

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Bibliography and References

1. Association of Bay Area Government (ABAG), *Shaking Hazard Maps for San Mateo County 2007*, available online at <http://www.abag.ca.gov/bayarea/eqmaps/mapsba.html>, accessed on December 2009.
2. Baker, Mark, *Daly City Water and Wastewater Resources, personal communication*, February 22, 2007.
3. Bay Area Water Supply & Conservation Agency (BAWSCA), *Annual Survey, FY 2004-05*, <http://www.bawasca.org/>. Accessed February 16, 2007.
4. Bonilla M.G, *Preliminary Geologic Map of the San Francisco South 7.5' Quadrangle and Part of the Hunters Point 7.5' Quadrangle, San Francisco Bay Area, California: A Digital Database*, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Open File Report 98-354, 1998.
5. Bryant, W. A. (compiler), *Digital Database of Quaternary and Younger Faults from the Fault Activity Map of California, version 2.0*, California Geological Survey Web Page, http://www.consrv.ca.gov/CGS/information/publications/QuaternaryFaults_ver2.htm, accessed December /2009, 2005.
6. California Geologic Survey (CGS), 2000, *Seismic Hazard Zone Report for the City and County of San Francisco*, California, available online at: http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/download/pdf/ozn_sf.pdf accessed March 16, 2010.
7. California Department of Water Resources (DWR), 2006, *California's Groundwater, Bulletin 118, San Francisco Bay Hydrologic Region, Individual Basin Description for Westside Groundwater Basin*. January 2006.
8. California Missions, *San Francisco de Asis: Mission Dolores*. <http://missions.bgmm.com/dolores.htm>. Last Visited November 2009.
9. California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), *San Francisco Bay Region (RWQCB), San Francisco Bay Basin (Region 2) Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan)*, January 18, 2007.

10. California Water Service Company (Calwater), 2007. <http://www.calwater.com>. Accessed February 20, 2007.
11. Camp Dresser & McKee (CDM), *Lake Merced Watershed Survey*, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, San Francisco, California, 1999.
12. Cartier, Robert. Santa Cruz County History: *An Overview of Ohlone Culture*. <http://www.santacruzpl.org/history/articles/248/>. 1991. Last Visited: November 2009.
13. City of Belmont, The. Belmont's History: *Ohlone Indians*. <http://www.belmont.gov/subContent.asp?CatID=240001203>. Last Visited: November, 2009.
14. City of Daly City, City and County of San Francisco. *Vista Grande Canal Watershed Plan, Executive Summary*. March 2006.
15. City and County of San Francisco, Resolution Number: 14-07: *Modifying Provisions of Resolution 10, 435*. Approved: January 18, 2007. <http://www.sfbos.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/bdsupvrs/resolutions07/r0014-07.pdf>. Last Visited: December 2009.
16. City of San Francisco, GIS Data (direct drainage culverts at South and Impound Lakes, catch basin inlets around lake, sewer pipeline network), Geology, <http://www.lmtf.org/FoLM/Data/SFSUReports/geology.htm>
17. City of San Francisco, Planning Department, *Draft Recreation & Open Space Element*, May 2009.
18. Dawdy, David R., *Assessment of Solar Radiation, Lake Evaporation, Higher Rainfall, Water Additions, and Reduced Pumping on Lake Levels at Lake Merced*, 2006. <http://www.lakemerced.org/>. Accessed February 21, 2007.
19. EDAW, Inc. *Initiative to Raise and Maintain Lake Level and Improve Water Quality*, Lake Merced, Task 3 Technical Memorandum, September 2004.
20. EDAW, *Preliminary Draft: Lake Merced Water Level Restoration, Alternatives Analysis Report*, prepared for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, 2007.
21. EIP Associates, *Final Draft Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan*, prepared for San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, February 2006.
22. Friends of Lake Merced, *Annual Lake Level and Rainfall Data from 1951*, <http://www.lakemerced.org> Accessed February 22, 2007.
23. Friends of Lake Merced, *Lake Merced Comprehensive Management Plan, Revised Draft*. April 1998.

