



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

MEETING MINUTES

**Tuesday, February 18, 2025
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 URL

<https://sfwater.zoom.us/j/81075508153?pwd=GxCMTuzSyJxHdg56Jh86bPe1TOZvS0.1>

Phone Dial-in

669.219.2599

Find your local number: <https://sfwater.zoom.us/j/81075508153?pwd=GxCMTuzSyJxHdg56Jh86bPe1TOZvS0.1>

Meeting ID/Passcode

810 7550 8153 / 978176

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:

Eliahu Perszyk Vice Chair (M-Large Water User)

VACANT (D9)

Cal Law (D1)

VACANT (D2)

Sally Chen (D3)

Douglas Jacuzzi (D4)

Scott Brown (D5)

Barklee Sanders (D6)

Elizabeth Steele Teshara (D7)

Amy Nagengast (D8)

VACANT (D10)

Jennifer Clary (D11)

Maika Pinkston (M-Environmental Org.)

VACANT (M-Regional Water Customers)

Jodi Soboll (M-Engineering/Financial)

Andrea Baker (B-Small Business)

Michelle Pierce (B-Environ. Justice)

D = District Supervisor appointed, M = Mayor 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 5:46 pm

Present (10): Perszyk, Chen, Jacuzzi, Sanders, Steele Teshara, Nagengast, Clary, Pinkston, Soboll, Brown.

Absent (3): Law, Baker, Pierce

Daniel L. Lurie
Mayor

Kate H. Stacy
President

Joshua Arce
Vice President

Avni Jamdar
Commissioner

Steve Leveroni
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.



Staff/Presenters: Commissioner Vice President Arce

Members of the Public: Tom Smegal (BAWSCA) and Jason Foster

2. Approve [January 21, 2025](#), Minutes

Motion was made (Clary) and was seconded (Soboll) to approve the January 21, 2025, minutes.

Approved without objection.

Public Comment: None

3. Report from the Chair

- Welcome members, staff, and the public
- Ohlone Tribal Land Acknowledgement
- Vice Chair Perszyk proposed to move item 6 and 7 up on the agenda. Members unanimously approved the proposed changes on the agenda without objection.

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: Amendment to the SFPUC CAC Rules of Order, Vice Chair Eliahu Perszyk

Motion was made (Clary) and Seconded (Soboll) to approve the amendment.

The amendment to the CAC Rules of Order section VI was approved without objection.

Public Comment: None

6. Discussion and Possible Action: CAC Officer Elections, Eliahu Perszyk, CAC Vice Chair

Member Soboll nominated Vice Chair Perszyk for Chair and nominated herself for Vice Chair. The nominations were accepted.

Member Pinkston nominated herself as Secretary. The nomination was accepted.

Motion was made (Clary) and seconded (Brown) to vote for the full slate of Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary.

Eli Perszyk is elected for Chair, Jodi Soboll is elected for Vice Chair, and Mikah Pinkston is elected for Secretary by the following vote:

The full slate for Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary was approved without objection.

Public Comment: None

7. Discussion: Commissioner Visit, SFPUC Commissioner, Vice President Joshua Arce

- **Member Perszyk** thanked Commissioner Vice President Arce for attending tonight's meeting, participating in the previous Full CAC meeting, and asked if there was anything Commissioner Vice President Arce would like to discuss before the prepared Q&A segment.
- **Commissioner Arce** introduced himself as Vice President of the Commission and has sat on the Commission since October of 2024 as the ratepayer advocate, seat 2. He has background as a civil rights lawyer and was involved in community organizing, labor organizing and spent some years in government. He likes being around people and being accountable to constituents and advocates and appreciates the work and involvement the CAC members are doing. Commissioner Arce commented he appreciated receiving a list of questions and topics that CAC members would like to discuss at tonight's meeting, and he has initiated conversations with staff and is looking forward to bringing information from the CAC to staff. Commissioner Arce commented that he is particularly interested in what is happening in Treasure Island and there are advocates like Member Sanders and Member Soboll, with the support of all CAC members who wrote the resolution. There is a tenacious advocate, District 6 Supervisor Matt Dorsey, who brought up Treasure Island immediately and was empathetic that Treasure Island is a community who gets neglected and left behind from the City and is treated as a separate part of the City when in fact, it is part of the City and in time, it will have an additional 20,000 residents which is the equivalent of a quarter of a supervisor district. Supervisor Dorsey's words resonate in his head "Do right by the Island". Commissioner Arce stated that the SFPUC's largest customer and representing 2/3 of the customers is the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency (BAWSCA), who's current CEO is Tom Segal. Commissioner Arce also stated that in the CAC Annual Update to the Commission the former CAC Chair Moises García presented to the Commissioners on January 14, where affordability was one of the priorities presented and advised that people watch a presentation on the midyear budget. Commissioner Arce commented he appreciated staff presenting on water hybrid rates for water and wastewater where for the next several decades are projected to have a significant amount of headroom below the affordability target. This year, due to the way the SFPUC is recalibrating affordability going forward that is mostly driven by capital expenditures and debt services, the SFPUC is headed toward hitting that affordability line sooner rather than later. It is estimated to be a 12.5% rate increase projected in 7 years from now. Commissioner Arce appreciates General Manager Herrera and the Finance Team providing the information about affordability to the Commission such as the affordability resolution and policy. As the ratepayer advocate on the body, he did ask that the SFPUC have a robust process when it comes to affordability and informed other Commissioners that he would be discussing this with the

