



San Francisco Public Utilities Commission  
Citizens' Advisory Committee

MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, April 16, 2024  
5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.  
525 Golden Gate Ave., 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Tuolumne Conference Room

**MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY OBSERVE AND PARTICIPATE VIA ZOOM  
VIRTUAL CONFERENCE SOFTWARE**

Meeting URL

<https://sfwater.zoom.us/j/85053847310?pwd=UmhFa3UxQmtmUhd0NEI4bVdrSFI1Zz09>

Phone Dial-in

669.219.2599

Find your local number: <https://sfwater.zoom.us/u/kbwFEr2FCG>

Meeting ID/Passcode

850 5384 7310 / 988367

**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)	Steven Lee (D10)
Caroline Law (D1)	Jennifer Clary (D11)
Suki Kott (D2)	Maika Pinkston (M-Environmental Org.)
Sally Chen (D3)	Nicole Sandkulla (M-Regional Water Customers)
Douglas Jacuzzi (D4)	Jodi Soboll (M-Engineering/Financial)
Emily Algire (D5)	Eliahu Perszyk (M-Large Water User)
Barklee Sanders (D6)	Andrea Baker (B-Small Business)
Elizabeth Steele Teshara (D7)	Michelle Pierce (B-Environ. Justice)
Amy Nagengast (D8)	

**London N. Breed**  
Mayor

**Tim Paulson**  
President

**Anthony Rivera**  
Vice President

**Newsha K. Ajami**  
Commissioner

**Sophie Maxwell**  
Commissioner

**Kate H. Stacy**  
Commissioner

**Dennis J. Herrera**  
General Manager

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

Staff Liaisons: Lexus Moncrease and Sharon Liu-Bettencourt  
Staff Email for Public Comment: [cac@sfwater.org](mailto:cac@sfwater.org)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

Members present at roll call: García, Law, Algire, Steele Teshara, Nagengast, Clary, Sandkulla, Soboll, Perszyk and Baker

Members absent: Kott\*, Chen, Jacuzzi\*, Sanders, Lee, Pinkston and Pierce

**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.



\*Member Kott and Member Jacuzzi joined the meeting at 5:42pm.

## 2. Approve [March 19, 2024 Minutes](#)

Motion was made (Clary) and seconded (Perszyk) to approve the March 19, 2024, minutes. Approved without objection.

Public Comment: None

## 3. Report from the Chair

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

Public Comment: None

## 4. General 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.

- **Dave Warner (Private Industry Chief Financial Officer):**

Warner commented that he sent a letter to the CAC yesterday asking the CAC to make one of their priorities in the coming months investigating rate payer risk associated with the SFPUC's current 10 Year Capital Plan. Warner believes that the risk is significant and that none of the SFPUC's current presentations discusses the risk in any significant way. He wondered if the SFPUC's leadership understands the risk created by their 10 Year Capital Plan. Warner commented that neither the SFPUC's Rate Fairness Board nor the Revenue Bond Oversight Committee has taken up this issue. He presented the issues in two parts.

In part one, he commented that with the proposed 10 Year Capital Plan, the SFPUC is already projecting that combined water and sewer rates will go up an average of 6% a year for the next 20 years. To put it in context, the Federal Reserve's target inflation rate is 2%. Today's average single family monthly water and Sewer Bill, according to the SFPUC is \$142. If that were to increase 2% at a 2% compound annual rate, the bill 20 years from now would be \$436, a \$211 increase, or almost triple today's rate.

In part two, Warner commented that while the SFPUC's projected rates are bad in themselves, this is not where the risk comes in. The risk is with the assumptions the SFPUC makes to project the rates. Warner states that the rates are optimistic and that he provides an example in the letter he sent the CAC. The SFPUC's 10 Year Capital Plan will very likely push rates well above the agency's affordability policy. This risk needs to be made visible and needs to be broadly understood.

