



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

MEETING AGENDA

**Tuesday, February 15, 2022
5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.**

PARTICIPATE VIA ZOOM VIRTUAL CONFERENCE SOFTWARE

Meeting URL

<https://sfwater.zoom.us/j/84224716608?pwd=a2xXWllUR2tGaUtnU2xtUVFhWTNHQT09>

Phone Dial-in

669.219.2599

Find your local number: <https://sfwater.zoom.us/j/kvjAQ987Q>

Meeting ID/Passcode

842 2471 6608 / 666849

This meeting is being held by Teleconference Pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order N-29-20 and the Sixteenth Supplement to Mayoral Proclamation Declaring the Existence of a Local Emergency Dated February 25,2020

During the Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) emergency, the San Francisco Public Utilities Citizens Advisory Committee's (SFPUC CAC) regular meeting room, 525 Golden Gate Ave., 3rd Floor Tuolumne Conference Room, is closed. CAC Members and SFPUC staff will convene CAC meetings remotely by teleconference. Members of the public are encouraged to submit their public comment on agenda items in advance of the teleconference meeting by emailing comments to cac@sfwater.org. Comments submitted no later than 12 PM Tuesday the day of the meeting will be read into the record by SFPUC CAC Staffing Team members during the teleconference meeting and will be treated as a substitute to providing public comment during the meeting. Persons who submit written public comment in advance on an agenda item or items will not be permitted to also provide public comment on the same agenda item(s) during the meeting.

Mission: The purpose of the SFPUC CAC is to provide recommendations to the SFPUC General Manager, the SFPUC Commission, and the Board of Supervisors regarding the agency's long-term strategic, financial, and capital improvement plans ([Admin. Code Article XV, Sections 5.140 - 5.142](#))

Members:

Moisés García, Chair (D9)

Marría Evbuoma (D1)

Suki Kott (D2)

Steven Kight (D3)

Douglas Jacuzzi (D4)

Emily Algire (D5)

Barklee Sanders (D6)

Joshua Ochoa (D7)

Amy Nagengast (D8)

Anietie Ekanem (D10)

Jennifer Clary (D11)

Maika Pinkston (M-Environmental Org.)

Nicole Sandkulla (M-Regional Water Customers)

Marisa Williams (M-Engineering/Financial)

Eliahu Perszyk (M-Large Water User)

VACANT (B-Small Business)

Michelle Pierce (B-Environ. Justice)

London N. Breed
Mayor

Anson Moran
President

Newsha Ajami
Vice President

Sophie Maxwell
Commissioner

Tim Paulson
Commissioner

Dennis J. Herrera
General Manager

OUR MISSION: To provide our customers with high-quality, efficient and reliable water, power and sewer services in a manner that values environmental and community interests and sustains the resources entrusted to our care.



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

Staff Liaisons: Mayara Ruski Augusto Sa and Jobanjot Aulakh
Staff Email for Public Comment: cac@sfwater.org

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Call to order and roll call at 5:33 pm

Members present at roll call: (11) García, Evbuoma, Kott, Jacuzzi, Algire, Sanders, Nagengast**, Ekanem, Clary, Perszyk, and Pierce

Members Absent: (5) Kight, Ochoa*, Pinkston, Sandkulla, and Williams

Staff presenters: Michael Hyams, Kiara Hermann, and Jackie Randazzo

Members of the Public: None

*Member Ochoa joined at 5:55 pm. Quorum maintained.

**Member Nagengast left at 6:55 pm. Quorum maintained.

2. Approve [January 18, 2022](#) Minutes

Motion was made (Kott) and seconded (Clary) to approve the January 18, 2022 Minutes.

AYES: (11) García, Evbuoma, Kott, Jacuzzi, Algire, Sanders, Nagengast, Ekanem, Clary, Perszyk, and Pierce

NOES: (0)

ABSENT: (5) Kight, Ochoa, Pinkston, Sandkulla, and Williams

Public Comment: None

3. Report from the Chair

- Welcome members, staff, and the public
- Ohlone Tribal Land Acknowledgement - [SF Public Library Acknowledgment](#)
- Welcome and introduction of new member District 4 representative Douglas Jacuzzi
- Appreciation for District 10 representative Anietie Ekanem

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

Public Comment: None

5. **Discussion and Possible Action:** [Resolution Making Findings to Allow Teleconferenced Meetings Under California Government Code Section 54953\(e\)](#)

Motion was made (Clary) and seconded (Algire) to adopt the resolution.