CAC members and wants an all-hands-on deck to collectively look at the options to avoid the 12.5% ratepayer increase. Toward the end of the city's budget process, Commissioner Vice President Arce would like to have as many stakeholders as possible understand what the trade-offs are and help advise the agency, both leadership, who has supported this, and the Commission.

Member Nagengast commented that the Rate Fairness Board sets the rates and provides advice and there is a distinction between what they do and see and what CAC does and sees. The CAC has been involved in some of the wraparound, but the rates are set by the Rate Fairness Board. The CAC can support another body working on transparency as well.

Member Clarry responded there is also an ordinance as well because the ordinance and the Rate Fairness Board was created by the same ballot measure.

Member Sanders commented the Rate Fairness Board does not apply to Treasure Island and are not treated the same. Treasure Island does not have any advocates in the ratepayer space and there is no oversight at the Federal, State, and local level. Treasure Island is usually left off maps.

- **Member Perszyk** asked if there was a question that Commissioner Vice President Arce would like to start with and stated that Treasure Island is saved for last because it will be a larger discussion item.

Member Sanders commented that Treasure Island is the most important question and currently Treasure Island is experiencing a gas outage that has lasted 4 days where residents have not been able to cook, heat water and their homes for 4 days. There has not been an emergency declared and there is nothing more important than having gas and electricity in our homes, especially on an island in the middle of the Bay. There is nothing more important than providing reliable electricity to some of the poorest people in San Francisco that are majority Black and is frustrated that after 4 to 5 years, SFPUC is not doing the bare minimum for residents. There is no excuse for a gas outage lasting 4 days and no excuse for the 4 power outages this year and this topic should be put first on the discussion.

Member Perszyk responded having the question go last does not change the importance and the intent was to allow more time to fully discuss the topic, especially since it has four sub questions and as a committee it is clearly a priority.

- **Question 1** About a year ago the Full CAC passed a resolution [REGARDING EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATIONS AND POWER OUTAGES ON TREASURE ISLAND](#) to address the ongoing power outages on Treasure Island. The resolution urges the Commission and Board of Supervisor to push TIDA towards a full inspection of the grid on TI, and to work with TIDA to find the funding to upgrade the grid.
 - What are your thoughts on the situation at Treasure Island and how can SFPUC help?

- Given the frequent and prolonged outages on Treasure Island, how will you advocate for a solution to these power outages, and what does a solution look like?
- Is what's laid out in the resolution feasible?
- Can SFPUC at a minimum agree to move from reactive repairs to a preventative maintenance model?

Commissioner Arce responded in respect to the last 4 days, the gas leak started as a natural gas leak and was originally notified as a gas leak impacting 0 – 50 residents then it worsened. In 2 days, it was affecting 50 – 100 and as he is reading through documents and internal conversations to understand what is happening, he learned the SFPUC is responsible for the gas at Treasure Island. For him this is part of trying to understand what the long-term plan to address the infrastructure if the SFPUC were to receive the \$15 million dollars that is stated in the resolution. On the website www.treasureislandsfpoweroutages.com, there is reference to a \$115 million dollar infrastructure allocation through certificates of participation. Currently, he does not know whether the \$15 million dollars allocated by Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) specifically for electricity reliability has been spent or not. Through his personal work with the City, he understands the lack of clarity of Treasure Island.