Warner believes there are several measures that can be done to mitigate the risk but before any measures can be implemented, we must first understand and recognize the problem. Warner wants the CAC to make investigating rate payer risk one of their priorities. He mentioned that in 1998 there was a rate freeze and rate payer revolt and that if we catch the problem early this time, we might be able to prevent that.

- **Peter Drekmeier (Policy Director for the Tuolumne River Trust):**  
Drekmeier commented that in 2019, the SFPUC joined some irrigation districts to sue the State Water Board over the Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan. In mid-March, a judge ruled against San Francisco. This has resulted in a loss of 5 years of potential improvements to the Tuolumne River, and an undisclosed amount used. Drekmeier commented that he has tried to look into the cost of the lawsuit but was told the costs associated with the lawsuits were considered attorney client privilege. He is unclear on if the SFPUC plans on appealing but feels like decision on whether to appeal will not be made with public input.

Drekmeier further commented that Sophie Maxwell is resigning from the Commission, and her last meeting will be next Tuesday, April 23. He encouraged the committee to do an exit interview with her and find out more about her experiences. Donna Hood, the Commission Secretary, is also retiring at the end of June. Drekmeier wants members of the committee to consider becoming replacement commissioners. He commented that the last couple of commissioners were essentially people recommended by the general manager, and he believes it is very unhealthy to have an oversight Board that feels as if they are subservient to staff.

**5. Presentation and Discussion:** IRP Update, Julia Olguin, SFPUC Director of Origination and Power Supply

*Presentation*

2024 CleanPowerSF IRP Update CAC  
Integrated Resource Plan (IRP)  
Integrated Resource Plan Portfolios  
Summary of 2022 IRP  
Evolution of CleanPowerSF's Energy Portfolio Under Adopted IRP (2021-2035)  
Status of Implementation  
2024 CleanPowerSF IRP – Just the Beginning

- **Member Soboll** asked if the numbers in the status of implementation slide for 2023 and 2024 were actuals (actual refers to the breakdown of CleanPowerSF's energy profile) or if they were estimates.

**Staff Olguin** responded yes; they are actuals.

**Member Soboll** commented that two years is a short time frame to redo the Integrated Resource Plan (IRP). She asked if there are any significant changes from the last plan that will change the prediction of energy profiles. Has everything been on schedule the past two years? What's happened to change the schedule for 2024?

**Staff Olguin** responded that they are on schedule but are having more challenges due to the fundamentals of the global, domestic and regional environment that they're dealing with. She commented that procurement is a lot harder now and there's more challenges involved. However, the procurement process gets better in 2030. A lot of the challenges come from the PG&E interconnection delays and getting new developments online late.

**Member Soboll** asked if procurement relates to goods and services coming in slowly or if it relates to money coming in slowly.

**Staff Olguin** responded it does relate to goods and services. She goes on to give an example. If they are doing a power purchase agreement for a solar PV in a new development, there would be delays in interconnection agreements with PG&E due to the state of California's unique restrictions. High interest rates make financing a little bit more for developers as well. As a result, they must be more creative in making sure that they're getting the best deals for our rate payers. They are hoping for long term procurement for renewable deals and market changes that alleviate the problem by 2033. On the demand side, there could also be some differences in two years but probably nothing significant.

**Member García** commented that SFPUC Communications gives a quarterly status report on interconnections.

- **Member Sandkulla** asked a question on slide 4. She pointed out that under bullet two, the presentation commented that the 90% time coincident case portfolio is supposed to achieve 100% renewable and greenhouse gas electricity in 2025. Is that correct was that supposed to say 2035?

**Staff Olguin** responded that is correct. In 2025 they plan to achieve 100% renewable and greenhouse gas free electricity.

- **Member Kott** commented that she sees there are solar wind and geothermal generated sources but it's unclear what those sources are for.

**Staff Olguin** commented that, that is the battery storage. A lot of solar and wind energy are co-located with battery storage. In California, for power there is something call the Dup Curve which means there are a lot of solar during the afternoon hours, because there's a lot of sunshine. As a result, we have battery storage for up to 4 hours that can hold some of the generation. During the hours when generation is down, we can use the storage that we collected during that time. The evening hours when generation is down is also considered peak hours because everyone is home. The stored energy is generated by either wind or solar. Now with the new IRA Act, they can pull storage off the grid, so it doesn't necessarily need to have a source.

