAY
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94112

From: [Nina Robertson](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for Peskin's resolution re Bay Delta Plan litigation
Date: Tuesday, June 1, 2021 10:33:22 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear SF BOS,

The City of San Francisco's litigation against clean water and the bay delta ecosystem must stop. It is anathema to what we stand for as a green city, and it is contrary to the interests of its residents who, like me, deeply value the Tuolumne River and clean water in the Bay. We need water to use in the city, but killing rivers isn't the only option. San Francisco must think creatively about innovative water solutions rather than sticking to the old trope of taking water from threatened ecosystems. I am ashamed of my city's litigating position on the Bay Delta Plan and demand change.

Please stop this backwards lawsuit and support Supervisor Peskin's resolution.

Thank you.

Nina Robertson
San Francisco resident

From: [Peter Burnes](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support Supervisor Peskin's water resolution
Date: Tuesday, June 1, 2021 4:47:38 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear SF Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to ask that you support Supervisor Peskin's resolution, "Urging the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to Pause Litigation Against the State Water Resources Control Board".

I lived most of my life in Palo Alto, worked in the City of Palo Alto Water Quality Lab and at Stanford University managing water quality including drinking water and waste water. I was born, raised, and lived on the spectacular water from the Hetch Hetchy system and know it quite well by profession: it is literally in my bones. I am also an avid fisher and have learned a great deal about how California and federal water and power policy and practice have all but extirpated the once world renowned salmon fishery that thrived inland in California for millennia. The cause of this great tragedy is that our water engineering has focused on up-scaling 5000 year old technology: an elevated bucket (reservoir), a ditch or hose (plumbing), and sometimes, fortunately now, a closed valve at the end. That, sadly, is the state of our 'art' and water engineering. Do you think it is possible to do better? I do.

But by suing the State Water Resources Control Board the SFPUC seems to think that doubling down on ancient thinking and indulging the hubris of more and more human intervention in our natural systems will somehow turn out well. News flash: it hasn't and it won't. It's long past time to move on to something new.

As much effort as has been put into water conservation, and congratulations to the SFPUC and all of us for doing our part in that regard, it is time to face the facts about our unsustainable use of water in California and the west. Until very recently there have been almost no actual innovations in the sourcing or use of water in either agricultural, commercial/industrial, or domestic use. Only recently have appliances actually been re-designed, and a low flow shower head, toilet, and drip irrigation are still just modern vestiges of that 5000 year old system (fortunately we did manage to add rudimentary waste water treatment after poisoning bays, rivers and each other for centuries).

It's tough with 40 million people, but the time has past for continuing down the same canal. We are in the midst of redesigning our lives in many ways, so why not with water? Is it possible to change how our homes are designed so that our supply of water is used multiple times? Yes. We spend lots of money cleaning water to drinking standards, then we poop in it. Our largest use of domestic water is to convey our human solid waste by gravity in a pipe to a distant treatment plant where ungodly

amounts of money and energy are used to... wait for it... turn it back into a solid that still has to be dealt with! We shower in drinking water, but is it possible to treat wash water and heat so you could take an endless shower? Yes. Flush the toilet with it? Yes. Not flush a toilet at all? Yes. Could warm compressed air be injected into a faucet or shower to drastically reduce the water used and be more enjoyable and effective? Yes. On and on and on with the innovations.

Could we design our agriculture to be adaptable to our ever changing environment? Yes. Could we choose to plant crops that are water efficient? Yes. Could we grow food generally more efficiently? Yes. Could we stop exporting huge amounts of precious California water in the form of exported food? Yes. Choices, choices, more choices.

Could we allow the environment to thrive on its own terms and get out of its way so it will actually support us into the future? Yes. Could we have comfortable homes, a thriving economy, abundant food, a beautiful place to live, and bring back our nearly lost salmon heritage? Yes.

There are so many water innovations that could be imagined, created, and brought into a truly sustainable water strategy if only we would think anew about water. Come on silicon valley, enough already with the social-media and advertising-mind-control businesses: how about getting back to solving some real world problems again instead of creating them?

