

**San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Citizens' Advisory Committee
Power Subcommittee**

MEETING MINUTES

**Tuesday, April 14, 2026
5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.
525 Golden Gate Ave., 3rd Floor Tuolumne Conference Room**

Members of the public may observe and participate via Zoom virtual conference software.

Meeting Recording:

https://sfwater.zoom.us/rec/share/615G3OEYI2tmV0V0hHDzWN_vXtnuaAcYgc2rsOpPKAVuF8jdYzdLkGnkVJ5vRGP3.txNC62uSmWzBYspy?startTime=1776212054000

Passcode:
787086

Mission: The Power Subcommittee shall review power generation and transmission system reliability and improvement programs, including but not limited to facilities siting and alternatives energy programs, as well as other relevant plans, programs, and policies ([Admin. Code Article XV, Sections 5.140 - 5.142](#)).

Members

Chair Barklee Sanders (D6)	Cal Law (D1)	Sally Chen (D3)
Lila Holzman (D5)	Julia Alicia Hernandez (D7)	Arthine Cossey van Duyne (B-Environ. Justice)

D = District Supervisor appointed, M = Mayoral appointed, B = Board President appointed

Staff Liaisons: Lexus Moncrease and Lupita Garcia
Staff Email for Public Comment: cac@sflower.org

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Call to order and roll call at 5:32pm

Members Present (4): Sanders, Law, Hernandez, Holzman

Members Absent: (2) Chen, Cossey van Duyne*

Staff/Presenters: Catherine Spaulding

Members of the Public: Douglas Jacuzzi

*Member Cossey van Duyne marked present at 6:00 pm

2. Approve [October 14, 2025](#), Minutes

A motion was made (Sanders) and seconded (Law) to approve October 14, 2025, minutes.

AYES: (4)

NOES: (0)

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

Joshua Arce
President

Stephen E. Leveroni
Vice President

Avni Jamdar
Commissioner

Kate H. Stacy
Commissioner

Meghan Thurlow
Commissioner

Dennis J. Herrera
General Manager



ABSENT: (0) Chen, Cossey van Duyne

Public Comment: None

3. Report from the Chair

- Welcome members, staff, and the public
- Ohlone Tribal Land Acknowledgement
- Welcome new subcommittee members

Public Comment: None

4. Public Comment: Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda (*2 minutes per speaker*)

Public Comment: None

5. Presentation and Discussion: [Streamlined Contracting for Customer Installation of Electric Infrastructure](#), Catherine Spaulding, Deputy Assistant General Manager, Power Planning and Capital Delivery

Presentation:

- Background – Need for electric Infrastructure in response to strong demand & Need for a unified construction process
- Opportunity
- Admin Code Section 99.5
- Proposed Extension of 99.5 Authority
- Proposal is in Public Interest
- From Proposal to Proposed Law
- Thank you
- Some Proposed Ordinance Language

Discussion:

- **Member Law** asked when it comes to construction being done by an outside business, how are they going to have the same requirements as the PUC such as local hire, local contracting, and things like that.

Staff Spaulding responded that further in the presentation she will explain what is being proposed and the vision.

- **Chair Sanders** asked if this administrative code applies to development on Treasure Island.

Staff Spaulding responded that the specific proposal is to expand the existing authority and administrative code section 99.5, which is currently used in our redevelopment areas, including new infrastructure being built on Treasure Island. And this is a similar process in the sense that we are giving customers the ability to construct infrastructure that we would otherwise be required to build as a Utility.

Member Law asked if the city does not have ownership right now under Administrative Code 99.5.

- **Staff Spaulding** responded that in our current redevelopment work the developer has a negotiated agreement with the city, called a development agreement, then infrastructure is built, then it is inspected so that it meets all city requirements, and then through Board of Supervisors action it is transferred over to the City. So, it is, in the redevelopment, portfolio, ultimately.
- **Member Holzman** asked if all our electrical assets are owned by PG&E, how does this process work, where slowly we're having companies help us build infrastructure, then pass the infrastructure on to the city? How does that affect the amount of assets we have versus PG&E.