Member Sanders asked if the Commissioner if he can provide a rundown of why the issue is legitimately not getting solved. Member Sanders commented he went to the federal level where they are not providing oversight, then went to the State and the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has no oversight. The SFPUC does not have the ability unless the SFPUC declares a state of emergency. If the situation that is occurring in Treasure Island were to happen at 525 Golden Gate Avenue, it would be considered an emergency and there would be backup generators. The reason nothing is getting done and hasn't been done for 25 years is because no one within the City, State or Federal level is liable. There are no regulations that are abided because the City owns the grid and the CPUC does not want to get involved. Earlier this week, Member Sanders commented he talked to folks through the North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC) and the Regional Bulk Distribution System, and they state they have no oversight. The reason being the SFPUC has the skill but does not have the will to declare an emergency like they did in 2017 because no one wants to solve the problem. The Mayor does not want to solve the problem. When a Presidential Declaration State of Emergency was declared, and the City was eligible for Federal Emergency Management Agency funding, (FEMA), other parts of the City asked for funds, but \$0 dollars went to Treasure Island due to TIDA's lack of asking even though they were included in the declaration. This area has already been hit with 5 power outages this year and 20+ last year and 20 the year before so they are experiencing one outage every other week. The real issue is the Mayor, Board of Supervisors and people who do not care about the Black and Brown people that live on Treasure Island.

Member Soboll further responded the agreement has absolutely no oversight. This agreement is the only one like it and is unacceptable because every place else does have some level of oversight.

Member Perszyk further responded this is how the resolution was developed. Members try to find a way to have something changed from its current state and asked to hear Commissioner Vice President Arce's thoughts on the resolution.

Member Sanders further responded they purposely set up the agreement this way. If you look at land use transfers, the City purposely only transfers the land that is new development, so they are not labile as the SFPUC to upgrade the old infrastructure.

Member Pinkston asked if the people living on Treasure Island are paying 30% of their income and are in Section 8 housing. She continued and stated if someone is paying for these residents to live out there, 9 out of 10 times, it is U.S Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD)

Member Sanders responded it is one of the poorest populations and the City pushed the people out there and now just don't maintain the grid and HUD and other programs are involved. There is a 50% market rate housing that is rent controlled.

- **Member Pinkston** stated that this is similar to what his happening in Bayview Hunter's Point where the Black community is being neglected because no one wants to deal with the issues of the Black community. If HUD is involved, then whoever is receiving funding is committing fraud because they are receiving the funds to ensure the safety of these people within the regulations and guidelines of HUD. If this is not happening, then it is time to contact HUD so that this can be stopped immediately. This funding allows for people to get paid allowing residents of Treasure Island to die who are Black and Brown. It is now time to bring in leaders, herself included, and let communities know this is happening because this is unacceptable.
- **Member Sanders** responded he would personally fund a lawsuit to sue the City. If he can find a lawyer that is willing to step up to do this because this is a Civil Rights issue. The difference between the Bayview and Treasure Island is that Treasure Island is legally set up as an entity that has no oversight. If you were to look at an org chart, Treasure Island is not within the same org chart, it is nestled under the City Administrator's department. This was purposely designed like redlining.
- **Commissioner Arce** commented that the buck stops with the SFPUC and what he would like to do tonight is gather information, share some thoughts, and have a strategy. He is committing himself to an action plan as a commissioner because he cares about this issue. He knows that Supervisor Dorsey cares and so does this agency and fellow commissioners. One question he had was understanding the genesis of the resolve clause around the SFPUC and identifying the public agency with authority over TIDA. It is important to say the SFPUC staff and Commissioners have the responsibility for the grid and responsibility for the service of gas. Part of improving transparency and public engagement is for the agency to avail itself to these conversations. He has been proud of what he's seen as a commissioner in terms of asking

questions around getting public dashboards like the Community Benefits program. When asking questions, Staff has been able to answer questions and guide them to resources. This issue is a big test because there is a lot of hurt and a lot of being pointed in different directions. He thanked Member Sanders, who is a success story of Treasure Island and has gained skills in technology and innovation trying to give it back to the community and asked if there has been a comprehensive inspection done as stated in the resolution.

Member Sanders responded that it hasn't been done, and it will never be done because that will require action and a price point to fix the infrastructure. The SFPUC has never generated a report to determine what the actual costs to do medial updates. They have been deflecting and if the City does not want to fund the upgrades, let someone else fund it.