The motion PASSED with the following votes:

AYES: (11) García, Evbuoma, Kott, Jacuzzi, Algire, Sanders, Nagengast, Ekanem, Clary, Perszyk, and Pierce

NOES: (0)

ABSENT: (5) Kight, Ochoa, Pinkston, Sandkulla, and Williams

Public Comment: None

6. **Presentation and Discussion:** [CleanPowerSF Overview, Disadvantaged Communities Green Tariff and Community Solar Programs](#), Michael Hyams, Deputy Assistant General Manager, CleanPowerSF, Power Enterprise; Kiara Hermann, Utility Analyst, CleanPowerSF, Power Enterprise

Resource: <https://www.cleanpowersf.org/communitysponsor>

Presentation

- CleanPowerSF Overview and Disadvantaged Communities Green Tariff Programs
- Power Enterprise
- What is a CCA?
- CleanPowerSF Program Goals
- Customer Choices Under CleanPowerSF
- Enrollment and Service Statistics
- Disadvantaged Communities (DAC) Green Tariff Programs Overview
- Program #1: DAC Green Tariff Program
- Program #2: DAC Community Solar Program
- CleanPowerSF Programs
- CleanPowerSF's DAC Green Tariff is now "SuperGreen Saver"
- Marketing, Education, & Outreach (ME&O)
- Community Partnerships
- Sourcing Energy Supply for the DAC Programs
- Questions?

Discussion

- **Member Ekanem** asked how a non-profit sign can up to be a community solar partner.

Staff Hermann responded that the website <https://www.cleanpowersf.org/communitysponsor> provided in the chat has information on how to become a partner. The organizations must work with the solar developers and submit a proposal to CleanPowerSF. The SFPUC has been working with interested partners to facilitate the connection between them and solar developers. Staff Hermann commented that Staff Randazzo worked a great deal to do this outreach and asked if she had anything to add.

Staff Randazzo responded that CAC members that are interested or know of any community-based organizations that would be interested in becoming a project sponsor as part of the Community Solar Program should review the website provided by Staff Hermann. The SFPUC would love to hear from them. Staff Randazzo added that they are looking into working with CBOs (Community-based Organizations) to do outreach on this program and other programs that are a part of CleanPowerSF. They have posted that opportunity on their SF Bid website. Winners of that bid will help with this project and outreach on these programs as well as others under CleanPowerSF. Staff Randazzo also offered to answer any questions offline as well.

- **Member Sanders** asked if any of the programs discussed today apply to Treasure Island.

Staff Hermann responded that these programs are only available to CleanPowerSF customers. The funding comes from CleanPowerSF customers. Treasure Island is not served by CleanPowerSF, so it is not available to that part of the City.

- **Members Sanders** commented that Treasure Island is one of the top disadvantaged communities and asked if he would not be eligible to apply as a community sponsor.

Staff Hermann responded no, not currently.

- **Member Sanders** asked if that was a choice that the SFPUC made or was it TIDA's (Treasure Island Development Authority) choice to not have Treasure Island join the Community Choice Aggregation Program.

Staff Hyams responded that it is not a choice. It is dictated by State law. Under State law, only customers that are participating in an investor-owned service area can launch a Community Choice Aggregation Program. CleanPowerSF is the SFPUC's CCA (Community Choice Aggregation) and only customers that receive retail distribution service from PG&E are eligible. Customers of Hetch Hetchy Power and customers of Treasure Island are not eligible for CleanPowerSF, and they are not eligible for the DAC (Disadvantaged Communities) program described by Staff Hermann. This might be available to Treasure Island in the future. The program is specific to CleanPowerSF and customers that are within an investor-owned utility service area.

- **Member Sanders** commented that presentations that have maps of the City often do not include Treasure Island. Even if Treasure Island is not a part of these programs, it would be great to still include Treasure Island on the maps.