It's long past time to stop chasing and suing each other for the last drops of 'paper water' and do something differently. That starts with bold thinking and action by you and the SFPUC by taking the lead in imagining and creating an entirely new way of using our precious water.

As with most new ways of thinking and living, I'm pretty sure no one else is going to step up to the plate, so you're it, San Francisco. And Palo Alto. And Silicon Valley.

Truly Yours,

Peter A. Burnes
Grass Valley, CA
within the SF Bay-Delta watershed

From: [Ed Hillard](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Support for the pause
Date: Tuesday, June 1, 2021 8:03:26 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors

The City of San Francisco on the existential issue of water management now finds itself on a precipice.

This situation is due to the recent action of the City's own attorney and the decades-long mismanagement and incompetence of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, and is thoroughly described in the letter of Peter Drekmeier to the San Francisco Chronicle of May 29, 2021. Mr. Drekmeier is the policy director of the Tuolumne River Trust.

Here is the link to that letter: <https://www.sfchronicle.com/opinion/openforum/article/Opinion-San-Francisco-doesn-t-have-a-16211308.php>

The State Water Board is moving to force San Francisco to release more water from its Tuolumne River dams into the river. There is universal support in the scientific and recreational and commercial fisheries industries to support this action on the part of the State Board. The universal position is that the river is endangered at its current flow levels and requires immediate corrective action, which equates to that of the State Water Board. San Francisco City Attorney Dennis Herrera is leading a lawsuit to prevent this action.

Given the truly dire circumstances that could result if attorney Herrera and the City are successful in their suit it is fortunate that members of the Board of Supervisors Peskin and Mandelman have moved to invoke a pause on attorney Herrera's lawsuit.

Their proposal for a pause is referenced here: <https://sfgov.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9420698&GUID=FF54FE51-0746-4395-AE02-93E8A93956BF>

I am writing to support these Supervisors' proposal for a pause at this urgent moment. I also support the continued, conservative and pragmatic positions of the Tuolumne River Trust and the Bay Delta Plan for management of the river's resources and maintenance of its health.

Edward Hillard

Palo Alto

From: [56solent](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Please support Supervisor Peskin"s resolution
Date: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 9:36:20 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

This is critical to the long term ecological sustainability of Northern California.

Thank you.

Alan Harrington - San Mateo - 650.703.0349

From: [Kerry Kriger](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Pause the City of SF's lawsuit against the State Water Board
Date: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 4:26:59 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Board of Supervisors,
Please support Supervisor Peskin's resolution encouraging the City to pause it's lawsuit against the State Water Board.
Thank you!

Dr. Kerry Kriger
SAVE THE FROGS!
Founder, Executive Director & Ecologist
www.savethefrogs.com/kerry-kriger
kerry@savethefrogs.com

SAVE THE FROGS! protects amphibian populations and empowers ordinary citizens to make extraordinary contributions to the betterment of the planet. We work in California, across the USA and around the world to create a better planet for humans and wildlife.

From: [Tom McManus](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Resolution 210577: Support
Date: Thursday, June 3, 2021 9:25:21 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

Dear Supervisors:

I'm writing to urge you to pass Resolution 210577, introduced by Supervisor Peskin, which calls on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board.

This resolution is needed because the SFPUC staff and the City Attorney, without informing the Board of Supervisors, or even seeking the approval of the SFPUC Commissioners, challenged state-required protections for the Tuolumne River, San Francisco's drinking water source. The lawsuit relies on a highly flawed interpretation of the Clean Water Act forced on the nation by the Trump administration.

The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera claim that allowing the state to protect the Tuolumne River would threaten the City's drinking water supplies. Together, San Francisco and the two big agricultural water districts on the Tuolumne River divert more than 90 percent of the river's water in some years. That unsustainable water pumping has had a devastating effect on the river and its salmon runs which the state rightly says needs addressing. San Francisco should be supporting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River and salmon – not fighting them.