Staff Spaulding responded that as we make capital investments, we need to be smart about where we're building new infrastructure, because we don't want to build anything that's redundant with PG&E. We're always thinking about making sure that whatever investment we make is going to be profitable and we're going to have customers that need to be connected. The city is in a very unique situation where most distribution is owned by PG&E, but SFPUC Power has distribution as well, and it's growing, and because everybody wants electricity right now, and because Hetch Hetchy Power is clean, reliable, and affordable, we have a lot of customers knocking on our doors, and they want to be served by us, rather than PG&E. And when it's financially feasible and in the interests of our existing ratepayers, to take on new customers, to grow our customer base, we do so.

Member Holzman asked if we have the capabilities to do that.

Staff Spaulding responded yes and further commented that what is being proposed here is a way to deliver that infrastructure more quickly, because there's already construction underway, so it makes sense for us to give that customer the authority to build the infrastructure for us.

- **Chair Sanders** commented that his focus is advocacy for Treasure Island and commented it looks like the same theory of thought can be applied to Treasure Island and asked if Administrative Code 99.5 could be used to help Treasure Island if someone wanted to donate money.

Staff Spaulding responded clarifying if Chair Sanders is referring to the legacy electric grid on Treasure Island.

Chair Sanders responded yes and commented that the infrastructure is 60 years old and is slowly being fixed as it breaks down.

Staff Spaulding responded and clarified that this proposal is about infrastructure that the SFPUC is otherwise obligated to install. It gives the SFPUC the authority to have a customer install it on our behalf. Granted with a lot of conditions and checks being made first. We are obliged to install infrastructure when a customer applies for service, and a cost obligation is negotiated, according to our rules and regulations. So, we take on that customer, and then we make an agreement to serve them but the legacy electrical system on Treasure Island is under Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) control and authority. It serves TIDA customers. Those are not SFPUC retail customers.

- **Staff Spaulding** further commented we believe strongly that this proposal is in the public interest and in the agency interest. It would make us prepared and

commercially ready to act. By streamlining the contracting process as proposed, we will deliver new utility capacity more quickly. We can build a larger customer and rate base sooner, and we can facilitate private sector investment in clean energy electric infrastructure that will help us meet our climate action plan goals and grow municipal and housing needs. The proposed authority would enable infrastructure to be delivered more efficiently and at a lower cost than what the city could otherwise provide due to utilizing construction processes that are already underway. All the while still maintaining all city equity, labor, and local economic participation standards. The Commission also agreed that this proposal was of interest to the public and agency. At the February 23rd meeting they passed a resolution authorizing the General Manager to pursue Board of Supervisors' approval, and just a few weeks ago, legislation was introduced by Board President Mandelman, and we are expecting to have a hearing on this proposed amendment to Section 99.5 within a few weeks, and this could be law shortly after.

- **Member Holzman** asked if that hearing will be held during a Board of Supervisors meeting, or a Land Use and Transportation hearing.

Staff Spaulding responded that it has been assigned to that committee and anticipates that it will be agendaized at an upcoming regular meeting, and there will be a hearing, so there will be a presentation probably like this one, and then, the board members will ask questions, and then there'll be an opportunity for public opinion.

- **Member Holzman** asked about the last slide and proposed ordinance language.

Staff Spaulding responded if you access the legislative file, there's some proposed language that the board president has proposed and pulled some of the language and put it here on the last slide for reference.

- **Member Hernandez** commented from her understanding Cordia owns the Loop right now, so then the request is to give public money for them to update it and then pass it over to us. But when they pass it over to us, we will have to pay them for the land lease and rights or renting of the space and they said the best place for that was on their land and asked is there a way that we can see why that was on their land and not on public land, where we wouldn't have to pay more.

Staff Spaulding responded there are many barriers to building new electrical infrastructure in the city. Time and money are barriers but maybe the biggest of all is just location. It is very hard to find real estate, where you can site electrical infrastructure. So, if you have a substation and it's proximate to the load you're serving, that cuts down the cost and makes it a lot more efficient. So, we are grateful for the opportunity that Cordia is providing land to us so that we can build a substation that can serve them, that could also serve other customers.

Member Hernandez commented having to build the infrastructure up would probably cost us more money.

