

1 Introduction

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

1.1 Introduction

The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF), through the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), owns and operates a regional water system that extends from the Sierra Nevada to San Francisco and serves 2.4 million people in San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Alameda, and Tuolumne Counties. The SFPUC proposes to adopt and implement the Water System Improvement Program (WSIP or proposed program) to increase the reliability of the regional system with respect to water quality, seismic response, water delivery, and water supply to meet water delivery needs in the service area through the year 2030. The WSIP would implement the SFPUC's service goals and system performance objectives for the regional system. These goals and objectives provide the basis for the facility improvement projects included in the WSIP and for the proposed water supply option to meet water delivery needs through 2030.

1.2 Purpose of the Program EIR

The San Francisco Planning Department, Major Environmental Analysis (MEA) Division, determined that implementation of the WSIP could have a significant effect on the environment and therefore required preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The Planning Department prepared this Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) to provide the public and responsible and trustee agencies with information about the potentially significant environmental effects of the proposed program, to identify possible ways to minimize the potentially significant effects, and to describe and evaluate feasible alternatives to the proposed program.

This PEIR has been prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970 (as amended), codified in California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq., and the CEQA Guidelines, codified in the California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3. This document has been prepared as a program EIR. According to the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15168(a), a program EIR is one type of environmental review document that may be used to evaluate a plan or program that has multiple components (projects and actions) or to address a series of actions that are related:

- Geographically
- As logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions

- In connection with the issuance of rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program, or
- As individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects that can be mitigated in similar ways

The proposed WSIP includes multiple projects and actions that cover a broad geographic scale. This PEIR provides a foundation for any necessary future environmental review documents that focus on individual projects of the WSIP. A program EIR can provide the following additional advantages (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15168[b]):

- Provide for a more exhaustive consideration of effects and alternatives than would be practical in an EIR on an individual action
- Ensure consideration of cumulative impacts that might not be evident in a case-by-case or project-by-project analysis
- Avoid duplicative consideration of basic policy issues
- Allow the lead agency to consider broad policy alternatives and program-wide mitigation measures early in the process when the agency has greater flexibility to deal with basic problems of cumulative impacts
- Allow a reduction in paperwork

A program EIR may be prepared on a plan or program before the details of every project included in the program have been developed, as is the case for the WSIP. Therefore, this PEIR addresses the environmental effects of the program as a whole. The analyses focus on the environmental effects of implementing the overall WSIP as a plan to improve and expand the ability of the regional water system to deliver water to the SFPUC service area through the year 2030 and increase the overall reliability of the system. To accomplish this, the PEIR includes a combination of *program-level* and *project-level* analyses.

This PEIR evaluates the major environmental effects of implementing proposed facility improvement projects from a broad perspective; this evaluation is a *program-level* analysis. While the SFPUC is aggressively developing the design, construction, and operation details of the projects included in the WSIP, these project details are not the focus of this PEIR. Instead, the PEIR frames the nature and magnitude of the expected environmental impacts associated with these proposed WSIP projects and identifies program mitigation measures to reduce the impacts of the projects as proposed. As discussed further below, more detailed *project-level* analysis of individual facility improvement projects will be conducted separately as required by CEQA.

In addition to the program-level analysis of proposed facility improvements, this PEIR also includes a *project-level* impact analysis of implementing the proposed WSIP water supply option through the 2030. The chief environmental issues evaluated in the PEIR at a *project-level* include:

- The effects of providing additional water to serve increasing purchase requests within the service area (specifically, the effect of increasing average annual water supply to serve customer needs through 2030)
- The effects of using the proposed sources of water to serve the increasing purchase requests through 2030 during both nondrought and drought periods
- The effects of proposed changes in system operations associated with implementing the proposed facility improvements and achieving the WSIP system performance objectives

For these water supply and system operations impacts, the PEIR also identifies mitigation measures when appropriate to address significant effects. This project-level analysis is intended to address these issues without the need for additional environmental review.

