

Brenda Bennett

From: James <eejfox@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 10:00 PM
To: Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org; alisa.somera@sfgov.org; Breedstaff@sfgov.org;
David.Campos@sfgov.org; Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org; Jane.Kim@sfgov.org;
John.Avalos@sfgov.org; Katy.Tang@sfgov.org; Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org;
Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org; mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org; Norman.Yee@sfgov.org;
Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org; commissioners@sfgov.org
Cc: Robert Hanna; PARKS_Commission; Adrienne Tissier; Carole Groom; Don Horsley; Dave
Pine; Marlene Finley; Warren Slocum
Subject: Open the SF Watershed - From John Muir's Hills

Dear Supervisors,

For the past 6 years, I've been working to preserve John Muir's only ridgeline (the Alhambra Hills), the tallest ridgeline in Martinez from development of 106 homes, with virtually no help from the Sierra Club (despite having spent many occasions reaching out to them), nonetheless, we were able to gather the entire City Council onto our side, and preservation is now looking very likely, thanks to many hours of work (after putting kids to bed).

I know firsthand what a grassroots movement is, and when the right thing to do is on the table, and I also realize the Sierra Club has become a very weak, not well supported organization (i.e. the entire Bay Chapter literally has only 2 staff members).

Please review the attached GIF showing public trails vs. home prices I created for you: <http://gph.is/2dftvcb>

Clearly opening the SF watershed is a social justice issue, and I urge you to do the right thing, (just as has been done in Marin, and the East Bay).

Wishing you the best at the City Council hearing tomorrow,

Best,
Jamie Fox
Alhambra Hills Open Space Committee
Martinez, CA

Brenda Bennett

From: Joe Witherspoon <joe@motostrano2.com>
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 3:08 PM
To: aaron.peskin@sfgov.org; breedstaff@sfgov.org; david.campos@sfgov.org; Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org; jane.kim@sfgov.org; john.avalos@sfgov.org; katy.tang@sfgov.org; malia.cohen@sfgov.org; mark.farrell@sfgov.org; norman.yee@sfgov.org; scott.wiener@sfgov.org
Cc: PARKS_Commission; atisslier@smcgov.org; Carole Groom; Don Horsley; Dave Pine; Marlene Finley; Warren Slocum
Subject: Please include my comments below as part of the public record

Dear Supervisors:

I am a San Mateo County Resident and have been for all 49 years of my life. I was born and raised in Burlingame just minutes away from Crystal Springs Watershed and have lived here with the constant knowledge that this public space has been closed off to me for any type of recreation- walking, bike riding. Growing up in Burlingame and going to Mills High School in Millbrae, I was keenly aware that these towns and San Bruno and also Daly City were completely barred from any real open space areas, in spite of the fact that this huge area was within bicycle riding distance was so close. Belmont has its parks. Half Moon Bay has its trails and yet this giant area with obvious pre-existing trails has been closed off. I now live in San Mateo and still the area is closed to any access.

It's good to know that others feel the same and that keeping the area closed to us not in the public's interest and I support their efforts.

PLEASE work to open these trails to the public.

I would like to express my support for improved public access to the San Francisco Public Utility Commission's Peninsula Watershed. This issue is very important to me and my family having grown up in the area and it being the place where I've chosen to raise my 3 children. I want my family to have close access to nature, without having to jump in a car and create more traffic in the Bay Area. . The public has been closed off from the Watershed's scenic, historical and recreational experiences for too long. Please do what you can to help achieve access reform.

I support the resolution (SFBOS file # 160183) to allow responsible access to the SFPUC watershed lands over existing service road such as Fifield-Cahill Ridge, Pilarcitos Road, Whiting Ridge, Old Cañada, and to historical sites for the following reasons:

-Access to the watershed's existing dirt roads would allow hikers, cyclists and equestrians to visit the area's largest and most scenic unused, publicly held open space, integrating National, State and County parklands across the San Francisco Peninsula.

-At this time there are no significant, scientific concerns over water security, fire safety or environmental stewardship. Prior to opening a complete environmental investigation will surface any environmental issues that need to be addressed.

-The "trails", dirt roads actually, are currently used by SFPUC trucks on a daily basis. They could easily be designated as a trail system, much as is done in the Marin County and Santa Clara County Watersheds.