Staff Spaulding responded there is an economy of scale involved in a construction project that is already underway. As we move forward with Cordia, there will be a series of agreements that go into all the details and we'll have something called a facilities agreement, and we'll be very clear about what we are building, and where it is. And that is yet to be finalized and negotiated, but the idea to put it on their property, adjacent to their other ongoing construction represents economies of scale

in terms of cost and time to build the substation to serve their load and future customers. I think what you're getting at is, are we thinking through the most efficient way to serve the customer and the land opportunity makes the project a lot more efficient in terms of the public money and the cost. All of that is governed and there's nothing new about how who pays for what and when. That is governed by our electric rules which are rules and regulations governing electric service. And generally, we follow, I think it's called cost causation principle, so growth pays for growth. We don't expect our existing ratepayers to foot the bill for new customers. We are careful when we take on large loads because it could be a risk to existing customers. What if you build something, and then the customer changes their mind, or goes out of business, or they say, we want 50 megawatts, but then ultimately, they only want 30 megawatts. Then we've invested all of this in this infrastructure without the associated revenue. So, we are very mindful of that as we structure our agreements to protect the city, to protect our existing ratepayers.

- **Member Holzman** commented this says it'll apply to just a few large-scale projects with unique circumstances and asked if staff can talk a little bit more about who those are and what they are. I know we talked about electrification broadly, and AI data centers, but one concern I do have is that I know we're in San Francisco, and we're very optimistic about AI, but if we do, at some point decide to regulate and stop this boom does it make sense for us to have invested even if we didn't have to put up the upfront cost because of this, we still will be owning and operating something that.

Staff Spaulding responded it doesn't matter if it's AI, or if it's the big housing developer, the risk is always the same if you're an electric utility. You don't want to build something to provide electricity, and then there's no customer who's going to pay the rate, so you recover the cost. We have a long history of structuring and to simplify it we make people pay up front. And then when the electrical load shows up, then we'll give you some money back. That's kind of a simple version of it, but to answer the first part of the question the unique circumstances are there is a vanishingly small number of customers who are doing an infill development and have the ability to construct substations on our behalf, per our specifications. So that's a big customer, that's a very sophisticated customer who has experience doing construction. So, we don't want to give the impression that we're going to be using this authority everywhere. In the Cordia situation, that would be really advantageous to the city, to give them the authority to construct the facilities. And we are talking to other customers, as well, where this could be used.

- **Member Sanders** asked if this would make the public power part of the city have more control over assets versus PG&E because we want to buy assets from PG&E, but this allows a developer to build us an asset, and then we own it, and we can slowly build out public power with it.

Staff Spaulding responded yes, we believe in public power because it is cleaner, more affordable, and more reliable than that other utility that provides service here in San Francisco. That is why customers are approaching us. And this authority basically helps us deliver service more quickly. Ultimately, the concept is simple: somebody is building something, and they need a lot of electricity, and so let them just include the electrical infrastructure as part of that construction project rather than us trying to do a separate contracting process and having, like, a parallel construction project at the same time where you're trying to schedule things, and from an efficiency point of view, to have two kinds of competing construction projects at the same time, it really doesn't make any sense.

- **Member Cossey van Duyne** introduced herself, asked what alternatives to this approach were considered and what the balance of clean energy versus dirty energy is. Is it part of the electrical sourcing? Is it part of these agreements or requirements? And then the third question is how does this bend, break, or augment the vendor relationships and hiring.

Staff Spaulding responded that yes, for procurement, it's the same as the city process. So, all the standards that we enforce in contracting for city-delivered projects would be the same under this proposal, including all city equity, labor, and local economic participation requirements are still met. That would include non-discrimination in contracts, prevailing wages, utilization of local business enterprises, project labor agreements, and local hiring. So, all those same goals that the city has, when it does its own construction contracts, the same standards would still be required. The Hetch Hetchy power portfolio is 100% greenhouse gas free, clean electricity, we don't provide anything else. PG&E, right now utilizes a lot of nuclear power in their portfolio, so their power mix is as clean as it's ever been but that nuclear mix is dependent on the Diablo power plant, and I guess maybe they just extended that. There's a lot of nuclear power in PG&E. I do think that they have a pretty clean energy mix right now, but Hetch Hetchy Power, has always been and will always be 100% clean.

Member Cossey van Duyne asked if Staff could expand upon that and commented because you're talking about multiple customers, and this one particular customer has a history of using clean energy, but you can deploy this rule against any other customer that has capacity to build energy. Are there rules or is there language where it's going to make sure that we're not you know, to ensure that there's enough capacity that they're going to do something that breaks our commitments to our community for clean energy and clean air.

Staff Spaulding responded I think what you might be asking about is generation. So, this isn't about contracting with anybody, or who's going to generate electricity. So, these are just consumers of our electricity. So, they're taking power service from us. They are taking our 100% Clean Electricity Service. So, they're not generating their own electricity.