- **Member Kott** asked if this energy could be non-green.

**Staff Olguin** responded that this energy is always green because they always make it green.

**Member Kott** asked what it means to make energy green.

**Staff Olguin** responded that this means they buy the PCC attribute to make energy green. If anything in their disclosure portfolio looked like it's not green, they would go and buy the attribute to make it green. It's called an attribute and if you buy it in the marketplace, it makes your energy green. She states she can guarantee all power with CleanPowerSF is green.

- **Member Kott** asked if staff could clarify what an attribute is.

**Staff Olguin** responded that there are different attributes, such as PCC 1 which makes energy green and renewable. There's PPC 1 which is what most of the projects they have are under, it's solar and wind. This gives you green certification and green credit.

**Member Kott** asked if the word attribute is just basically how a seller labels their product.

**Staff Olguin** responded that she can give an example. Hetch Hetchy Hydro produces GHG free attributes off its generation while our solar power produces PC1 attributes. It's basically just a different labeling of different technology and what you receive from it.

**Member Soboll** asked if attributes is just a description of the source and if the source is green.

**Staff Olguin** responded that when you pull off the grid, the energy is green.

**Member Soboll** commented this means when we pull the energy off the grid, it's already green and we do not purchase this energy from PG&E.

**Member Clary** commented that this means they're purchasing from someone who is certified PCC 1.

**Staff Olguin** responded that this is correct. She added that CleanPowerSF only uses power with a GHG free component of a PCC attribute and that she can send the committee members additional resources if they want.

- **Member Baker** commented that this month CleanPowerSF is finalizing their consultant propositions and stakeholder engagement plans and she wants to know what their stakeholder engagement plan is.

**Staff Olguin** responded that the committee is part of the stakeholder engagement plan and are putting together a presentation so that the committee knows what they're planning, what the recourse planning looks like and what the demand profile looks like. They will do this during their process to gain commissioner approval.

**Member Baker** asked if the members of the committee are the only people who receive this presentation.

**Staff Olguin** responded that they have other stakeholders as well.

- **Member Baker** asked how many presentations CleanPowerSF does.

**Staff Olguin** responded that they did between 5-7 last time.

**Member Baker** asked if these presentations take place around the city.

**Staff Olguin** responded that last time a lot of these presentations were done over zoom due to Covid. She added she is unsure how many presentations will be over zoom this time.

**Member Baker** asked if any changes take place due to the feedback received during stakeholder engagement presentations to the public.

**Staff Olguin** responded that CleanPowerSF does want to make sure there is a local component and that their organization is meeting local needs. However, there is strict CPC guidelines they must follow. However, they like to hear community thoughts and they try and adjust their models to fit the community. For example, if you're concerned about climate change and live in a microclimate, how does that climate look in 30 years in relation to global warming? They try and run different types of models and deterministic statistics. However, the modeling can only do so much, so they just try and listen to the public and engage so that they know what the opinions are.

**Member García** commented that one example is that 5 or 6 years ago there was a lot of folks who were interested in local generation. However, there was a lot of debate over what local generation meant. The SFPUC decided that it meant energy generated within the 9 bay area counties. This cost more than projects done out in the Mohave desert. So, it was a tradeoff between local generation and how much more local generation cost compared to non-local generation.

**Staff Olguin** commented that they do attempt to have local generations, such as a rooftop in the inner city or something similar. However, this is only really done in smaller volumes because there is a big price difference.

- **Member Law** asked about the line that reads "finalizing consultant proposals." Member Law is curious as to what the proposals look like, basically what do these consultants do?

**Staff Olguin** responded that the consultants do a lot of the modeling because we do not have the sophistication in house to do most of it and is a large task because CleanPowerSF choses portfolios and scenarios and they run several sensitivities of what could happen against that. Staff Olguin added It is a very time-consuming process.