Please also retire the "mandatory docent system". There are times when we will need to enjoy these lands with out being forced into a large group. This approach works well in other watershed lands across the state, there's no reason it shouldn't work on the Peninsula.

For San Franciscans: Please ask for support of Resolution 160183 and for SFPUC to work cooperatively with San Mateo County to improve access to the watershed.

For San Mateo County residents: Please ask for support of expanded access and see to it that our County works cooperatively with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, The San Francisco Planning department and the GGNRA to achieve access reform.

Thank you for your public service.

Joe Witherspoon

San Mateo, California

Office. 650-918-6259

www.motostrano.com

joe@motostrano.com

Motostrano

926 Broadway

Redwood City CA 94063

tel. [650-918-6259](tel:650-918-6259)

EBIKELane www.ebikelane.com

1452 Bush St

San Francisco CA 94109

[415-580-1452](tel:415-580-1452)

Web: www.motostrano.com

YouTube <http://www.youtube.com/user/motostrano>

Yelp: https://www.yelp.com/biz/motostrano-redwood-city-3?sort_by=date_desc

Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/Motostrano/>

Twitter: <https://twitter.com/motostrano>

Instagram: <https://www.instagram.com/motostrano/>

Meet-up: <http://www.meetup.com/ebiketreks/>

Brenda Bennett

From: Kevin Lee <kevinlee324@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 2:06 PM
To: Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org; alisa.somera@sfgov.org; Breedstaff@sfgov.org; David.Campos@sfgov.org; Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org; Jane.Kim@sfgov.org; John.Avalos@sfgov.org; Katy.Tang@sfgov.org; Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org; Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org; mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org; Norman.Yee@sfgov.org; Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org; commissioners@sfgov.org
Cc: PARKS_Commission; Adrienne Tissier; Carole Groom; Don Horsley; Dave Pine; Marlene Finley; Warren Slocum
Subject: Public access to the SF Watershed RE: SFBOS 160183

Dear honorable Supervisors,

Please include this email as part of the public record.

Public access in the SF Watershed, and open space in general is a social justice, equity issue. I support the resolution (SFBOS file # 160183) to allow responsible access to the SFPUC watershed lands over existing service road such as Fifield-Cahill Ridge, Pilarcitos Road, Whiting Ridge, Old Cañada, and to historical sites for the following reasons:

-Residents of Southern San Francisco and Northern San Mateo County are some of the most socioeconomically and culturally diverse areas of the SF Peninsula. They are as close to the road network in the Watershed as they are to the Presidio. For these residents the SF Watershed is the closest open space.

-Fostering public sentiment of environmental stewardship through public engagement is the model for environmental protection. The communities that surround the Watershed should be as trusted as environmental stewards as the communities that surround Mid-Pen or Marin. People with resources can travel to find open space in Marin, Southern San Mateo County or other locals in California. These alternative options do not apply for many residents on the SF Peninsula.

-The docent program is unusable by many people, primarily those on the lower rungs of the socioeconomic ladder, including those who do not own a motor vehicle and who are unable to fit their lifestyle into the limited times the docent program runs. From a socioeconomic and social justice perspective, the docent program is very far from providing access to economically disadvantaged groups in the peninsula. Indeed, it is contrary to the ethos of enabling those who may not be as economically well off from partaking in the outdoors closest to their homes. Many who reside in these areas are working class individuals for whom planning a foray the SF Watershed with a docent program is not a viable option. In effect, the barriers to exclude residents who are stone's throw away from the SF Watershed places an inequitable and unfair burden on those individuals from equal access to their environment. From that perspective a permit program would be much better than the docent program to accommodate the economically disadvantaged populations of the area. In fact, open dusk till dawn access is even better than a permit program.

Thank you for your public service.

Kevin Lee, Palo Alto resident since 1998

Brenda Bennett

From: Mark Alan Prior <mark@markalanprior.com>
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 11:35 AM
To: Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org; alisa.somera@sfgov.org; Breedstaff@sfgov.org; David.Campos@sfgov.org; Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org; Jane.Kim@sfgov.org; John.Avalos@sfgov.org; Katy.Tang@sfgov.org; Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org; Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org; mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org; Norman.Yee@sfgov.org; Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org; commissioners@sfgov.org
Cc: PARKS_Commission; Adrienne Tissier; Carole Groom; Don Horsley; Dave Pine; Marlene Finley; Warren Slocum
Subject: Please vote for public access to the SF Watershed today

Dear Honorable Supervisors,

Please include this email as part of the public record.