Member Holzman asked so they wouldn't be getting it from PG&E if they're getting through this.

Staff Spaulding responded no, they're getting served by us, they're not being served by PG&E.

Member Cossey van Duyne commented so what you're talking about is building their own distribution and technology not their generation.

Staff Spaulding responded affirmatively, and that distribution might be transmission level infrastructure as well but no generation.

- **Staff Spaulding** responding to the question, what is the alternative to this proposal, commented that we would need to go through sole source approval. We would still seek to have the customer, if they have the capacity, like Cordia does, to deliver the infrastructure on our behalf, because that's in the best interest of our ratepayers, because it's efficient. And so, we would still try to accomplish that, but we would need

to go through different mechanisms, and it's called sole source, there's different approvals and have to go to the board. It would, it's something we would still pursue, but it would be, there'd be a lot more steps.

- **Member Cossey van Duyne** asked would we still own.

Staff Spaulding responded we would still seek to own and operate the electric infrastructure.

Member Cossey van Duyne commented they're just building it.

Member Hernandez further commented on their land, and we have to pay them.

- **Member Cossey van Duyne** commented I understand, there are non-cash benefits, such as carbon credit that are generated from these kinds of transactions. Who gets to own that.

Staff Spaulding responded there's no carbon credit involved here. We would build the new substation for the customer and serve the customer.

- **Chair Sanders** commented that it seems like this proposal expands the PUC's authority to determine which customers' facilities to buy, like what procurement selections happen and not requiring independent cost verification. Do you get more power from this getting expanded, or do you just get more oversight as a city department.

Staff Spaulding responded that it doesn't affect either of those things. What affected is how infrastructure is delivered and who is doing the contracting.

- **Chair Sanders** asked who has the authority to select the contractor or veto the contractor that's on the project.

Staff Spaulding responded it would be the customer that's delivering the construction project, per our specifications.

- **Chair Sanders** asked using PG&E and example, PG&E could pick a contractor that we don't like, and then we still must, as the city, pay them, even if we don't like it.

Staff Spaulding responded PG&E wouldn't have anything to do with any of these proposed projects. We want to make sure that money is being spent in the public interest, that we're meeting the city's standards in terms of fairness and equity, transparency, and, you know, efficiency. So, the city has requirements that are aimed at getting to those good outcomes, and those are the same processes and standards that would still be applicable here and would be enforced.

- **Member Hernandez** commented do you guys have contract compliance folks that make sure that they're following through with the contract and overseeing prevailing wage and all that stuff.

Staff Spaulding responded similarly to the way that the city performs oversight on construction contracts now. We would seek to have the same mechanisms in place to verify, to make sure that Standards are being met.

- **Member Holzman** asked what risks are thought of with this and what are the unintended consequences that could come about by making this streamlining happen, and could there be an instance where the city gets bullied because they do actually meet all of the requirements.

Staff Spaulding responded that all of us who are responsible for directing and managing public funds are to think about what the risks are, what could go wrong and what we should do now to prevent any missteps or lapses in quality since it is part of the job. So, you're talking more on the construction side and right now, I'm thinking how do we structure relationships with these customers so that they bear the risk. So, we don't have this situation of stranded assets, or what if we go out and procure a lot of clean electricity for them and then we're sitting on all of this procurement, and then we don't have the customers to use it and then pay us rates, so we recoup our costs. We're structuring our thinking so that these larger customers bear the risk and not our existing customer base.

- **Chair Sanders** asked does this exempt Chapter 6 and Chapter 21? To me, it seems like based on the language of it, it exempts public works contracting, competitive bidding, bid bonds, it exempts competitive Solicitation over \$10,000, minimum of 3 quotes and it seems like you're exempting more oversight than asking for more for this process.

Staff Spaulding responded that because this is an authority to purchase facilities constructed by the customer, that means it exempts the city from those sections of the admin code. But we still have standards for competitive bidding that will be enforced on the customer. There are still standards around competitive bidding that the customer is obligated to.

Chair Sanders asked does the customer have the same standards legally and commented when it comes down to it they're not legally required to follow some charter laws, they're legally required to follow, like, private entity laws. I could not upgrade the infrastructure and burn down a city like PG&E, or I could be the one enforcing the law, and if the building burns down. If you're not exempting yourself why write it in to it.