Staff Hyams responded that he did not mean to imply that Treasure Island is not a part of the City. For today's presentation, Treasure Island was not included because it is not a part of CleanPowerSF's service territory. They were trying to represent CleanPowerSF's service area in the map.

Member Sanders asked that presentations address the fact that Treasure Island is not included as it helps people to understand how much does not apply to Treasure Island. Sanders believe this will

increase awareness about the outages there caused by the old infrastructure even though people live on Treasure Island.

- **Member Nagengast** asked if the 20% discount was based on SuperGreen or the Green product rates.

Staff Hermann responded that they are based off the Green product rates. It would be off a customer's total electric bill and not the CleanPowerSF charges.

Staff Hyams added that the discount was for the generation's supply that CleanPowerSF provides and the distribution charges that PG&E would put on the bill as well, so it is a full bill discount.

- **Member Nagengast** asked if they could put the estimated customer cap into a percent so that she could understand what that looked like.

Staff Hermann responded that she does not have the information readily available and offered to provide that information later via email.

Staff Hyams added that they will send that to Staff Sa. At a high level qualitatively, it is a significant portion, but it is not all of them. It is a subset.

- **Member Nagengast** commented that there are energy efficiency programs that are targeted DACs, there is Community Solar, and there are Green tariff options for customers in DAC. Nagengast asked how they are navigating all the programs and how are they are working together to make it easy for them to layer energy efficiency upgrades for the various parties and parts that CleanPowerSF can provide.

Staff Hyams responded that one of the things they tried to do with CleanPowerSF is be a source of information for their customers to help them navigate a complicated landscape. Staff Hyams commented that both Staff Randazzo and Staff Hermann are key members of the team that are working on rolling out SFPUC's outreach to customers. Staff Hyams commented that Staff Hermann mentioned in the presentation that one of their goals is to help educate customers on some of the discount programs that are available to them that they may not be aware of. Their goal is to raise awareness in enrollment of the discount programs, but they should be doing the same for any energy efficiency or any other offerings that may be available to these parts of the community.

Member Nagengast commented that as a person who works in the energy space, she can certainly understand how they all layer together. From an outside perspective, though, she can see people not understanding all the options that are available to them.

- **Member Jacuzzi** asked how does the hierarchy between the Green and the SuperGreen play out once the Green becomes 100% renewable.

Staff Hyams responded that they are already creating some boundaries around the product type to differentiate them. The SuperGreen product will be sourced only from new projects that they have developed or cause to be constructed through the City's demand since they launched. CleanPowerSF, unlike Hetch Hetchy Power, acquires its supplies through contracts with third parties. One of the

ways that they drive investment in new renewable energy supply is by making long-term commitments. They sign contracts that are 15-25 years long, and a developer can finance these projects and get them constructed. The SuperGreen product will only be supplied from energy that has been constructed since they launched the program. It does come at a slight premium, and their intent is to direct some of the premium dollars towards more local content, which does cost more than renewables sourced from the Central Valley or Southern California. Those are the two main differentiators for the SuperGreen product from Green.

- **Chair García** asked if the presenters could the different bills received by customers enrolled in each one of the programs from a generation and distribution perspective.

Staff Hyams responded that one differentiator between Hetch Hetchy Power and CleanPowerSF is that Hetchy Power performs all the functions associated with a larger utility, including the billing function. Hetch Hetchy customers receive an SFPUC generated bill that includes all the charges for that service. CleanPowerSF, under State law, is part of the PG&E bill. CleanPowerSF customers receive a PG&E energy statement that includes PG&E distribution, transmission charges, and CleanPowerSF charges. The CleanPowerSF bill will have a separate page that details CleanPowerSF charges and rates. The summary page describes line items and the different components of the PG&E bill where an individual could see PG&E distribution charges and CleanPowerSF generation charges. CleanPowerSF charges are not duplicative of PG&E charges. It replaces the energy supply or generation portion of the service that otherwise PG&E would have been providing if they didn't have the CleanPowerSF program.

Chair García commented that he just wanted to make sure that folks understood what Nagengast's question was and the importance of the 20% discount on the whole bill as opposed to just the generation.