I beg you to vote yes on today's vote for resolution 160183.

I am 25 year resident of SF and depend on local open space for access to the outdoor for myself and my family. I am dependent on public transportation and current ranger-led hikes do not suite my schedule or desperate need for silence and isolation that only open access can provide.

Public access in the SF Watershed, and open space in general is a social justice, equity issue. I support the resolution (SFBOS file # 160183) to allow responsible access to the SFPUC watershed lands over existing service road such as Fifield-Cahill Ridge, Pilarcitos Road, Whiting Ridge, Old Cañada, and to historical sites for the following reasons:

-Residents of Southern San Francisco and Northern San Mateo County are some of the most socioeconomically and culturally diverse areas of the SF Peninsula. They are as close to the road network in the Watershed as they are to the Presidio. For these residents the SF Watershed is the closest open space.

-Fostering public sentiment of enviornmental stewardship through public engagement is the model for enviornmental protection The communities that surround the Watershed should be as trusted as enviornmental stewards as the communities that surround Mid-Pen or Marin. People with resources can travel to find open space in Marin, Southern San Mateo County or other locals in California. These alternative options do not apply for many residents on the SF Peninsula.

-The docent program is unusable by many people, primarily those on the lower runs of the socioeconomic ladder, including those who do not own a motor vehicle and who are unable to fit their lifestyle into the limited times the docent program runs. From a socioeconomic and social justice perspective, the docent program is very far from providing access to economically disadvantaged groups in the peninsula. Indeed, it is contrary to the ethos of enabling those who may not be as economically well off from part taking in the outdoors closest to their homes. Many who reside in these areas are working class individuals for whom planning a foray the SF Watershed with a docent program is not a viable option. In effect, the barriers to exclude residents who are stone's throw away from the SF Watershed places an inequitable and unfair burden on those individuals from equal access to their environment. From that perspective a permit program would be much better than the docent program to accommodate the economically disadvantaged populations of the area. In fact, open dusk till dawn access is even better than a permit program.

Thank you for your public service.

Yours,

Mark Prior
San Francisco Resident (543 Grove St, 94102)

Brenda Bennett

From: mself.com@gmail.com on behalf of Matthew Self <matthew@mself.com>
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 2:25 PM
To: Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org; alisa.somera@sfgov.org; Breedstaff@sfgov.org; David.Campos@sfgov.org; Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org; Jane.Kim@sfgov.org; John.Avalos@sfgov.org; Katy.Tang@sfgov.org; Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org; Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org; mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org; Norman.Yee@sfgov.org; Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org; commissioners@sfgov.org
Cc: PARKS_Commission; Adrienne Tissier; Carole Groom; Don Horsley; Dave Pine; Marlene Finley; Warren Slocum
Subject: In support of responsible public access to the SFPUC watershed

Honorable Supervisors,

Please open the SFPUC watershed to greater public access. As the population on the Peninsula continues to surge, the need for opportunities to experience nature and get healthy exercise will only continue to increase. I believe that much greater public access can be offered without damaging the environment or the watershed. The issues are manageable.

I have taken one of the docent-led bike rides on Fifiel-Cahill Ridge, and it opened my eyes to what I had been missing for the previous 40 years. I am an avid hiker and cyclist, but the extra burden of scheduling a docent-led tour was significant. I couldn't pick what time to go, or ride at my own pace, or enjoy the setting just on my own. Weekend hikes and bike rides aren't the kind of activity that one plans out weeks in advance. Having used the docent-led program, I don't feel that it is a sufficient or workable solution.

SFPUC manages these lands as a public trust. What is the greatest public benefit that these lands can offer? I believe that much greater (but responsible) public access is needed.

Regards,

--Matthew Self

Matthew Self
Redwood City

Please include this email as part of the public record.

