

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

MEETING MINUTES

**Tuesday, August 11, 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.

Zoom Recording:

<https://sfwater.zoom.us/rec/share/FBwwl27WOicghiiu3sm4bnQZHXZYHVfOwaXh5K46ZaXeu-5EdXE96L6PIJq6Z2X.VCn51xKOzfdTgUEK>

Meeting Recording Passcode:
333801

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

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Call to order and roll call at 5:31pm

Present (4): Law, Chen, Holzman, Cossey van Duyne

Absent (1): Hernandez

Staff/Presenters: Firas Abu-Sneneh, Hayle Cantiller

Members of the Public: Douglas Jacuzzi, Thomas Lee

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

Joshua Arce
President

2. Approve [June 9, 2026](#) Minutes

Stephen E. Leveroni
Vice President

A motion was made (Chen) and seconded (Cossey van Duyne) to approve the June 9, 2026, meeting minutes.

Avni Jamdar
Commissioner

The minutes were approved without objection.

Kate H. Stacy
Commissioner

Public Comment: None.

Meghan Thurlow
Commissioner

3. Report from the Chair

Dennis J. Herrera
General Manager



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

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:** [CleanPowerSF's 2026 Integrated Resource Plan](#), Firas Abu-Sneneh, Utility Specialist, Regulatory and Legislative Affairs, SFPUC

Presentation:

- CleanPowerSF's 2026 Integrated Resource Plan
- Agenda
- Background
- Brief Overview
- California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Requirements
- IRP within the State Planning Process
- What's changed since our last IRP?
- New CPUC Mandated Demand Forecast is Much Higher
- Policy and Economic Headwinds
- Analysis and Initial Results
- Analyzed 3 Energy Resource Portfolios
- What is Time Coincidence?
- 100% Renewable Portfolio
- Time Coincident by 2030 Portfolio
- Time Coincident by 2035 Portfolio
- Comparison of Portfolios: Energy Generated by Resource Type (Year 2035)
- Cost Comparison of Portfolios
- Approach to Evaluating Portfolios
- Portfolio Evaluation
- Portfolio Ranking
- Thank you

Discussion:

- **Member Holzman** asked if this is what California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) calculated.

Staff Abu-Sneneh responded yes.

- **Member Cossey van Duyne** asked if the demand lines were specifically for San Francisco.

Staff Abu-Sneneh responded yes.

- **Member Holzman** asked if SFPUC owns solar assets.

Staff Abu-Sneneh responded generally SFPUC enters into Power Purchase Agreements (PPA) and we do not own the solar, but we gain the rights to the energy.

Member Holzman asked if SFPUC ends up procuring more than is needed.

Staff Abu-Sneneh responded to make sure you have supply to meet demand 90% of the time, you need to buy more wind and solar energy than you need to meet the demand when there is not enough supply like during the early mornings or winter when there is not much solar energy.

- **Member Holzman** asked for the other two scenarios, how it was decided to evaluate them.

Staff Abu-Sneneh responded the last time; they adopted 90% time coincident case and this time they went for 100% renewable.

Member Holzman asked if the last time this was done, did 90% time coincidence score better.

Staff Abu-Sneneh responded yes.

- **Member Holzman** asked whether SFPUC look at 90% time coincidence with actual demand.

Staff Abu-Sneneh responded yes, and we would be over procured and exposing to a lot of financial costs.

- **Member Cossey van Duyne** asked if these models were controlled by the CPUC.

Staff Abu-Sneneh responded no, SFPUC works with a consultant to evaluate.

- **Chair Law** asked if the 100% renewable portfolio will meet the goal.

Staff Abu-Sneneh responded yes.

- **Member Cossey van Duyne** asked what SFPUC does with the surplus of energy.

Staff Abu-Sneneh responded SFPUC manages it and at times may go back to the market to sell it to attempt to get revenue back. There may be times where it's not able to do to surplus of solar power in the market.

Member Cossey van Duyne asked if this is reflected in the 100% renewable portfolio.

Staff Abu-Sneneh responded in slide 16, there is line that is "net present value (NPV)" and accounts for all energy sales and renewable credits minus the cost of entering the contracts.

- **Member Cossey van Duyne** asked if the fleet of renewable energy California-based.

Staff Abu-Sneneh responded it is mostly California based but the wind is from New Mexico and geothermal is from Nevada.

- **Member Holzman** asked in practice is the 100% renewable not that different that the 90% time coincidence.

Staff Abu-Sneneh responded yes if SFPUC is correct in the calculations.

- **Member Holzman** commented she believes SFPUC is more correct than CPUC and asked how much of a bummer is it CPUC's data is spitting out other scenarios are "no-goes" and are not actively pursuing when in reality it may be a better option.

Staff Abu-Sneneh responded this is something they have always advocated for at the CPUC and mentioned in the Integrated Resource Plan (IRP). They let them know they get San Francisco demand wrong.

- **Member Holzman** asked CPUC was agnostic on the portfolio SFPUC decided on.

Staff Abu-Sneneh responded that all these portfolios meet the requirements.

- **Member Cossey van Duyne** asked given that this is material to the rate payer, is there a published cost analysis done comparing CPUC's model and what SFPUC actually procures.

Staff Abu-Sneneh responded for the cost of the energy in the different portfolios is present but there was no analysis done on the rates. There was an analysis on whether SFPUC's forecast was true and while the numbers are not present, the information is in slide 20.

Member Cossey van Duyne asked which would be more expensive: SFPUC or CPUC?

Staff Abu-Sneneh responded SFPUC because essentially you have a lot of power supply, but the demand is low so cost per megawatt hour is higher if the forecast is true.

Member Cossey van Duyne commented this is presented as a given and asked what is the alternative that is not going to greatly impact the rate payer.

Staff Abu-Sneneh responded 100% renewable is similar to our 10-year financial plan. We are always thinking of how to meet our mandated requirements that will have the lowest impact on the rate payer.

Public Comment:

- **Doug Jacuzzi** commented he appreciated the in-depth presentation and the slides were excellent.
- **Thomas Lee** commented noticed in the slides it was discussed incorporating distributed resources and trying to procure locally and asked how this plays into this.

Staff Abu-Sneneh responded the distributed energy resources; the assumptions are incorporated by the CPUC and SFPUC does not have the ability to modify this. We incorporated local resources that we are planning to invest in, and this was part of the analysis. In terms of which long-term utility scale projects, we did not model those differently. In the procurement side, we score projects from the 9 Bay Area counties higher than others, so we give them preference in our procurement.

Thomas Lee asked is procuring distributed energy from within the city incorporated in any of the scenarios.

Staff Abu-Sneneh responded that the in-city projects were considered among all three scenarios.

6. Staff report

- Full CAC meeting on Tuesday, August 18, where Communications will be presenting and members will be discussing and voting on the proposed Rules of Order changes.

Public Comment: None.

7. Future Agenda Items and Resolutions

Adopted Resolutions for Follow Up

- Resolution Regarding Emergency Authorizations and Power Outages on Treasure Island [adopted on February 20, 2024](#)
- 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](#)
- 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](#)

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 6:27 pm

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@sfgov.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@sfgov.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@sfgov.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@sfgov.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.