- **Member Algire** asked what kind of bill people on Treasure Island receive and if it is issued by TIDA.

Staff Hyams responded that he believes it is not a TIDA bill and that he believes it is a Hetch Hetchy Power bill.

Staff Randazzo responded that was correct.

Member Sanders commented that as a resident of Treasure Island, he does not pay an electricity bill. The developer pays a connection charge to PG&E. Currently, none of the residents on Treasure Island pay a bill. It is all factored into the rent and equalized across all units because of some prior agreement. When Sanders discussed this with TIDA, he tried to determine whether TIDA was paying a bill to Hetch Hetchy directly and whether Sanders could be provided a copy of that bill. Sanders then asked if he could be provided with a copy of that bill. Sanders added that he has asked Bob Beck, who is the director of TIDA, and he has not been able to get that information directly because there are different liabilities if it is paid towards Hetch Hetchy directly as a bill versus PG&E.

Staff Hyams responded that the bill would not go to PG&E. He cannot speak to whether it is going to TIDA. It is not that uncommon to have a building owner pay a utility bill and have those costs spread out in

some fashion across tenants. Many commercial buildings are still managed that way. It is more common today to have residential buildings be separately metered and separately billed. He cannot speak specifically to the charges that Sanders is discussing regarding the bill. The “landlord” should be the one receiving the bill for Hetchy service on Treasure Island.

- **Member Sanders** asked if this was the correct venue to receive information regarding who TIDA pays the bill to directly.

Staff Hyams responded that he could look into that and asked Sanders to post his question to the chat to help translate it effectively.

Member Sanders added to the chat his question as “who does TIDA pay the electric bill to for all residents on Treasure Island from the Port of Oakland connection that feeds the island”.

Public Comment: None

7. **Presentation, Discussion and Possible Action:** [Resolution to Continue Online Meetings Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic](#), Moisés García, Full CAC Chair; Eliahu Perszyk, Full CAC Vice Chair

Introduction

Chair García stated that this Resolution is intended to convey the CAC’s desire to continue having online meetings. After the resolution was drafted, the Mayor’s office issued a new supplement that differentiated charter and advisory commissions and that required advisory bodies not created by charters to continue to meet remotely until further notice. The CAC is still allowed to continue to meet via webconference.

Discussion

- **Member Perszyk** commented that the Mayor’s Office had previously required all commission, boards, and committees to resume in-person meetings starting February 28th. The CAC voiced their concerns about that decision and decided to draft a resolution voicing their concerns and disagreement. Perszyk added that the resolution was conceived as a response to the 42nd supplement where the Mayor’s Office stated that public interest outweighed the public health risk. The CAC was concerned about children ineligible to get vaccinated, immunocompromised folks. Additionally, virtual meetings have been working well.

Chair García commented that the 42nd supplement require updating the “Whereas” sections.

- **Member Clary** suggested that the Committee should consider whether they agree with this being a temporary measure during the state of emergency or whether they want this to be long-term to engage people who do not have the ability to attend meetings in person including the members of the Committee. Clary understands that this has been partially delayed or rescinded by the Mayor and suggested editing the last Resolved to remove the portion about the date of February 28th.

Member Perszyk responded that he agreed that it should not be limited to the state of emergency and that remote or hybrid meetings work well as it increases attendance. While the state of emergency

provides great justification, they do not necessarily need to be tied to that because it will end at some point.

Member Clary commented that the long-term discussion of how they meet must be resolved through State law. She would recommend removing the words “on February 28, 2022” in the second Resolved, which would address the date issue. The words “on February 28, 2022” were then removed from the second Resolved.

- **Member Jacuzzi** asked if attendance has been better online and if there was a general sentiment that the group has been functioning better with a remote process versus an in-person process.

Chair García responded affirmatively. The CAC has been able to have far more meetings where they have quorum. It has not been as much of an issue as it has been prior to the pandemic where members would have to all go down to 525 Golden Gate Avenue to partake in the meetings. They have seen more engagement during the pandemic.

Member Kott commented that she misses seeing everyone in person and being at 525 Golden Gate Avenue, but online meetings improved attendance.