Brenda Bennett

From: Silvia Keller <sildog@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 10:35 AM
To: Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org; alisa.somera@sfgov.org; Breedstaff@sfgov.org; David.Campos@sfgov.org; Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org; Jane.Kim@sfgov.org; John.Avalos@sfgov.org; Katy.Tang@sfgov.org; Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org; Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org; mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org; Norman.Yee@sfgov.org; Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org; commissioners@sfgov.org
Cc: PARKS_Commission; Adrienne Tissier; Carole Groom; Don Horsley; Dave Pine; Marlene Finley; Warren Slocum
Subject: Public support of SFBOS file # 160183

Dear honorable Supervisors,

Please include this email as part of the public record.

Public access in the SF Watershed, and open space in general is a social justice, equity issue. I support the resolution (SFBOS file # 160183) to allow responsible access to the SFPUC watershed lands over existing service road such as Fifield-Cahill Ridge, Pilarcitos Road, Whiting Ridge, Old Cañada, and to historical sites for the following reasons:

-Residents of Southern San Francisco and Northern San Mateo County are some of the most socioeconomically and culturally diverse areas of the SF Peninsula. They are as close to the road network in the Watershed as they are to the Presidio. For these residents the SF Watershed is the closest open space.

-Fostering public sentiment of environmental stewardship through public engagement is the model for environmental protection the communities that surround the Watershed should be as trusted as environmental stewards as the communities that surround Mid-Pen or Marin. People with resources can travel to find open space in Marin, Southern San Mateo County or other locals in California. These alternative options do not apply for many residents on the SF Peninsula.

-The docent program is unusable by many people, primarily those on the lower runs of the socioeconomic ladder, including those who do not own a motor vehicle and who are unable to fit their lifestyle into the limited times the docent program runs. From a socioeconomic and social justice perspective, the docent program is very far from providing access to economically disadvantaged groups in the peninsula. Indeed, it is contrary to the ethos of enabling those who may not be as economically well off from part taking in the outdoors closest to their homes. Many who reside in these areas are working class individuals for whom planning a foray the SF Watershed with a docent program is not a viable option. In effect, the barriers to exclude residents who are stone's throw away from the SF Watershed places an inequitable and unfair burden on those individuals from equal access to their environment. From that perspective a permit program would be much better than the docent program to accommodate the economically disadvantaged populations of the area. In fact, open dusk till dawn access is even better than a permit program.

Thank you for your public service.

Silvia Keller

Woodside, CA

Brenda Bennett

From: Cathy Apsley <chapsley@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2016 2:26 PM
To: Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org; alisa.somera@sfgov.org; Breedstaff@sfgov.org; David.Campos@sfgov.org; Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org; Jane.Kim@sfgov.org; John.Avalos@sfgov.org; Katy.Tang@sfgov.org; Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org; Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org; mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org; Norman.Yee@sfgov.org; Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org; commissioners@sfgov.org; PARKS_Commission; Adrienne Tissier; Carole Groom; Don Horsley; Dave Pine; Marlene Finley; Warren Slocum
Subject: Increased access to the watershed

Members of the Board of Supervisors:

I write to you today to encourage you to vote in favor of increasing access to the Crystal Springs watershed/SFPUC lands. I am sure you are aware of the many studies coming out recently showing how important access to nature is important to maintaining mental health as well as combatting stress and obesity. I found the one conducted here in the Bay Area by Stanford University very enlightening: "After some preliminary tests, half the participants walked for 90 minutes through a grassland dotted with oak trees and shrubs ("views include neighboring, scenic hills, and distant views of the San Francisco Bay"). The other half took a jaunt along El Camino Real, a four-lane, traffic-logged street in Palo Alto. The nature walkers showed decreases in rumination and in activity in their subgenual prefrontal cortices. The urban walkers showed no such improvements." The very urban environment of San Francisco and northern San Mateo County have quite a paucity of trails suitable for the kind of inexpensive "self-treatment" that the watershed's existing roads could easily provide. San Mateo County has recognized a need to assist residents of the southeastern county's "park-poor" communities with connecting with more wild spaces, and has instituted a shuttle program to Huddart and to Edgewood Park to support that. What will you do for your constituents?