- **Member Soboll** asked what exactly is being modeled. Is it the technology being used? Is it whether it will work or is it what the cost is?

**Staff Olguin** responded that the model is a cost-model, driven by economic pricing and the model takes the demand curve and gives least cost modeling. What is the best least cost modeling to do in order to meet goals and targets. The models also run sensitivities that account for various situations such as climate change. After they finish the modeling, they take the results and formulate the way they want to project the modeling in their IRP and figure out what the best cost is for their ratepayers. They are trying to provide 100% renewable and greenhouse gas free energy at the lowest cost. This is especially difficult because with electrification, there is an increase in demand for electricity.

- **Member Perszyk** asked about the scope of building departmentalization under alternative portfolios.

**Staff Olguin** responded the scope is basically what can be done locally. Some examples include local roof-top solar panels and looking at efficiencies within different buildings in the city and how to save cost within those efficiencies. The amount of cost savings that can be done within the city is small since we can't go out and build a solar field in the middle of San Francisco.

- **Member Clary** asked if Staff Olguin can talk about some of the lessons she learned in 2022 and how they are applying those lessons.

**Staff Olguin** responded that they had too many base case scenarios in 2022. This time they'll be starting off with less base case scenarios and running alternatives against a limited set of base scenarios. Another lesson learned was that internally they needed more than just one or two people working on the IRP, it's a much bigger undertaking and far too much for an individual. They are also trying to bring in internal teams to help with the IRP. She further states that there were a few more lessons but that she can't remember them off the top of her head.

- **Member Clary** asked if she could explain more on implementation, it looks like there is going to be a big bump in capacity in 2026? Does this mean there are specific projects that are coming online in 2026.

**Staff Olguin** responded that 2026 is going to be a great year and that there are multiple projects coming online that year, a bunch of solar projects and fully collocated batteries.

**Member Clary** asked if this would be local or in the Mojave Desert.

**Staff Olguin** responded that this would be in the Mojave as local would be very expensive and difficult. The groups they are working with in the dessert are being very preventative of the wildlife in the dessert.

- **Member Clary** asked if CleanPowerSf has thought about pump storage or if they just don't have the infrastructure for it.

**Staff Olguin** commented they have thought about pump storage but that pump storage is very expensive.

**Member Clary** explained that pump storage is when water goes downhill at night and is pumped up during the day.

**Staff Olguin** commented that they have looked into getting pump storage for Hetch Hetchy. They just finished the Hetch Hetchy IRP last year and took it to commission in November where it was approved. It doesn't look like there is a great need for pump storage until 2032 or 2035. Pump storage is very expensive, and they want to explore storage alternatives and make sure there are no better alternative before they commit to it.

**Member Clary** commented that there are also the oil field graphs. She asked if that had been considered.

**Staff Olguin** asked if this had to do with the cell phones.

**Member Clary** responded it did, it is where you use solar power to pull something up and at night it falls and generate electricity. She isn't sure exactly what they're putting in or how it works but knows the general concept and that it's done out of abandoned oil wells.

- **Member Jacuzzi** asked a question relating to the first portfolio for 2035. He is curious if this estimate identifies projects that are already scheduled out that far in advance or if it is just hopeful estimates.

**Staff Olguin** commented that the estimates come from modeling. They like to compare models with what is in the pipeline and see what kinds of



interconnection there are. They also look into the CISA in regard to their modeling.

**Member García** asked if she could define CISA.

**Staff Olguin** replied that CISA is the California Independent System Operator. CISA manages the grid, they manage both the load and the generation side and make sure the grid is reliable based on all the generation that goes onto the grid and all the demand that's pulling from the grid. They are an independent grid operator who has rules and regulations as to how they must operate the grid.

**Member Jacuzzi** commented that even though there's only do graphs, one could hypothesize a trend that goes past 2035. Are there models that take the estimates past 2035 in five-year increments?