This PEIR can be used to simplify the task of preparing project-specific environmental review documents that evaluate the effects of implementing the individual WSIP facility improvement projects at a more detailed, *project-level* of analysis. As required by CEQA and where necessary, project-level CEQA review will be conducted separately for individual facility improvement projects proposed under the WSIP. The separate environmental review of individual projects will evaluate site-specific impacts and incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the PEIR as appropriate (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15168[c]). In addition, this PEIR can be incorporated by reference into project-level CEQA analyses to deal with water supply effects, regional influences, secondary effects of growth, and other factors that apply to the program as a whole (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15168[d]).

1.3 CEQA Process

1.3.1 Notice of Preparation

In accordance with Sections 15063 and 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the San Francisco Planning Department, as lead agency, prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR and conducted scoping meetings (see **Appendix A**). The NOP was circulated to local, state, and federal agencies and to other interested parties on September 6, 2005, initiating a public comment period that extended through October 24, 2005. An Initial Study was not prepared because the lead agency decided in advance that a PEIR would be required for this program.

As indicated in the NOP, the PEIR addresses the full range of environmental impacts of the WSIP. The NOP included a preliminary list of the potential environmental impacts related to the following resource topics: surface water resources; groundwater resources; fisheries and aquatic resources; terrestrial vegetation and wildlife; geology, soils, and seismicity; cultural resources; land use, plans, and policies; recreation; agricultural resources; traffic, transportation, and circulation; air quality; noise and vibration; public services, utilities, and energy; hazards and public safety; visual quality; socioeconomics; growth-inducement potential and secondary effects of growth; and cumulative effects. The NOP provided a general description of the

proposed action, the need for the program and program benefits, the proposed facilities, and the program location.

1.3.2 Public Scoping Meetings

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15083, the San Francisco Planning Department held five public scoping meetings as follows:

- Wednesday, October 5, 2005 – Sonora Opera House, Sonora, CA
- Thursday, October 6, 2005 – Thomas Downey High School Cafeteria, Modesto, CA
- Tuesday, October 11, 2005 – Fremont Main Library, Fremont, CA
- Tuesday, October 18, 2005 – Palo Alto Arts Center, Palo Alto, CA
- Wednesday, October 19, 2005 – Tenderloin Community School, San Francisco, CA

Public notices were placed in local newspapers informing the general public of the scoping meetings. The purpose of the meetings was to present the proposed WSIP to the public and receive public input regarding the proposed scope of the PEIR analysis. Attendees were provided an opportunity to voice comments or concerns regarding potential effects of the program.

A scoping report was prepared to summarize the public scoping process and the comments received in response to the NOP, and the report is included in Appendix A of this PEIR. Based on sign-in sheets at each of the meetings, 260 participants attended the scoping meetings, with 75 of those participants providing oral comments. Transcripts of the each scoping meeting are included in the scoping report.

The San Francisco Planning Department held a scoping meeting for resource agencies on Thursday, November 3, 2005 in San Francisco. Representatives from the following agencies attended: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Fish and Game, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Representatives of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the National Marine Fisheries Service were invited but were unable to attend. Additional coordination with public agencies was provided through informal consultation and telephone interviews conducted throughout the PEIR process.

1.3.3 Public and Agency Comments on the NOP

The comment period on the NOP extended from September 6 through October 24, 2005. In response to the NOP, comments were received by letter sent via mail, email, or fax (104, including 5 form letters counted once each but submitted multiple times), orally by speakers at the scoping meetings (79), and by phone (187 voicemail messages left with the San Francisco Planning Department). The comments addressed concerns regarding the full range of potential environmental issues as well as program alternatives and the CEQA process. As described in the previous section, a scoping report was prepared to compile and summarize comments received on the NOP and is included in Appendix A.

1.3.4 PEIR – Impact Determination

This document constitutes the PEIR. It describes the WSIP and the environmental setting for the proposed program, identifies potential impacts, presents mitigation measures for impacts found to be significant or potentially significant, and evaluates program alternatives. It also includes an analysis of three variants to the proposed WSIP, as requested by the SFPUC.