24. Fugro West, Inc., *Geotechnical Study for Harding Park Recycled Water Project*, prepared for Carollo Engineers, December 2008.
25. Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy, *Fort Funston*. <http://www.parksconservancy.org/visit/park-sites/fort-funston.html>. Last Visited: November 2009.
26. Hemingway, Heather. *From Peace to Present: A Look at the Ohlone Indians*. <http://www.mchsmuseum.com/ohlonepeace.html>. 1996. Last Visited: November 2009.
27. HOK, San Francisco State University, *Lake Merced Boathouse Visioning Workshop Document*, August 6, 2006.
28. HOK, San Francisco State University, *Public Workshop notes, Lake Merced Boathouse Rehabilitation Project*, September 12, 2006.
29. Holzman, Barbara A., ed. *The Biogeography of Lake Merced*, <http://www.bss.sfsu.edu/holzman/Lakemerced>. Last Updated: January 5, 2005. Last Visited: November 2009.
30. Lake Merced Task Force, *Nature Subcommittee Report*, September 1, 2000.
31. Lake Merced Task Force, *Water Committee Report*, January 10, 2001.
32. Lake Merced Task Force, *Recreation Committee Report*, January 16, 2001.
33. Lake Merced Task Force, *Initial Report & Stewardship Proposal*, June 1, 2001.
34. Lake Merced Task Force, *The State of the Lake*, July 12, 2006.
35. Lake Merced Task Force, web site, <http://www.lmtf.org/>
36. Marcellino, Sara and Jebens, Brandon. Holzman, Barbara, ed. *The Biogeography of Lake Merced: The History of Human Use at Lake Merced*. <http://bss.sfsu.edu/holzman/LakeMerced/landuse.htm>. January 2005. Last Visited: November 2009.
37. MPA Design, *Gap Analysis, Revised Draft*, March 30, 2006.
38. MPA Design, *Lake Merced Trail and Circulation Plan*, September 2006.
39. Luhdorff and Scalmanini, *Hydrogeologic Conditions in the Westside Basin 2005*, November 2006.
40. National Resource and Conservation Service (NRCS), United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Web Soils Survey, available online

at <http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/>, accessed December 2009.

41. Peterson, M.D., Bryant, W.A., Cramer, C.H., *Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Assessment for the State of California*, California Division of Mines and Geology Open-File Report issued jointly with U.S. Geological Survey, CDMG OFR 96-08 and USGS OFR 96-706, 1996.

42. Pilat, Kathleen, *Leaving A Lake Legacy – San Francisco Lakes in Peril*, Urban Resource Systems, San Francisco, California, 2002.

43. RMC Water and Environment, *Vista Grande Watershed Study*, City and County of San Francisco and City of Daly City, 2006.

44. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), *North Westside Groundwater Basin Management Plan – City and County of San Francisco*, 2005.

45. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), *Groundwater Elevations Report, 2006*. http://sfwater.org/detail.cfm/MC_ID/20/MSC_ID/179/MTO_ID/310/C_ID/2143, Accessed February 21, 2007.

46. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), *Lake Merced Watershed, 2007*. http://sfwater.org/mto_main.cfm/MC_ID/20/MSC_ID/179/MTO_ID/310. Accessed February 23, 2007.

47. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), *Sunset Swales Parking Lot Stormwater Retrofit, Project Summary*, 10 May 2007, <http://sfwater.org/Files/Reports/SunsetSwalesProjectSummary5-10-07.pdf>. Accessed July 28, 2009.

48. San Francisco Planning Department, *SFPUC Water System Improvement Program Draft Program EIR*, San Francisco Planning Department File No. 2005.0159E, June 2007.

49. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), *Lake Merced Vegetation Assessment Report*, July 2007.

50. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), 2009, *Lake Merced Watershed*, Available online at: http://sfwater.org/msc_main.cfm/MC_ID/20/MSC_ID/179, Accessed on December 2009.

51. San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), *2002 CWA Section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segment, Region 2*, approved by U.S. EPA, July 2003.

52. Sannadan, Sheila, Luu, Alain, Fassil, Abbey, *Stormwater Constructed Wetland – Restoration of Lake Merced*, San Francisco State University, 2004. Wikipedia, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/San_francisco. Accessed February 20, 2007.

53. Sherwood Design Engineers, *Erosions Analysis Memorandum, Lake*

Merced Watershed Plan, prepared for SFPUC, September 2009.

54. U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), *Summary Distribution of Slides and Earth Flows in the San Francisco Bay Region, California*, GIS database for Open File Report 97 745 Part C, by C. M. Wentworth, S. E. Graham, R. J. Pike, G. S. Beukelman, D. W. Ramsey, and A. D. Barron, 1997.

55. U.S. Census Bureau: State and County QuickFacts. Data derived from Population Estimates and Census of Population and Housing. <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/06075.html>

56. Last Revised: September 4, 2009. List Visited: November 2009.

57. United States Geological Survey (USGS) Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities (WG07), Fact Sheet 2008-3027, *Forecasting California's Earthquakes – What Can We Expect in the Next 30 Years?*, <http://pubs.usgs.gov/fs/2008/3027/fs2008-3027.pdf>, 2008.