At the Land Use subcommittee hearing a couple of weeks ago, I heard more than one speaker who was opposed to increased access say that the watershed was "never meant to be a park" and implied that it was some kind of wilderness, untouched by human hands, and therefore should remain closed. I disagree with that characterization and that rationale. The watershed lands have been inhabited for at least 5,000 years! When Padre Francisco Palou came through, going between Mission Dolores, the asistencia in San Mateo, and Mission Santa Clara, he noted that there were at least five villages there. The lands were logged, farmed, and ranched in support of the Missions and then the ranchos. After the Americans arrived, the area was logged some more, mined for cinnabar, quarried for stone, farmed, ranched, and had a thriving dairy industry. Three towns existed there, two school houses, and a hotel/resort/stagecoach stop that served as a polling place in San Mateo County's first election. The man credited as being the Father of California Viticulture, Agoston Haraszthy, planted his first California vineyard on his land in the watershed. Now, of course, the watershed is dammed, crisscrossed with service roads, bisected by two freeways, and adjacent to a golf course, a quarry, and Ox Mountain Landfill. Obviously, the land retains a great deal of value as habitat for wildlife, and would have a great deal of value to residents in need of nature-based recreation, but I think you can see that the watershed land is in no way equivalent to a federally-designated wilderness. Ironically, if it *were* a federally-designated wilderness area, it would be easily accessible to the public via a permit system. Can we not do the same?

Another point that was put forth was that the watershed needed to be restricted to protect endangered species. Can I offer up a comparison to Edgewood County Park and Natural Preserve? Edgewood park abuts the southwestern border of the watershed and shares many characteristics. Like the watershed, it also hosts a range of endangered plants and animals. Both preserves feature chaparral, oaks, and grasslands with views of the forested ridge to the west. Close to the San Andreas fault, they share a special feature, serpentine soil. Serpentine is so nutrient-poor, that only California native plants that are adapted to it can effectively grow there. Some of those plants support animal life that are adapted to specific plants, like the endangered Bay

Checkerspot butterfly. Plants (and their corresponding animals) are under threat in both preserves due to car exhaust from the 280 freeway and Cañada Road. The nitrogen in the exhaust has been shown to slowly, incrementally, changing the balance of nutrients in the soil so that it favors the serpentine endemics less, and weedy invasives more.

Due to proximity to neighborhoods and in the interest of preserving water quality, neither controlled burns or grazing is very feasible at these preserves. Edgewood's response has been to mow, and also enlist a cadre of volunteer "Weed Warriors", who meet 1-3 times a week, year round, helping to control the invasives and foster the native plants and animals. The watershed's response is a fence. "Doing nothing is not an option anymore in a lot of areas," says biologist Stuart Weiss with the Creekside Center for Earth Observation, which has worked on key habitat projects... "The age of fencing areas off and letting them take care of themselves—those are long gone if they ever existed. So finding ways to have very careful stewardship and management is going to be absolutely essential over the long run if we're going to preserve biodiversity." Rather than fence out visitors out of fear that they will damage the ecosystem, can we not invite them to help preserve it? Hikers and bikers are encouraged to visit Edgewood unaccompanied (see aforementioned shuttle bus), or participate in docent-led wildflower and wildlife walks. In addition to the docents and Weed Warriors, volunteers in the park work to support the Bay Checkerspot butterfly population and have completed a flora for the park on iNaturalist; I would love to see a flora for the watershed! The Bay Area Ridge Trail, which we expect to go through the watershed, sponsors trail maintenance days (such as the one coming up November 5). Can we enlist them to do the same in the watershed? I think citizen engagement would be healthy for the watershed rather than detrimental.

As it stands, what is probably the most delicate part of watershed property is the part that is already open: the Sawyer Camp/Crystal Springs trail. This is also the part where the water is closest and most vulnerable. Given that, how can it not make sense to open some roads that are much further away from the water, up on the ridgeline where they connect to other existing parks to permitted access?

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Catherine Apsley

Brenda Bennett

From: Scott Legocki <stlegocki@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2016 11:35 AM
To: Jane.Kim@sfgov.org
Cc: Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org; alisa.somera@sfgov.org; Breedstaff@sfgov.org; David.Campos@sfgov.org; Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org; John.Avalos@sfgov.org; Katy.Tang@sfgov.org; Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org; Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org; Norman.Yee@sfgov.org; Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org; commissioners@sfgov.org; PARKS_Commission; Adrienne Tissier; Carole Groom; Don Horsley; Dave Pine; Marlene Finley; Warren Slocum
Subject: San Francisco's Resolution 160183

Please include my comments below as part of the public record

Dear Ms. Kim:

I would like to express my support for improved public access to the San Francisco Public Utility Commission's Peninsula Watershed. This issue is very important to me and my family. The public has been closed off from the Watershed's scenic, historical and recreational experiences for too long. Please do what you can to help achieve access reform.