The analysis of environmental impacts in this PEIR is divided into three main groups: (1) construction and operational impact of the WSIP facility improvement projects are analyzed in Chapter 4; (2) water supply and system operational impacts of the WSIP are analyzed in Chapter 5; and (3) growth-inducing impacts Chapter 7. In assessing construction and operational impacts of the facility improvement projects, Chapter 4 considers impacts of individual projects, the “collective” construction and operational impacts from multiple WSIP facility improvement projects, and cumulative impacts associated with construction and operation of WSIP projects in combination with other past, present, and future actions with potential for similar impacts on the same resources as those affected by the WSIP. Similarly, in assessing water supply and system operations impacts, Chapter 5 includes analysis of cumulative impacts associated with the WSIP water supply and system operations in combination with other past, present, and future actions with potential for impacts on the same resources as those affected by the WSIP.

Each environmental issue presented in this PEIR is analyzed with respect to significance criteria that are based on MEA guidance regarding the environmental effects to be considered significant. MEA guidance is, in turn, based on CEQA Guidelines Appendix G with some modifications. In cases where potential environmental issues associated with the WSIP are identified but are not clearly addressed by MEA’s standard Initial Study checklist, additional impact significance criteria are presented. Appendix B of this PEIR presents the MEA Initial Study checklist as applied to the WSIP, and indicates the criteria applicable to the WSIP and discussed in the PEIR.

For the impact analyses, the following categories are used to describe impact significance:

Not Applicable (N/A). An impact is considered not applicable if there is no potential for impacts or if the environmental resource does not occur within the study area or the area of potential effect.

Beneficial (B). An impact is considered beneficial if it is determined that WSIP water supply or system operations would improve an environmental resource or result in a beneficial effect on the environment.

Less than Significant (LS). This determination applies if there is a potential for some limited impact, but not a substantial adverse effect that qualifies under the significance criteria as a significant impact. LS impacts do not require mitigation.

Less than Significant with Program-Level Mitigation (LSM). This determination applies to the collective impact analysis and is used only in Chapter 4. It indicates a potential for some limited impact after implementation of program-level mitigation measures, but not a substantial adverse effect that qualifies under the significance criteria

as a significant impact. LSM impacts for a collective impact do not require additional mitigation beyond program-level mitigation (see Chapter 4 for further explanation).

Potentially Significant, Mitigatable (PSM) / Significant Mitigable (SM). This determination applies if there is the potential for a substantial adverse effect that meets the significance criteria, but mitigation is available to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. In Chapter 4, an impact is labeled “potentially” significant when there is not enough site-specific information at the program level of analysis to determine definitively that it is significant; separate, project-level CEQA evaluation of the WSIP projects could confirm that the impact is significant for that project or document that the impact is less than significant. In Chapter 5, an impact is labeled “potentially” significant in the cases where the analysis cannot conclusively determine the extent of adverse effects and the PEIR errs on the conservative side.

The impacts identified as “potentially significant” are treated as significant impacts in this PEIR. In both Chapters 4 and 5, “significant, mitigatable” applies if there is certainty that a substantial adverse effect that meets the significance criteria would occur, but implementation of mitigation measures would reduce the impact to less than significant. For both PSM and SM impacts, mitigation would reduce or lessen the severity of the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Potentially Significant, Unavoidable (PSU). This determination applies if there is a potential for a substantial adverse effect that meets the significance criteria but for which there appears to be no feasible mitigation available to reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation might be available to lessen the severity of the impact, but the residual effect remains significant and therefore unavoidable. The impacts identified as potentially significant are treated as significant impacts in this PEIR.

In Chapter 4, an impact is labeled “potentially” significant and unavoidable when there is not enough site-specific information at the program level of analysis to determine definitively that the impact is significant or that recommended mitigation could sufficiently reduce the severity of the impact; in these cases, the PEIR errs on the conservative side and applies this determination. However, project-level CEQA evaluation could confirm that the impact is in fact significant and unavoidable for a specific WSIP project or could provide additional detail to determine the impact is significant but can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

In Chapter 5, an impact is labeled “potentially” significant and unavoidable when the mitigation measure could lessen the effect of the impact, but it is not certain that if it could reduce the impact to less than significant.