Member Soboll responded that the comprehensive inspection is a big ask and part of the CAC resolution states to look at the data and see where it should start. Maybe there is certain equipment that breaks frequently so inspecting that equipment is a start. The SFPUC has data on every repair that has been done in these years so looking at that and figuring out where to focus and prioritize.

Member Perszyk responded that currently the way things are set up is reactive where if things break, it gets fixed, which is the process set up by TIDA. However, this is not how it is done in the rest of the City. There is no desire to invest in these communities because the response has been to wait until a real estate developer comes in and emphasized the sub-question of whether the SFPUC can commit to move to a preventive maintenance model.

Commissioner Arce stated that his hunch is Treasure Island needs a new grid.

Member Perszyk responded Power Assistant General Manager (AGM) Hale has mentioned it is not just running a new grid.

Member Sanders responded that it is because this is what was done for Yerba Buena Island when they installed a new multi-million-dollar condo. They wasted money to run a power line by the community that has been there for 25 years, and they tore it down within 2 years. The SFPUC does have the skill and money to do so.

- **Member Pinkston** asked why we are using TIDA and why are we not using PG&E.

Member Perszyk responded that there is an agreement in place.

- **Commissioner Arce** commented he wants to be fair and respectful to the SFPUC Staff as much as he is hearing frustration and the lack of action. When he saw Treasure Island has already experienced 4 power outages in 2025, it is a real issue. However, he does want to give SFPUC Staff the benefit of the doubt when he goes back to staff to get

answers. He wants to propose an action plan that is formulated with feedback from CAC members, and he wants to keep a fair and open mind on the responses he will be hearing from staff. Currently, the City is trying to obtain energy independence by acquiring the PG&E grid. The consequence of not doing this is stalling our ability to open the doors of brand-new affordable housing for low-income residents, former unhoused residents, and folks who we are seeking to support and sustain in the City because we cannot get PG&E to turn on the lights. What he has learned with conversations from affordable housing advocates is that PG&E will leverage the SFPUC and for the SFPUC to bypass PG&E, it requires us to build our own grid on top of a grid. He anticipates when he begins questioning, something similar will arise. However, this does not explain why the SFPUC has not produced a response to the request for a plan by July 2024 which is 5 months after the resolution.

Member Clary further responded that what this is dealing with is a basic case of institutional racism and it is more recent than most because the agreement was signed, they said they were not going to replace power for the communities in existing housing because that housing is going to go away and they have no responsibility to replace, and the governance model was created to aid developers. There was some litigation but none of it was successful.

Member Soboll commented this is why the CAC is pushing for the maintenance and preventative maintenance because while everyone agrees a new grid is needed, contractually it is not happening and are still needing to deal with the current grid to stop all these maintenance problems.

Member Sanders commented if the SFPUC can build a brand- new building, it has the financial resources to maintain the grid on Treasure Island.

- **Member Brown** commented he wants to make sure the conversation is focused on creating a solution with Commissioner Arce and currently the three points the CAC has come up to create a solution are the following: 1. A feasibility study 2. A report on how to make it better and 3. An emergency declaration and asked if there are any additional points that the SFPUC specifically and the Mayor could do to come up with a solution.

Member Sanders commented it should include an emergency declaration because anything else than that will not open the resources and bypass Robert Beck. If this is not included, no action will be taken because in 2017, when the last emergency declaration was signed by the head of the SFPUC, it unlocked funding to buy two new generators for Treasure Island and take ownership of the grid completely now through land use rules so that the SFPUC can use the funding like it has for the multi-million-dollar condos. There is a specific reason why the City did not do a land transfer. Currently, when the SFPUC wants to upgrade something, TIDA director Robert Beck needs to approve it and if he does not approve, it does not get done. The SFPUC should control every city part of the grid because Treasure Island is the only part of the

city-owned grid that is sectioned out for the responsibility of TIDA and TIDA should release the liability and oversight of the grid to the SFPUC or the SFPUC should ask to do that because anything less will keep the status quo in power.

- **Member Perszyk** asked Commissioner Arce what is feasible and what the plan of action should be considering he is only 1 of 5 Commissioners.

Commissioner Arce responded Thursday marks 1 year since this resolution has passed and asked if there has been a response from the agency.