I support the resolution (SFBOS file # 160183) to allow responsible access to the SFPUC watershed lands over existing service road such as Fifield-Cahill Ridge, Pilarcitos Road, Whiting Ridge, Old Cañada, and to historical sites for the following reasons:

-Access to the watershed's existing dirt roads would allow hikers, cyclists and equestrians to visit the area's largest and most scenic unused, publicly held open space, integrating National, State and County parklands across the San Francisco Peninsula.

-At this time there are no significant, scientific concerns over water security, fire safety or environmental stewardship. Prior to opening a complete environmental investigation will surface any environmental issues that need to be addressed.

-The "trails", dirt roads actually, are currently used by SFPUC trucks on a daily basis. They could easily be designated as a trail system, much as is done in the Marin County and Santa Clara County Watersheds.

Please also retire the "mandatory docent system". There are times when we will need to enjoy these lands without being forced into a large group. This approach works well in other watershed lands across the state, there's no reason it shouldn't work on the Peninsula.

Please support of Resolution 160183 and ensure SFPUC works cooperatively with San Mateo County to improve access to the watershed.

Scott T Legocki
Resident of SOMA in the City and County of San Francisco

--

Scott Legocki

Sent from my iPhone using Gmail Mobile so please excuse any strange autocorrections.

--

Scott Legocki

Sent from my iPhone using Gmail Mobile so please excuse any strange autocorrections.

Brenda Bennett

From: Alex Abbas <alex@abbas.org>
Sent: Wednesday, September 28, 2016 5:27 PM
To: Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org; alisa.somera@sfgov.org; Breedstaff@sfgov.org; David.Campos@sfgov.org; Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org; John.Avalos@sfgov.org; Katy.Tang@sfgov.org; Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org; Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org; mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org; Norman.Yee@sfgov.org; Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org; commissioners@sfgov.org
Cc: PARKS_Commission; Adrienne Tissier; Carole Groom; Don Horsley; Dave Pine; Marlene Finley; Warren Slocum
Subject: Resolution 160183

Dear Supervisors Cohen, Peskin and Wiener:

Please include this email as part of the public record.

I would like to express my support for improved public access to the San Francisco Public Utility Commission's Peninsula Watershed. This area is beautiful network of wide, durable fire roads that I've only had the pleasure of visiting once because of the restrictions on access, but there's no good reason not to open them up. Reservoir security, fire safety, and environmental issues have all been mentioned but none of them are a problem. The costs would be minimal and the recreational value would be great.

Please support Resolution 160183 and to have SFPUC work cooperatively with San Mateo County to improve access for hikers, bicycles, and equestrians to the watershed.

Thank you for your public service.

Dr. Alexander R. Abbas

San Carlos resident

Brenda Bennett

From: Jason Beck <lionchow@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2016 12:48 PM
To: Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org; alisa.somera@sfgov.org; Breedstaff@sfgov.org; David.Campos@sfgov.org; Jane.Kim@sfgov.org; John.Avalos@sfgov.org; Katy.Tang@sfgov.org; Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org; Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org; mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org; Norman.Yee@sfgov.org; Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org; commissioners@sfgov.org
Cc: PARKS_Commission; Adrienne Tissier; Carole Groom; Don Horsley; Dave Pine; Marlene Finley; Warren Slocum
Subject: Support for Resolution to Allow Improved Access to the SF Watershed (SFBOS file # 160183)

Greetings Supervisors,

I support the resolution (SFBOS file # 160183) to allow responsible access to the SFPUC watershed lands over existing service road such as Fifield-Cahill Ridge, Pilarcitos Road, Whiting Ridge, Old Cañada, and to historical sites.

I'm a resident of District 1 in SF. I love to hike and ride my bike around the Bay Area. Opening the existing dirt roads in the watershed to hikers, cyclists and equestrians, without a scheduled docent led tour, is a very simple and responsible way to increase access the natural beauty of our region, and to create more opportunities for citizens to build health and wellness. I'm aware of the arguments against opening the watershed, and I've personally found them to be lacking in sound judgement. I'm a nature enthusiast, and care deeply about the preservation of the environment. I believe that increasing recreational opportunities in this area goes hand in hand with preserving the environment, as users will be exposed to natural beauty and be more inclined to protect it. I don't believe that an area needs to be closed off to be preserved. Recreation and preservation are not mutually exclusive, they are actually intertwined and support each other.