In both Chapter 4 and 5, this determination is also applied if the feasibility of the mitigation is contingent on review and approval by other jurisdictional agencies (i.e., mitigation feasibility is outside SFPUC control). For PSU impacts, mitigation would be required to the extent feasible even if the severity of the impact with mitigation would not be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Significant Unavoidable (SU). This determination applies if there is certainty for a substantial adverse effect that meets the significance criteria but for which there appears to be no feasible mitigation available to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. The word “potentially” is not used for impacts where it can be determined during this PEIR process that: (1) the impact would occur and (2) the impact could not be mitigated

to a less-than-significant level. For SU impacts, mitigation would be required to the extent feasible even if the severity of the impact with mitigation would not be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

1.3.5 PEIR—Documents Incorporated by Reference

The following documents are incorporated by reference in this PEIR. See Section 1.3.6 for locations where these documents were available for review during the public review period.

- City of Belmont, *San Juan Hills Area Plan Environmental Impact Report*, State Clearinghouse #86122320, adopted March 22, 1988.
- City of Belmont, *Western Hills Area Plan Environmental Impact Report*, State Clearinghouse #89051615, adopted June 12, 1990.
- City of Brisbane, *City of Brisbane 1993 General Plan Environmental Impact Report, Volume I: Environmental Setting* (1993) and *Volume II: Draft EIR*, State Clearinghouse #93071072, January, 1994a.
- City of Brisbane, Resolution No. 94-23: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Brisbane, State of California, Making Certain Findings Regarding the Environmental Impact Report for the 1994 General Plan and Adopting a Mitigation Monitoring Program, June 1994b.
- City of East Palo Alto, *General Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report*, State Clearinghouse #98051028, November 23, 1999a.
- City of East Palo Alto, Final Environmental Impact Report CEQA Findings: City of East Palo Alto General Plan Final Program EIR, November 23, 1999b.
- City of Foster City, *Final Environmental Impact Report on the General Plan Revision for the City of Foster City*, State Clearinghouse #92073017, April 1993.
- City of Fremont, *Fremont 1990 General Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report*, State Clearinghouse #90030675, March, 1991a.
- City of Fremont, Resolution No. 8080: Resolution of the City of Fremont Adopting an Updated General Plan, Certifying a Project EIR, and Adopting Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations, May 7, 1991b.
- City of Hayward, *General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*, State Clearinghouse #2001072069, January 2002a.
- City of Hayward, City of Hayward Resolution 02-025 Certifying the Program Environmental Impact Report and Adopting the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, Statement of Overriding Considerations and General Plan, March, 12, 2002b.
- City of Menlo Park, *Final Environmental Impact Report: Amendments to the City of Menlo Park General Plan and to the City of Menlo Park Zoning Ordinance including Policy Document, Background Report, and Land Use and Circulation Elements*, State

Clearinghouse #890 124 20, October 19, 1994 (includes November 15, 1994 Findings for Project and Final EIR).

- City of Millbrae, *Final Environmental Impact Report for the City of Millbrae General Plan Revision*, State Clearinghouse #98041090, October 1998a.
- City of Millbrae, *Draft Finalized with Addition of Comments and Responses as Adopted by City Council November 24, 1998: Millbrae Station Area Specific Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report*, State Clearinghouse #98041091, 1998b.
- City of Milpitas, *Draft Environmental Impact Report (October 2001) and Final Environmental Impact Report for the Midtown Milpitas Specific Plan*, State Clearinghouse #2000092027, January 2002a.
- City of Milpitas, Resolution No. 7150: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Milpitas Certifying an Environmental Impact Report for the Milpitas Midtown General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan Project and Adopting Related Mitigation Findings, Findings Regarding Alternatives, A Statement of Overriding Considerations and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, March 19, 2002b.
- City of Mountain View, *Final Environmental Impact Report: City of Mountain View 1992-2005 General Plan*, State Clearinghouse #91083044, November 1992a.
- City of Mountain View, Resolution 15481 series 1992, A Resolution Certifying the Final EIR for the 1992 General Plan, Adopting the 1992 General Plan Land Use Map and Adopting the City of Mountain View 1992-2005 General Plan, October 29, 1992b.
- City of Newark, *General Plan Update Project 2007 Draft Environmental Impact Report (March 1992) and Final Environmental Impact Report*, State Clearinghouse #91093071, June 1992a.
- City of Newark, Resolution No. 1241: Resolution Recommending to the City Council Approval and Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Newark General Plan Update, Including a Statement of Overriding Considerations and Mitigation Monitoring Program, passed May 26, 1992b.
- City of Palo Alto, *City of Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report (December 1996) and Final Environmental Impact Report (September 1997)*, State Clearinghouse #96052043, certified July 1998a.
- City of Palo Alto, Resolution 7780 Certifying the Adequacy of the 1998-2010 Comprehensive Plan Final EIR and Making Findings Thereon Pursuant to the CEQA and Adopting the 1998-2010 City of Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan and Land Use and Circulation Map, July 20, 1998b.
- City of Redwood City, *Downtown Precise Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (October 2006) and Final Environmental Impact Report*, State Clearinghouse #2006052027 certified March 2007a.
- City of Redwood City, Resolution No. 14769: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Redwood City Making Certain Findings Concerning Mitigation Measures,