58. Westfall, John. San Francisco State University: *An Air-Photo History of the Lake Merced Campus*. 1999.

59. Yates, Eugene B., Hamlin, Scott N., McCann, Lisa Horowitz, Geohydrology, *Water Quality, and Water Budgets of Golden Gate Park and the Lake Merced Area in the Western Part of San Francisco, California*, U.S. Geological Survey, Sacramento, California, 1990.

60. Youd, T.L. and Hoose, S.N., 1978, "Historic Ground Failures in Northern California Triggered by Earthquakes," USGS Professional Paper 993, available online at: http://pubs.usgs.gov/pp/1978/pp0993/pp993_text.pdf, accessed on December 2009.

APPENDIX B

Public Comment on the Draft Lake Merced Watershed Report

The Draft Lake Merced Watershed Report (Draft Report) was posted on the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission website and distributed to stakeholders on May 6, 2010. The public comment period, an opportunity for stakeholders to review and provide comments on the Draft Report began on May 6, 2010 and continued until May 25, 2010. Stakeholders were invited to submit comments in writing to the SFPUC. There were two e-mail addresses provided, as well as the mailing address of the Project Manager. Comments were submitted to both e-mail addresses, and in hard copy through the mail.

An Open House was held on May 12, 2010. The Open House provided members of the public with an opportunity to meet members of the project team, ask questions about the Draft Report, review the document and some highlighted sections in detail and submit written comments. There was no oral presentation nor was oral testimony given.

The Draft Report generated hundreds of comments. Comments came from individual stakeholders, members of clubs and organizations that use portions of the Lake Merced Watershed for recreation, and representatives from Civic and Government agencies, organizations and departments.

Many of the comments expressed support for a particular section or page of the report, such as “page 163” the Land Use Scenario Option that would preserve the Pacific Rod and Gun Club’s use of the land they currently occupy, while others provided comments on the general direction and goals of the report.

A summary of the comments is included in Appendix C.

APPENDIX C

Summary of Public Comments on the Draft Lake Merced Watershed Report

The public comment period for the draft watershed report began on May 6, 2010 and continued until May 25, 2010.

The public comments received during the review period included the following:

- 192 Comments were submitted via e-mail after the Draft report was posted
- 92 comment forms were submitted at the May 12 Open House (duplicate comments from the same person were eliminated)
- 36 comment letters were received, either via US postal service or as attachments to e-mails

The following is a summary of the comments received on the draft report:

- 36 of the comments submitted at the Open House were almost identical – “I support scenario #1 on page 163”.
- 41 of the comments submitted at the Open House expressed support for Scenario #1 on page 163, i.e., keeping the Pacific Rod and Gun Club intact, and typically provided some additional commentary about the value of the Pacific Rod and Gun Club – historical value, recreational value, diversity of users, diversity of programs and events were named most often. These same “values” were repeated in many of the comments submitted via e-mail.
- 13 of the comments submitted at the Open House expressed a preference for other recreational and/or educational opportunities at the current site of the Pacific Rod and Gun Club, including: share the site with other uses, build a nature center, clean up the lead, and shooting is no longer appropriate at this location.
- 7 of the comment letters and 28 of the e-mails were submitted as a form letter from members of the San Francisco Veteran Police Office Association that said “I urge you to accept the Draft Lake Merced Watershed Report with Scenario #1, of page 163”.
- 10 of the comment letters and 58 of the comments submitted via e-mail declared support for “Scenario #1 on page 163” of the Draft Report without reference to membership in a particular organization.

- 8 of the comment letters and 6 of the e-mails were from persons who identified themselves as members of the Pacific Rod and Gun Club. All expressed support for keeping the Club as is.
- 5 comments submitted via e-mail, and letters from organizations including SPUR, the Committee to Save Lake Merced, the Golden Gate Audubon Society, San Francisco Beautiful, the San Francisco Neighborhood Parks Council, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, and Nature in the City all recommended that the Lake Merced Watershed Report be followed up with a plan for ongoing sustainable management of the Lake Merced Watershed. This management could include the expansion of recreational, educational and habitat enhancement opportunities throughout the watershed area. Maximizing public access to the watershed, and preserving parts of the natural areas for maximum habitat value over time were messages contained in many of these comments.
- Several comment letters asked about the “next steps” relating to the long-term management of the Lake Merced Watershed and the subsequent implementation of the Watershed Report’s recommendations, whether that be traffic planning, facility improvements, erosion mitigation, and habitat enhancement.

Other issues that might be considered in the “next steps” category could include:

- Financial planning and sustainable funding for improvements, operations and maintenance of the watershed
- Partnerships between the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and other City Departments, agencies and non-profit organizations – including Memoranda of Understanding to be developed between partners
- Ongoing stakeholder participation in planning for the Lake Merced Watershed
- Water quality monitoring and maintenance.