I ask you to please support Resolution 160183 and for SFPUC to work cooperatively with San Mateo County to improve access to the watershed.

Thank you for your time and your service to our city and region.

Cheers,
Jason Beck

San Francisco

Brenda Bennett

From: Rex Harris <rexhunter8@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 28, 2016 5:00 PM
To: Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org; alisa.somera@sfgov.org; Breedstaff@sfgov.org; David.Campos@sfgov.org; Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org; John.Avalos@sfgov.org; Katy.Tang@sfgov.org; Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org; Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org; mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org; Norman.Yee@sfgov.org; Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org; commissioners@sfgov.org
Cc: PARKS_Commission; Adrienne Tissier; Carole Groom; Don Horsley; Dave Pine; Marlene Finley; Warren Slocum
Subject: SF Watershed upcoming vote

Dear Supervisors Cohen, Peskin and Wiener:

Please include this email as part of the public record.

I would like to express my support for improved public access to the San Francisco Public Utility Commission's Peninsula Watershed. This issue is very important to me and my family. The public has been closed off from the Watershed's scenic, historical and recreational experiences for too long. Please do what you can to help achieve access reform.

I support the resolution (SFBOS file # 160183) to allow responsible access to the SFPUC watershed lands over existing service road such as Fifield-Cahill Ridge, Pilarcitos Road, Whiting Ridge, Old Cañada, and to historical sites for the following reasons:

- Access to the watershed's existing dirt roads would allow hikers, cyclists and equestrians to visit the area's largest and most scenic unused, publicly held open space, integrating National, State and County parklands across the San Francisco Peninsula.
- At this time there are no significant, scientific concerns over water security, fire safety or environmental stewardship. Prior to opening a complete environmental investigation will surface any environmental issues that need to be addressed.
- The "trails", dirt roads actually, are currently used by SFPUC trucks on a daily basis. They could easily be designated as a trail system, much as is done in the Marin County and Santa Clara County Watersheds.

Please support of Resolution 160183 and for SFPUC to work cooperatively with San Mateo County to improve access to the watershed. Thank you for your public service.

Rex Harris
773.562.2157

Brenda Bennett

From: Richard F McLaughlin <rfm3@att.net>
Sent: Wednesday, September 28, 2016 3:57 PM
To: Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org; alisa.somera@sfgov.org; Breedstaff@sfgov.org; David.Campos@sfgov.org; Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org; John.Avalos@sfgov.org; Katy.Tang@sfgov.org; Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org; Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org; mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org; Norman.Yee@sfgov.org; Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org; commissioners@sfgov.org
Cc: PARKS_Commission; Adrienne Tissier; Carole Groom; Don Horsley; Dave Pine; Marlene Finley; Warren Slocum
Subject: Please Open the SF Watershed!

Dear Supervisors Cohen, Peskin and Wiener:

Please include this email as part of the public record.

I would like to express my support for improved public access to the San Francisco Public Utility Commission's Peninsula Watershed. This issue is very important to me and my family. The public has been closed off from the Watershed's scenic, historical and recreational experiences for too long. Please do what you can to help achieve access reform.

I support the resolution (SFBOS file # 160183) to allow responsible access to the SFPUC watershed lands over existing service road such as Fifield-Cahill Ridge, Pilarcitos Road, Whiting Ridge, Old Cañada, and to historical sites for the following reasons:

-Access to the watershed's existing dirt roads would allow hikers, cyclists and equestrians to visit the area's largest and most scenic unused, publicly held open space, integrating National, State and County parklands across the San Francisco Peninsula.

-At this time there are no significant, scientific concerns over water security, fire safety or environmental stewardship. Prior to opening a complete environmental investigation will surface any environmental issues that need to be addressed.

-The "trails", dirt roads actually, are currently used by SFPUC trucks on a daily basis. They could easily be designated as a trail system, much as is done in the Marin County and Santa Clara County Watersheds.

Please support of Resolution 160183 and for SFPUC to work cooperatively with San Mateo County to improve access to the watershed.