Member Evbuoma commented that as someone who joined the CAC during the pandemic, she would not have been able to serve if the meeting were in-person. Evbuoma added that virtual meetings created a space of equity because it allowed folks who were not able to go in person to participate. Evbuoma agreed with Clary and others that they do have to look at this long-term. Hybrid is something of the future and it often increases attendance.

Member Sanders commented that if these meetings were not remote, he would not be able to be on this Committee. The remote option has helped him attend the meetings, and he hopes that this continues to be an option moving forward because it helps with many equity issues. He supports this Resolution in full and how it is laid out.

- **Member Algire** commented that hybrid meetings are the wave of the future and that it would be worth it to have the City consider it as an option.

Chair García responded that Algire is correct. State law did change to allow public comment to be continued as hybrid. The bodies themselves, though, would have to go back in-person once the state of emergency ends.

Member Clary responded affirmatively and that they are governed by State law.

Chair García was added that the State Law is the Brown Act. Chair added that online meetings helped creating a more equitable Committee, and it has allowed them to fill 16 of the 17 seats.

- **Member Clary** commented that since doing permanent hybrid/remote meetings would require a change in State law, that is technically not in the purview of this Committee. They would have to ask their elected officials to forward it.

Motion was made (Clary) and seconded (Nagengast) to adopt the Resolution to Continue Online Meetings Due to the Covid-19 Pandemic as amended.

The motion PASSED with the following votes:

AYES: (12) García, Evbuoma, Kott, Jacuzzi, Algire, Sanders, Ochoa, Nagengast, Ekanem, Clary, Perszyk, and Pierce

NOES: (0)

ABSENT: (4) Kight, Pinkston, Sandkulla, and Williams

Public Comment: None

8. Staff Report

- The need to resume in-person meetings has been suspended until further notice

Public Comment: None

9. Future Agenda Items and Resolutions

- Emergency Firefighting Water System – *tentatively* March
- Environmental Justice Team Portfolio – *tentatively* April
- Education Efforts Update – *tentatively* April
- Corruption and Accountability Measures – *tentatively* May
- Affordability and Assistance Programs – *tentatively* June
- Water Equity and Water Access for Homeless – *tentatively* June
- Succession Planning – HR Practices
- Lake Merced
- Treasure Island Power and Outages
- Racial Equity – Composition of the Management Team
- Power Rate Increases
- Commissioners Visit
- Drought and Bay Delta Discussion
- CleanPowerSF and Hetch Hetchy Power Study Rates
- Agency-wide Planning & Policy on Climate Change & Adaptation
- Interagency Working Group on Sea Level Rise
- Contracting Process
- Education Resolution
- PUC Properties and City Department Partnerships
- Workforce Programs
- Water Rights and Raker Act
- Water Use and Parks
- Flooding Protection
- Water Quality Report
- Green New Deal
- Micro Hydroelectric Power
- Prop A Bond Funding
- SECFC/CAC Joint Meeting

Adopted Resolutions for Follow Up

- Resolution for Continued Support and Budget for SFPUC Racial Equity Plan and Community Benefits [adopted on September 21, 2021](#)
- Resolution in Support of a Resilient Water Supply [adopted August 17, 2021](#)

- 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 in Support of the Southern Skyline Boulevard Ridge Trail Extension project [adopted April 20, 2021](#)
- Resolution in Support of Interim Emergency Rate Assistance Program and Revised Community Assistance Program [adopted on July 21, 2020](#)
- Resolution in Support of a Skilled and Diverse Utility Workforce [adopted February 19, 2019](#)
- Resolution Honoring the Life, Activism, and Contributions of Dr. Espanola Jackson to the Local Community [adopted on April 19, 2016](#)
- Resolution on Balboa Reservoir [adopted March 15, 2016](#)

Public Comment: None

10. **Announcements/Comments** Please visit www.sfpuc.org/cac for confirmation of the next scheduled meeting, agenda, and materials.
- Chair García commented that there is a meeting on the 17th for folks that are interested on the Lake Merced topic
link: <https://bit.ly/lakemercedupdate>.

Public Comment: None

11. Adjournment

Motion was made (García) and seconded (Clary) to adjourn the meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:58pm.