**Staff Olguin** responded that they do have that.

**Member Jacuzzi** commented that he sees geothermal and solar are both increasing.

**Staff Olguin** responded that geothermal is increasing because they are hoping for offshore wind which has a great capacity factor that's almost like a base load. If California could get offshore wind energy, it would really help us in the winter months when the sun doesn't shine but wind still blows offshore.

**Member García** asked if Staff Olguin could explain baseload versus intermittence.

**Staff Olguin** explained that if you think about it from a stack perspective, a baseload is like a constant 24 hour, all year, all season generation facility. On the other hand, solar, hydro and California wind all have seasonality. When the shine the most in spring and summer, the wind in California also blows the most. Hydro flows the most in the spring in California. The offshore wind is an example of a baseload, offshore wind blows all season long, all night long. New Mexico wind is also a baseload wind which is why they're building huge wind facilities in New Mexico.

- **Member García** asked to clarify that the solar in the diagram refers to solar plus storage.

**Staff Olguin** explained that in this diagram, solar does not refer to solar plus storage but rather just solar. Some of the solar is collocated but that's not reflected in the graph.

**Member Clary** asked what the existing renewable energy is referring to.

**Staff Olguin** commented that existing renewables refer to renewable energy sources that have been around for many years already and are starting to degrade. She commented she can go back and look at what made up the existing renewable sources but that she isn't sure off the top of her head.

**Member Clary** commented she is wondering because it is not reflected in the presentation and she asked if this means there's more solar energy than reflected on the graph because some of the 14% of existing renewable energy is solar.



- **Member Kott** asked how batteries can qualify as renewable energy. She commented that our aim is for renewable and greenhouse free gas, but batteries are such a stressor on the environment.

**Staff Olguin** responded that what we put into our batteries is already renewable solar energy. The battery does not lose energy as the energy is stored.

**Member Soboll** asked why the batteries are categorized as batteries instead of their originating power source. For example, if power stored in battery started off as solar, why would we not categorize them as solar?

**Staff Olguin** responded that they could have categorized it that way as well. This is just a more specific way of categorizing because not all our wind and solar energy sources have batteries sitting next to them. They like to divide their megawatts this way so that they can see what their position is in terms of battery, solar and wind.

**Member Soboll** asked if this meant that there's multiple categories of solar; solar that does not fall into the battery category and is used to serve load and solar that did not go into the battery at all and was not used.

**Staff Olguin** explained this was incorrect. Solar is either used to serve a load or if there is additional solar energy, it is held in a battery until evening peak hours and it serves a load in the evening.

- **Member Soboll** asked if this meant that storing solar in batteries is not as good as using it immediately because there is an impact to batteries.

**Staff Olguin** confirmed that there are some losses when using a battery.

**Member Kott** asked if batteries in clean power is bad for the environment.

**Staff Olguin** responded that it is still renewable and doesn't lose its renewable attributes. By losses she means if she puts 50 megawatts into a battery, they will probably only get 47 megawatts of energy. There is losses in efficiency when using a battery, but it doesn't lose the solar generating aspect. The green energy component, the PCC 1 value happens at generation.

**Member Kott** asked if that means clean power within SF refers to clean generated power.

**Staff Olguin** responded that is true.

**Member Jacuzzi** commented that batteries themselves are not a source of electricity but rather storage and they have a finite period before they become waste.

**Staff Olguin** commented that we are looking for a new way to store energy. There is new, untested technology coming down the pipelines. She commented this is just the system we have right now to help the grid since reliability is so important for the grid. It doesn't change the green attribute, there's just losses just round-trip efficiency losses to account for. Better storage is in the pipelines, just not within the next five years.

**Member Jacuzzi** asked if this refers to different types of batteries.

**Staff Olguin** responded that it refers to different type of batteries but also different storage technology all together. She commented lithium batteries is currently driving the market.

- **Member Steele Teshara** asked if there is a consideration environmental concerns such as what impacts the equipment to collect solar in the desert or to collect offshore wind might have. Is there some balancing between acquiring clean energy and how that equipment might affect the ecology and the ecosystem of the environment.