Thank you for your public service.

Richard McLaughlin

Bay Area Resident for 59 years

Brenda Bennett

From: Victoria Whisner <viciwhiz@charter.net>
Sent: Wednesday, September 28, 2016 4:54 PM
To: Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org; alisa.somera@sfgov.org; Breedstaff@sfgov.org; David.Campos@sfgov.org; Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org; John.Avalos@sfgov.org; Katy.Tang@sfgov.org; Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org; Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org; mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org; Norman.Yee@sfgov.org; Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org; commissioners@sflower.org
Cc: PARKS_Commission; Adrienne Tissier; Carole Groom; Don Horsley; Dave Pine; Marlene Finley; Warren Slocum
Subject: Public Access to the SF Watershed

Dear Supervisors Cohen, Peskin and Wiener:

Please include this email as part of the public record.

I would like to express my support for improved public access to the San Francisco Public Utility Commission's Peninsula Watershed. This issue is very important to me and my family. The public has been closed off from the Watershed's scenic, historical and recreational experiences for too long. Please do what you can to help achieve access reform.

I support the resolution (SFBOS file # 160183) to allow responsible access to the SFPUC watershed lands over existing service road such as Fifield-Cahill Ridge, Pilarcitos Road, Whiting Ridge, Old Cañada, and to historical sites for the following reasons:

-Access to the watershed's existing dirt roads would allow hikers, cyclists and equestrians to visit the area's largest and most scenic unused, publicly held open space, integrating National, State and County parklands across the San Francisco Peninsula.

-At this time there are no significant, scientific concerns over water security, fire safety or environmental stewardship. Prior to opening a complete environmental investigation will surface any environmental issues that need to be addressed.

-The "trails", dirt roads actually, are currently used by SFPUC trucks on a daily basis. They could easily be designated as a trail system, much as is done in the Marin County and Santa Clara County Watersheds.

Please support of Resolution 160183 and for SFPUC to work cooperatively with San Mateo County to improve access to the watershed.

Thank you for your public service.

Vici Whisner
viciwhiz@charter.net 408 776 3903

Brenda Bennett

From: Jordan Kestler <jordankestler@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 29, 2016 4:06 PM
To: Aaron.Peskin@sfgov.org; alisa.somera@sfgov.org; Breedstaff@sfgov.org; David.Campos@sfgov.org; Eric.L.Mar@sfgov.org; Jane.Kim@sfgov.org; John.Avalos@sfgov.org; Katy.Tang@sfgov.org; Malia.Cohen@sfgov.org; Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org; mayoredwinlee@sfgov.org; Norman.Yee@sfgov.org; Scott.Wiener@sfgov.org; commissioners@sfgov.org
Cc: PARKS_Commission; Adrienne Tissier; Carole Groom; Don Horsley; Dave Pine; Marlene Finley; Warren Slocum
Subject: SF Watershed Opening

Dear honorable Supervisors,

Please include this email as part of the public record.

I would like to express my support for improved public access to the San Francisco Public Utility Commission's Peninsula Watershed. This issue is very important to me and my family. The public has been closed off from the Watershed's scenic, historical and recreational experiences for too long. Please do what you can to help achieve access reform.

I support the resolution (SFBOS file # 160183) to allow responsible access to the SFPUC watershed lands over existing service road such as Fifield-Cahill Ridge, Pilarcitos Road, Whiting Ridge, Old Cañada, and to historical sites for the following reasons:

- Access to the watershed's existing dirt roads would allow hikers, cyclists and equestrians to visit the area's largest and most scenic unused, publicly held open space, integrating National, State and County parklands across the San Francisco Peninsula.
- At this time there are no significant, scientific concerns over water security, fire safety or environmental stewardship. Prior to opening a complete environmental investigation will surface any environmental issues that need to be addressed.
- The "trails", dirt roads actually, are currently used by SFPUC trucks on a daily basis. They could easily be designated as a trail system, much as is done in the Marin County and Santa Clara County Watersheds.
- The Watershed property contains some of the most important historical and cultural heritage sites in the state of California. The public has a right to be able to access these sites.

Please support of Resolution 160183 and for SFPUC to work cooperatively with San Mateo County to improve access to the watershed.

Thank you for your public service.

Jordan Kestler

Pacifica