Staff Spaulding responded that's an excellent question and will need to circle back with this group to be specific, because asking what the legal mechanism is that's enforcing a competitive and a solid bidding process if it's not those sections in the admin code.

Chair Sanders responded thank you.

- **Member Hernandez** asked to clarify if the sole procurement process is only for the developers and commented in the case of, Cordia but they would still have to engage in competitive bidding to procure the work being done on the thing, and they still have to uphold whatever is agreed upon in the contract, which is what I assume is all these, like, things are going to be protective measures and policies are going to be placed in that contract, right.

Staff Spaulding responded we will have a series of requirements that the customer must meet. All of the city's requirements about their labor practices and hiring and sole source, will be in our agreement with the customer, and we will utilize the agreements that we've used in our redevelopment portfolio.

Member Hernandez asked if they're still accountable to you.

Staff Spaulding responded absolutely.

- **Member Cossey van Duyne** asked the asset that the customers build on behalf of the PUC, is this something that was already in the capital plan or is it an asset like what is in the capital plan or is this additional.

Staff Spaulding responded it would be on the capital plan, because we need the authority to invest the capital dollars, and this is something that was already in the plan.

Member Cossey van Duyne asked because right now we're just talking about the procurement and the construction phase of it, there's a piece of this puzzle around sitting of the asset that normally would go through a community engagement and environmental justice and impact dance party. If all of that now becomes the jurisdiction or the permission of the customer who's building it part of their plan.

Staff Spaulding responded I'm sorry to interrupt you, but I just want to tell you right now that there's nothing about this proposed authority that changes any city process about our new construction, so it still requires CEQA, it still requires planning department approval, there's nothing that gets around any existing city process.

Member Cossey Van Duyne commented she's stating it clearly so that we can make sure that when we review the notes and the records, that it's clear that we're asking questions on behalf of the communities that we represent, because there's always going to be impact. There's going to be impact just for the moment that that thing gets built, but there's going to be ongoing impact because of what it represents and what it represents for the communities wherever this is located.

Staff Spaulding responded absolutely because it's a really important thing to make clear that there's nothing in this proposal, this new authority, that changes anything about the city's processes and requirements for doing a new development, or doing infill or construction.

- **Chair Sanders** commented the final sentence of Section 9-5 read under this proposal, contracts that the SFPUC enters under this section are exempt from requirements of Chapter 6 and 21 of their Administrative Code. You're not changing anything, but you're exempting two major provisions and asked if this is not a change.

Staff Spaulding responded this is why I wanted to circle back with you, because this gets a little deep into the legalese, but let me do my best to answer that there is an exemption from competitive bidding requirements because it is no longer a public works construction project as defined in Chapter 6 and Chapter 21. So that's why the City Attorney advised to include that language.

Member Holzman commented it sounds like it's about terminology.

Chair Sanders commented it's like legalizing something. You're exempting, you're making it legal. If nothing's changing between those things, and you truly wanted it to

stay the same, you could just say I want these to be requirements of this bid that we're buying, this private asset.

Member Holzman responded I haven't looked at what Chapter 6 or 21 say, but they might talk about a Public Works Project so if they use that language and it's no longer that, then I can see why, legally, it doesn't make sense to be, like referring to that language.

- **Member Cossey van Duynes** commented I think there's some lines of code that we need to learn more about to be more to be more educated on the impacts for our communities on this.
- **Member Holzman** asked if this would apply to just a few large-scale projects, do we have a pipeline already, and are you able to talk about projects that you know will want to use this.

Staff Spaulding responded that we have Cordia, we have another customer that has put in an application and then we have other customers that are speaking with us, but these are early stages.

Member Holzman asked when the hearing will take place, and will be open to public comment so that we can let our constituents know about it.

Staff Spaulding responded affirmatively and commented she appreciates the members' questions and engagements.

Public Comment: None

6. Staff report

No Staff report

Public Comment: None

7.