Adopting a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, Making Findings Concerning Alternatives, and Adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations in Accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act for the Redwood City Downtown Precise Plan, adopted March 26, 2007b.

- City of Redwood City, Ordinance No. 2308: An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Redwood City Adopting the Redwood City Downtown Precise Plan and the Moderate Intensity Alternative as the Most Appropriate Maximum Alternative Development Limitation for the Downtown Precise Plan, approved April 24, 2007c.
- City of San Bruno, *City of San Bruno 1984 General Plan and Environmental Impact Report*, adopted June 25, 1984a.
- City of San Bruno, Resolution No. 1984-37 A Resolution of the City Council of the City of San Bruno Adopting a Modification to the General Plan of the City Including the Following Elements: Noise, Seismic Safety/Safety, Housing, Open Space, Conservation, Scenic Corridors, Circulation, and Land Use, and the Certification of an Environmental Impact Report Pertinent Thereto, June 25, 1984b.
- City of San Jose, *San Jose 2020 General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*, State Clearinghouse #94023031, 1994.
- City of San Mateo, Final Environmental Impact Report: Proposed General Plan Revisions, State Clearinghouse #89100308, June 1990a.
- City of San Mateo, Resolution #77 (1990) Certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report Pertaining to the General Plan Revision, and Adopting the Revised City of San Mateo General Plan, July 16, 1990b.
- City of Santa Clara, Resolution No. 5728: A Resolution and Related Findings Certifying a Final Environmental Impact Report and Directing the Filing of a Notice of Determination, General Plan Amendment #32, State Clearinghouse #8908017, July 1992.
- City of Union City, *Draft Environmental Impact Report* (September 2001) and *Final Environmental Impact Report for the City of Union City General Plan Update*, State Clearinghouse #2000112009, January 2002a.
- City of Union City, Resolution 2109-02 A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Union City Adopting the 2002 General Plan Update Making Mitigations and Alternatives Finding and Adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations and Adopting a Mitigation Monitoring Plan, February 12, 2002b.
- County of San Mateo, San Mateo County, Board of Supervisors Resolution 48639 Adopting Findings Pursuant to Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report for the San Mateo County General Plan, State Clearinghouse #84042404, November 18, 1986.
- County of Santa Clara, *Santa Clara County General Plan Draft Environmental Report* (September 1994) and *Final Environmental Impact Report Addendum*, State Clearinghouse #94023004, November 1994a.
- County of Santa Clara, Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Clara Recommending Certification of Final Impact Report, Adopting Related Overriding

Considerations and Monitoring Program, and Adoption of the County General Plan, December 20, 1994b.

- County of Santa Clara, *2000 Stanford University Draft Community Plan and General Use Permit Application Final Environmental Impact Report*, State Clearinghouse #1999112107, December 2000a.
- County of Santa Clara, Resolution of the Board of Supervisors or the County of Santa Clara Certifying the Environmental Impact Report, Making Related Findings, and Adopting a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Stanford University Community Plan and 2000 General Use Permit, December 12, 2000b.