San Francisco has a vast network of large reservoirs that store enough water to weather years of drought. In fact, we use less water today than a decade ago and are likely to use even less in future, thanks to technology and population trends. San Francisco could use even less of the Tuolumne River's water if it followed the example of communities like Los Angeles and Orange County, which are far ahead in water recycling and reuse technologies.

The City's lawsuit stands in stark contrast to actions taken by former State Attorney General Xavier Becerra who sued the Trump administration over its attempts to weaken the Clean Water Act. The Attorney General's actions were based on the belief that California should have the ability to keep its rivers and lakes clean and healthy. The SFPUC and City Attorney Dennis Herrera disagree and argues that Trump was right when it comes to stripping protections for the environment.

No doubt the SFPUC and City Attorney's office will present you with arguments about how the sky will fall if the City is forced to withdraw its anti-environmental lawsuit. Some of the biggest air polluters in the state would have presented similar arguments when AG Becerra fought off Trump administration efforts to weaken California's air pollution laws. Fortunately, Becerra won that fight. If he were still here, he'd probably win this fight too.

Sincerely,

Tom McManus
319 London St
San Francisco, CA 94112



Restore the Delta
509 E Main Street
Stockton, CA 95202

June 7, 2021

Supervisor Aaron Peskin
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Resolution 210577 - SFPUC's Litigation Against Environmental Protections

Dear Supervisor Peskin:

We are writing to express our support for your resolution urging the SFPUC to pause their litigation against the State Water Resources Control Board. That litigation is another step in the SFPUC's ongoing efforts to prevent the State of California from adopting stronger protections for the Tuolumne River, the Bay-Delta and the communities that are affected directly by pollution and the decline of this ecosystem.

Our organization represents the Delta, which has suffered enormously from the lack of freshwater inflow and the lack of scientifically driven State Board flow standards. This is a primary cause of the dramatic increase in harmful algae blooms (HAB) in the Delta. Those HAB outbreaks represent a significant threat to public health. During these blooms, merely swimming in Delta waterways can be harmful to public health, and they potentially threaten drinking water supplies. Those blooms have become so intense that they also result in the degradation of air quality - in a community that already has among the highest asthma rates in the nation. Recently, HABs have also been linked with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, also known as Lou Gehrig's disease.

The HAB problem has been growing worse for years and has become a public health crisis. In addition to threatening public health, this crisis also undermines efforts to rebuild the economy in our communities. This crisis represents a particular threat to economically disadvantaged communities of color.

Unfortunately, for years, the SFPUC has been fighting against science-based new flow standards to improve this situation. They have developed a proposed "voluntary agreement" that would fail to significantly improve flows that a NMFS peer review has revealed to be without a credible scientific foundation. That proposal offers nothing to improve the crisis facing our communities. The SFPUC has now sued the State Board twice in an effort to block desperately needed new flow standards. The SFPUC's positions completely ignore the HAB crisis and its impacts on our communities.

Their latest litigation, challenging the State Board's 401 certification for the Tuolumne River FERC licensing process, ignores the solid scientific foundation for the State Board's action. It also embraces a Trump era interpretation of Section 401 of the Clean Water Act in an effort to muzzle State efforts to protect State rivers in this federal process. The suit even claims that the State Board's efforts violate the state constitution. These claims are not merely incorrect, they undermine San Francisco's reputation as a leader in protecting the environment and disadvantaged communities.

The SFPUC has, for years, worked to block the adoption of environmental protections that are needed to protect public health, as well as the economic health of our communities. Their current litigation against the State Board is a clear example of this pattern. We urge the Board of Supervisors to support your resolution and encourage the SFPUC to change direction.

Thank you for introducing this resolution. We look forward to continuing to work with you to ensure that the SFPUC changes direction and supports water policies that reflect San Francisco's values.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla". The signature is fluid and cursive, written over a light blue horizontal line.