**Staff Olguin** commented that they do consider environmental impact but does so in a different way as they are not the developers. They're the off taker, the individual who's buying the power. She commented that California has excellent environmental laws and regulations that developers already must follow, it's one of the reasons why there's such a big delay in offshore wind. Sometimes there is an environmental tradeoff for acquiring green energy, however that process is not technically accounted for in the IRP.

**Member Soboll** commented that from a societal level, everyone wants clean energy specifically to benefit the environment. It doesn't make sense if the developers who are creating equipment for clean energy collection or if the person building the battery to help run green energy grid is actively hurting the environment. As a consumer, she does not care that the energy is labeled green energy, she cares that the process of getting the energy to her has low environmental impact.

**Staff Olguin** commented that the environmental impact in obtaining clean energy is lower in California compared to other states.

- **Member Garcia** commented that there is a difference between East Coast and West Coast offshore wind. The continental shelf on East Coast allows them to be on the sea floor, which isn't possible on the West Coast.

**Member Algire** asked if our clean energy can be sourced from out of state.

**Staff Olguin** commented it can be sourced from out of state.

**Member Algire** asked if California's rules would apply to out of state sources.

**Staff Olguin** commented they do not change their PPA for anyone, all city rules still apply whether the source is in state or out of state.

**Member Algire** provided an example to specify her question. She asked if we sourced from Arizona but the equipment to source the clean energy harmed turtles in Arizona, would the source in Arizona have to comply with California's environmental laws regarding their environmental impact.

**Staff Olguin** responded that she understands where that concern comes from, however they don't really look at that or put it in their IRP because they don't have that problem in California.

- **Member Algire** asked if there's any consideration to a more westward placement of solar panels so that the solar energy can be used during the 4pm-8pm peak hours. Is there a significant difference between solar panels in the Mohave Desert versus in a place like San Luis Obispo?

**Staff Olguin** responded the difference is very small.

**Member Algire** asked how putting rooftop solar on each building in San Francisco would compare to a project in the Mojave Desert resource wise?

**Staff Olguin** commented that she does not know the answer to this question. She commented there are people in the city who are working on efficiency for solar projects in the city. However, they have not looked into the possibility of putting solar on every single rooftop.

- **Member Algire** asked if the new, better batteries that are supposed to be brought in by 2035 will have a longer lifespan.

**Staff Olguin** responded that these batteries will have a longer lifespan as well and be using a different, better technology compared to the current batteries.

Public Comment: None

**6. Presentation, Discussion, and Possible Action:** Response to Folsom Stormwater Community Complaint, Moisés García, Full CAC Chair

*Presentation*

**Member García** commented that on March 28 the Full CAC received a letter from Kieran Farr, an Executive Committee member of the Sierra Club, San Francisco Group. The letter was cosigned by the Sierra Club San Francisco Group and the San Francisco Bay Area Water Committee regarding the Folsom Area Stormwater improvement projects. This project was developed by SFPUC to address flooding that occurs during moderate to heavy storms and the in low line intermission neighborhoods, primarily, Folsom Street from 17th to 18<sup>th</sup> street. The project will increase collection system capacity, reduce the risk of flooding by constructing and upsizing sewer pipes and boxes, as well as construct a new storm tunnel to Mission Creek (the creek near Caltrain that goes out next to Oracle Park). The letter expresses concerns about phases 2 and 3 of the projects which is the construction of a new stormwater tunnel from that area to the creek and sewer box upgrades. The letter is urging the Board of Supervisors to immediately pause any phase 2 or 3 activities including issuing RFPs and awarding contracts to allow for comprehensive evaluation of the abatement plan to better align with community needs, environmental priorities, long term resilience and develop a strategy for authentic community and stakeholder engagement. Their main concern is a lack of notification on the impending work as well as potential failure to review green infrastructure alternatives.

*Discussion*

- **Member García** commented that the Wastewater Subcommittee previously heard about a green infrastructure project that they supported but was rejected by the State Water Board.