1.3.6 Draft PEIR—Public Review

The Draft PEIR was circulated to local, state, and federal agencies and to interested organizations and individuals to allow them to review and comment on the report. Publication of this Draft PEIR marked the beginning of a 108-day public review period, which extended from June 29, 2007 to October 15, 2007 and during which written comments were directed to the following address:

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

Or by email to: wsip.peir.comments@gmail.com

Copies of the Draft PEIR and related key documents, as well as documents incorporated by reference, were available for review at the following public locations in the seven counties affected by construction and/or operation of the WSIP:

- San Francisco County: San Francisco Planning Department
1660 Mission Street, 1st Floor
Planning Information Counter
San Francisco, CA

San Francisco Main Library
100 Larkin Street
San Francisco, CA

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
1145 Market Street, 1st Floor
San Francisco, CA
- San Mateo County: City of San Mateo Main Library
55 West 3rd Avenue
San Mateo, CA
- Santa Clara County: Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Library
150 E. San Fernando
San Jose, CA

- Alameda County: Alameda County/City of Fremont Library
2400 Stevenson Blvd.
Fremont, CA
- San Joaquin County: Stockton-San Joaquin County Public Library
605 N. El Dorado Street
Stockton, CA
- Stanislaus County: Modesto Library
1500 I Street
Modesto, CA
- Tuolumne County: Tuolumne County Library
480 Greenley Road
Sonora, CA

The PEIR can also be accessed through the internet at: www.sfgov.org/site/planning/mea.

Public Hearings

Public comments on the Draft PEIR were accepted from June 29, 2007 to October 15, 2007. Public hearings on the Draft PEIR to accept written or oral comments were scheduled and held as follows:

- Sonora, CA: Sonora Opera House
250 S. Washington St.
Sonora, CA

September 5, 2007, 6:30 pm
- Modesto, CA: Thomas Downey High School Cafeteria
1000 Coffee Road
Modesto, CA

September 6, 2007, 6:30 pm
- Fremont, CA: Fremont Main Library, Fukaya Room
2400 Stevenson Blvd
Fremont, CA

September 18, 2007, 6:30 pm
- Palo Alto, CA: Avenidas Senior Center
450 Bryant Street
Palo Alto, CA

September 19, 2007, 6:30 pm
- San Francisco, CA: San Francisco Planning Commission
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carleton B. Goodlet Place
Commission Chambers, Room 400

September 20, 2007, 1:30 pm

- San Francisco, CA: San Francisco Planning Commission
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carleton B. Goodlet Place
Commission Chambers, Room 400

October 11, 2007, 3:30 pm

1.3.7 Comments and Responses Document and Final Program EIR

Written and oral comments received in response to the Draft PEIR were addressed in the Comments and Responses document. The Comments and Responses document was released for public review on September 30, 2008. The Draft PEIR and the Comments and Responses document together constitute the Final PEIR. On October 30, 2008, the Final PEIR was certified by the San Francisco Planning Commission, and the program was subsequently approved and adopted by the SFPUC.

CEQA requires the adoption of findings prior to approval of a project where a certified EIR identifies significant environmental effects (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15091 and 15092). As part of the WSIP approval process on October 30, 2008, the SFPUC adopted the CEQA Findings, which describe the findings of fact and decisions regarding mitigation measures and alternatives, and provides a statement of overriding considerations for significant impacts identified by the PEIR that cannot be mitigated to less-than-significant levels (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15093[b]).

1.3.8 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting

At the time of project approval, CEQA requires lead agencies to “adopt a reporting and mitigation monitoring program for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment” (CEQA, Section 21081.6; CEQA Guidelines, Section 15097). The mitigation measures identified and presented in this PEIR form the basis of the WSIP Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). All measures adopted by the SFPUC as conditions for approval of the program were included in the WSIP MMRP to ensure compliance. The SFPUC adopted the WSIP MMRP as part of the CEQA Findings. Project-level CEQA review for individual WSIP facility improvement projects will include mitigation measures adopted under the PEIR as appropriate based on project-specific analyses.

[Additional discussion of the CEQA process for the PEIR is provided in the Comments and Responses document. Please refer to Section 11.2, Environmental Review Process (Vol. 7, Chapter 11).]