Barbara Barrigan-Parrilla
Executive Director
Restore the Delta

Cc: SF Board of Supervisors

From: [Alison Goh](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Roberta Borgonovo](#); [LWVSF Advocacy](#)
Subject: File # 210577 and 210595 Urging the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to Pause Litigation Against the State Water Resources Control Board
Date: Thursday, June 3, 2021 4:51:39 PM
Attachments: [5.27.21 LWVC Letter to San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.pdf](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear San Francisco Board of Supervisors,

The League of Women Voters of San Francisco encourages the Board of Supervisors to take steps to pass the resolution urging the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission to pause its litigation against the California State Water Resources Control Board and instead heed the beneficial input of a diverse and inclusive group of stakeholders, including subject matter experts in environmental protection, habitat restoration, and the diversification of water supplies based on credible science (File # 210577 and 210595) with all appropriate speed.

Attached to this email is a copy of the League of Women Voters of California's letter to the Commissioners of the SFPUC regarding our request to increase flows in the Tuolumne River. The letter is very much in line with the resolution (File # 210577 and 210595). In this year of drought and changes in the climate regime in California, it is imperative that San Francisco joins other diverters in the Tuolumne River basin to increase flows that will reach the Bay-Delta.

Sincerely,

Alison Goh

Alison Goh
President
president@lwvsf.org
pronouns: she/her

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
582 Market Street, Suite 615, San Francisco, CA 94104
415-989-8683 • [Facebook](#) • [Twitter](#)
Empowering voters. Defending democracy. Learn more at lwvsf.org.



May 27, 2021

VIA Email

President Sophie Maxwell and Commissioners
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)
525 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Request to Increase Flows in the Tuolumne River

Dear President Maxwell and Commissioners:

The League of Women Voters of California urges you to work with the State Water Board (SWB) to increase flows in the Tuolumne River. The League believes that increasing flows in the tributaries of the San Joaquin and Sacramento rivers is critical to protecting the Bay-Delta Estuary.

As background, the League supports the efforts of the State Water Board to adopt scientifically based instream flow standards that will increase unimpaired flow in the San Joaquin River and its tributaries. We support high water quality standards and protection of fisheries, habitat, and instream uses without enabling continued unsustainable levels of reliance on exports from the Delta.

We believe increased flow is necessary for the survival of salmon and other species in the San Joaquin and Sacramento River ecosystems. Further, we believe all diverters from the San Francisco/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary should contribute to the flows necessary to sustain the health of the Estuary.

We make these comments in the hope that stakeholders will be encouraged to work together to reach agreements to increase unimpaired flows. We also encourage the staff of the SWB to continue working with local entities to fashion a standard that will protect all beneficial uses in the watershed. We note that the unimpaired flow proposal has an adaptive management approach so that the standard does not require rigid adherence to a fixed percent of unimpaired flow. This flexibility is necessary, especially as tributary watersheds struggle to meet requirements of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act. Implementation of non-flow measures could reduce the flows needed. Such

May 27, 2021

measures could include restoring gravel-spawning beds, improving native fish habitat, and suppressing predatory fish habitat.

Because the Tuolumne River is the most impacted, leaving only 21% of unimpaired flow in the river from February through June, we specifically encourage the San Francisco Public Utility Commission (SFPUC) to study various options in partnership with the Modesto and Turlock Irrigation Districts to increase flows in the river. Exploring groundwater banking, enhanced conservation projects, and other innovative approaches to water management could benefit all and lessen the economic impacts to both agricultural and urban users. Leadership, a strong commitment, and financial resources are required.

We recognize that San Francisco's main water supply comes from the Tuolumne River. However, the League believes San Francisco can reduce water diversions and still sustain its local economy by increased investments in local and regional water supply projects, such as water recycling and improved conservation projects. In this year of drought and changes in the climate regime in California, it is imperative that San Francisco joins other diverters in the Tuolumne River basin to increase flows that will reach the Bay-Delta.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



Carol Moon Goldberg
President