- IEPR from the CEC
- TI Resolution Report back
- Bayview Power
- Emergency Preparedness
- Power Enterprise Training
- Legislative Update – Federal and State
- Electrification: San Francisco Climate Action Plan
- Municipalization: Interconnection, FERC Order 568, CCSF Purchase Offer
- Electric Rates & Equity
- Power Enterprise Residential & Commercial Power Programs: Heat Pumps, CAP
- California Community Choice Aggregation Residential & Commercial Power Programs
- Redevelopment Projects: Hunter's Point Shipyard & Treasure Island
- Time-of-Use Rates Update
- Reliability: Wildfires and Public Safety Power Shutoffs

Adopted Resolutions for Follow Up

- Resolution Recommending that the SFPUC Commission Reverses its Position on the "Not to Exceed Rates" for CleanPowerSF, Move Forward with this Important Program, and Allow Staff to Move Forward with its Launch [adopted September 16, 2014](#)
- Resolution in Support of SB 612 Electrical Corporations and other Load-Serving Entities [adopted on July 20, 2021](#)
- Resolution in Supporting of the Transition of CleanPowerSF Residential Customers to Time-of-Use Rates [adopted on July 20, 2021](#)

Public Comment: None

- 8. Announcements/Comments** Visit www.sfpuc.gov/cac for confirmation of the next scheduled meeting, agenda, and materials.

Public Comment: None

9. Adjournment at 6:55pm.

For more information concerning the agendas, minutes, and meeting information, please visit sfpuc.gov/cac. For more information concerning the CAC, please contact by email at cac@sfwater.org or by calling (415) 517-8465.

Disability Access

The following services are available on request 48 hours prior to the meeting; except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline shall be 4:00 p.m. of the last business day of the preceding week: For American sign language interpreters or the use of a reader during a meeting, a sound enhancement system, and/or alternative formats of the agenda and minutes, please contact Lexus Moncrease at (415) 517-8465 or our TTY at (415) 554-3488 to make arrangements for the accommodation. Late requests will be honored, if possible.

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. Individuals with chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should call our accessibility hotline at (415) 554-6789.

LANGUAGE ACCESS

Per the Language Access Ordinance (Chapter 91 of the San Francisco Administrative Code), Chinese, Spanish and or Filipino (Tagalog) interpreters will be available upon requests. Meeting Minutes may be translated, if requested, after they have been adopted by the Committee. Assistance in additional languages may be honored whenever possible. To request assistance with these services please contact Lexus Moncrease at (415) 517-8465, or cac@sfwater.org at least 48 hours in advance of the hearing. Late requests will be honored if possible.

語言服務

根據三藩市行政法第91章"語言服務條例", 中文、西班牙語和/或菲律賓語口譯服務在有人提出要求後會提供。翻譯版本的會議記錄可在委員會後要求提供。其他語言協助在可能的情況下也可提供。請於會議前至少48小時致電((415) 517-8465或電郵至[cac@sfwater.org] Lexus Moncrease 提出口譯要求。逾期要求, 在可能狀況下會被考慮。

ACCESO A IDIOMAS

De acuerdo con la Ordenanza de Acceso a Idiomas "Language Access Ordinance" (Capítulo 91 del Código Administrativo de San Francisco "Chapter 91 of the San Francisco Administrative Code") intérpretes de chino, español y/o filipino (tagalo) estarán disponibles de ser requeridos. Los minutos

podrán ser traducidos, de ser requeridos, luego de ser aprobados por la comité. La asistencia en idiomas adicionales se tomará en cuenta siempre que sea posible. Para solicitar asistencia con estos servicios favor comunicarse con Lexus Moncrease al (415) 517-8465, o cac@sfgwater.org por lo menos 48 horas antes de la reunión. Las solicitudes tardías serán consideradas de ser posible.

PAG-ACCESS SA WIKA

Ayon sa Language Access Ordinance (Chapter 91 ng San Francisco Administrative Code), maaaring mag-request ng mga tagapagsalin sa wikang Tsino, Espanyol, at/o Filipino (Tagalog). Kapag hiniling, ang mga kaganapan ng miting ay maaring isalin sa ibang wika matapos ito ay aprobahan ng komite. Maari din magkaroon ng tulong sa ibang wika. Sa mga ganitong uri ng kahilingan, mangyaring tumawag sa Lexus Moncrease at (415) 517-8465, o cac@sfgwater.org sa hindi bababa sa 48 oras bago mag miting. Kung maari, ang mga late na hiling ay posibleng pagbibigyan.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code §2.100] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220 San Francisco, CA 94102, Phone: (415) 252-3100/Fax: (415) 252-3112, Email: ethics.commission@sfgov.org.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, by mail to Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244 San Francisco, CA 94102-4683; by telephone 415-554-7724, by Fax 415-554-7854, or by email: sotf@sfgov.org

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.