**Member Clary** commented that the State Water Board doesn't have the authority to reject or accept projects and project just wasn't given funding by the State Water Board. She commented that it feels like it's a double standard that the SFPUC has money to pay for a pipe but needs to go out and get outside funding for green infrastructure.

**Member García** commented that the letter wants a response from the committee and asks if anyone has input. He states that it relates to other projects in the city where there is a complaint due to lack of notification of impending work. He believes this happens often in the city. He also commented that there is interest in green infrastructure which isn't currently being utilized.

**Member Soboll** commented that Kieran is in attendance and that they could ask him for his response during public comments.

**Member Nagengast** commented that perhaps a response could be asking the author of the letter to make a presentation and the committee making a resolution based on the presentation.

**Member Kott** commented that the committee can't address Kieran, but he could address the committee.

- **Member Perszyk** commented that if the committee wants to bring Kieran in as a presenter, they should figure out what they even want to talk to them about.

**Member Clary** asked for clarification on who "them" refers to.

**Member Perszyk** commented that "them" refers to project manager for the Folsom Area Stormwater improvement projects.

**Member Clary** commented that she had two thoughts. One thought is what is the process of notification, education, and outreach for doing a project in the city with major disruptions. There are a lot of people in the communication department and their job is to do outreach for projects. Understanding the communication team's protocols could be very important. The other thought is that a wastewater master plan has not been done and published since the 1990s. The unpublished 2007 plan does not mention this project. This area, between 14<sup>th</sup> Street and Folsom Street is the Western most part of Mission Bay. We already know that Mission Bay and Inner Richmond and Inner Mission are all subject to flooding. What is the capacity of these areas to address flooding through green infrastructure. She states she hasn't been very active in Wastewater topics, but she would like to know how they are integrating green infrastructure into their capital program, what kind of green infrastructure they are integrating and what kind of performance are they expecting from green infrastructure? She commented that in a lot of case green infrastructure ends up being something the community wants, so it gets installed and its only real purpose is to look pretty and appease the community. However, we really need to know what performance we're getting from the green infrastructure. One of the problems here is the freeway, whenever it rains, water pours off the freeway.

**Member Sandkulla** responded that if she is understanding correctly, their committee had this letter forwarded to them and is being asked to respond. However, the letter isn't addressed to the CAC, it's addressed to the State of California, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, State of California Water Resources Control Board, SFPUC, Board of Supervisors, State Senator Scott Wiener and Mayor London Breed. From a

procedural standpoint, it seems like the committee's response should just be "thank you" and asking the SFPUC to come and respond to this letter.

- **Member Clary** commented that the committee should be specific as to what they want the SFPUC to respond to. She asks if the email wants a response from the committee as well.

**Member Sandkulla** states that this letter is not addressed to the committee as needing action. So, the committee should think carefully about what their responsibility is versus, what someone might want the committee to be responsible for.

**Member Clary** commented that she believes this is all within their jurisdiction.

**Member Perszyk** commented that he believes it is within their purview to ask the SFPUC to come in and explain this project. He explains that they have a couple issues regarding the project, one issue is the communication or lack thereof. Additionally, it would be good to know if green infrastructure was analyzed. He gave example questions such as how much land is available, how much capacity there is to manage stormwater instead of building this tunnel. He wants to know if alternatives to building a tunnel was looked at and discussed and if not, why was it not looked at and could it be looked at. The Mission Bay Area is very urban and there is not a lot of space there, but flooding is a big issue. He wonders if maybe the pumps there are no longer working. He commented that the CAC could ask the SFPUC to come in, explain the project and their analysis process. He feels that this is within the CAC's oversight.

- **Member García** commented that the reason why this issue is being brought to the Full CAC is because in the past when the CAC has requested presentations on certain information, the presentations have often lacked focus on the requested presentation topic. He wanted to have a conversation with the Full CAC in order to figure out how to frame what kind of presentations the CAC wants to see from SFPUC staff as well as how should the CAC engage the SFPUC's staff and commissioners in a productive way.
- **Member Jacuzzi** commented that the area on Folsom between 16<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> street used to be a lake. He believes 75% of the suggested solutions need to happen upstream, otherwise water will just pour down and collect in the area. In that area, anytime someone digs a hole more than three feet deep, they end up hitting water. As a result, any projects in that area need constant dewatering. That area is basically a cap of soil over a lake. This area needs a comprehensive approach in order to fix the constant flooding, a drainpipe out of the basin is not enough.

**Member Algire** commented that she heard parts of SOMA is also sinking and she was wondering if those neighborhoods had the same issues.

**Member Jacuzzi** commented that he is unsure if it is the same basin in SOMA.

**Member Clary** responded that it is the same basin, there are only two major basins and seven watersheds in the city. She does not think SOMA

is sinking as much as the area on Folsom between 16<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> because there are less buildings and as a result less weight.

**Member Jacuzzi** said that the entire area is built out and there is no place for the water to run.

**Member Clary** commented that something to think about is how to de-concrete the city and add from filtration. This is an issue because water comes down the buildings quickly with nowhere to drain. However, it can be improved, the question is have any solutions been modeled yet? What are the solutions and where can they take place? Maybe parking lots.

**Member Jacuzzi** commented that having some of those solutions upstream would be fantastic.

**Member García** summarized the CAC's discussion so far.

- Respond to the complaint.
- What is the procedure?
- What is the protocol for neighborhood identification and engagement?
- How is green infrastructure integrated into the SFPUC's capital plan?
- What kind of performance can be expected

Public Comment:

- **Kieran Farr (Executive Committee member of the Sierra Club, San Francisco Group):**  
There are two major separate issues. The first issue is that there is no comprehensive systemwide green infrastructure plan for SFPUC. We are at the bottom of a watershed and the lack of a comprehensive plan leads us to this issue. The second issue is the Treat Plaza project, the Treat Corridor and the Greater Corridor of the proposed project of the Folsom Storm Water Improvement plan. There is both a systemwide systemic issue and an issue with this project. He commented that he received a response from Eileen White, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Area Region that stated that their board does not tell the SFPUC what to do. However, he feels that while this statement is technically true, it is not true in spirit. They do control the SFPUC through funding. He said that both agencies blame each other and as a resident he is caught between both agencies without an adequate response from either agency on how to help the city create greener infrastructure.

## 7. Staff Report

Public Comment: None

## 8. SFPUC Communications

- [FY 2023-24 2nd Quarter Budget Report](#)
- [FY 2023-24 Overtime Supplemental](#)
- Water Enterprise
  - [Water Supply Conditions Update \(April 1, 2024\)](#)
  - [2009 Water Supply Agreement Update \(March 18, 2024\)](#)
  - [Water Enterprise Miscellaneous Fee](#)

- [Hetch Hetchy Capital Improvement Program, FY 2023-24 Q2](#)
- Wastewater Enterprise
  - [Wastewater Enterprise Miscellaneous Fees](#)
  - [Wastewater Capital Programs Quarterly Report, FY 20-2024 Q2](#)
  - [Adopt Rules and Regulations for Users Receiving Recycled Water Service](#)
- Power Enterprise
  - [CleanPowerSF's Draft Load Management Standards Plan](#)

Public Comment: None

## 9. Future Agenda Items and Resolutions

- [CAC Advance Calendar](#)

Public Comment: None

## 10. Announcements/Comments Please visit [www.sfpuc.org/cac](http://www.sfpuc.org/cac) for confirmation of the next scheduled meeting, agenda, and materials.

Public Comment: None

## 11. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 7:12 pm.

For more information concerning the agendas, minutes, and meeting information, please visit [www.sfwater.org/cac](http://www.sfwater.org/cac). For more information concerning the CAC, please contact via email at [cac@sfwater.org](mailto: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](mailto: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 [\[cac@sfgov.org\]](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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: [sof@sfgov.org](mailto:sof@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.