Staff Moncrease responded that the CAC is an advisory body and is here to make recommendations to the general manager, Board of Supervisors and Commissioners and there is no enforcement authority behind the resolution, it is more of a show of support.

- **Commissioner Arce** responded in fairness on an issue as important as to this where outages last year went up to 23 and this year it is on track to surpass this; his first thought is to ask the SFPUC to respond to the resolution. He found a 2022 SFPUC report that details the plans for system improvements and there is language on that report detailing TIDA owns the electrical system and contracts with the SFPUC to operate and maintain the grid. In 2022, TIDA authorized a series of improvements, and it is appropriate for the SFPUC to acknowledge this is a problem and for TIDA as well since they have hired the SFPUC to maintain and operate the grid. If the problem is on TIDA authorizing improvements, the SFPUC as the contractor can be proactive. This will be a public issue because Supervisor Dorsey will be engaging members of the public and others and there is a new Mayor who finds out this is still a lingering issue will be expected to engage. He will ask the agency to provide a response to the CAC with respect to the resolution and asked what TIDA is whether a Board of Directors or leadership.

Member Perszyk responded that this is a high priority for the CAC, and it seems this is a high priority item for Commissioner Arce and time is needed to do research and get responses from various stakeholders and asks if Commissioner Arce can keep the CAC informed of his investigations and have this as a future agenda item to follow up and understand what is feasible. Member Perszyk asked Commissioner Vice President Arce what a reasonable time frame is.

Commissioner Arce responded what is laid out in the resolution seems feasible and is unsure about the emergency declaration and would like to see the circumstances that led to the July 25, 2017, emergency declaration. The driving theme of the resolution is information and communication which seems very feasible, and it seems the request for the SFPUC to move from a reactive to preventative maintenance model seems reasonable with the caveat that there should be nothing wrong for or should stop the SFPUC from stating what the short-term solution and long-term solutions are. If TIDA has the \$15 million dollars and has access to the additional potential \$115 million dollars allocated, then there will be a conversation that follows what the SFPUC recommendations are. He proposes the following four items: 1. SFPUC

respond to the CAC's resolution 2. Within the context of that response, provide the SFPUC's opinion on what is necessary to address in 2025 for what is headed to be a record year of power outages in the island 3. A long-term preventative maintenance model that will provide the needs to Treasure Island and 4. until that response is met, he will come back every month to provide and update the best he can with the information that has been provided to him.

Member Soboll commented the resolution was reviewed by some staff at the PUC and agreed to the dates written in the resolution.

Commissioner Arce responded that he appreciates the information and wants to give the benefit of the doubt. He respects the hard work of the SFPUC leadership and hard-working staff.

- **Member Perszyk** responded in the case Commissioner Arce is not able to attend the CAC meeting, he may provide an update through Staff Moncrease.

Commissioner Arce responded that he doesn't imagine not receiving a response from SFPUC leadership and staff between now and next month.

- **Member Sanders** responded with appreciation for Commissioner Vice President Arce being one of the first to commit to real action and responses and apologized for his behavior as he has been extremely frustrated for the past 4 to 5 years because this is a personal issue and he experienced over 120 power outages and through COVID no one in the City would listen or help when he is asking for basic reliable electricity, water and gas.

Commissioner Arce responded it is not unreasonable to expect, and it is what the residents deserve.

- **Member Jacuzzi** responded with appreciation for Member Sanders bringing up this issue multiple times over the years and the umbrella thought is the Commission engagement with the CAC and the CAC not being able to get the attention of the Commission. If the CAC were to have a greater engagement with the Commission as a body, the CAC could be more effective.
- **Question 2:** What steps is the Commission taking to improve transparency and public engagement?

Commissioner Arce responded SFPUC leadership is embracing the call around improving transparency and to look at the budget conversation that recently took place because there was a breadth of information provided around finances. At the end of the Commission meeting, he asked as an agency, to what extent are staff going out to the CAC, going to different community councils to do outreach and there is a strong social media presence and the SFPUC is present at a lot of different events, however, there is opportunity for learning and growth.

- **Question 3:** Can you provide an overview of changes in financial risk to the SFPUC from the current federal administration?

Commissioner Arce responded he does not know what the financial risks of the current federal administration are. Looking at the lawsuit that is in front the Supreme Court at the moment waiting for decision, it was the first time the Trump Administration attacked us and our combined sewer overflows and there could potentially be political discourse that impacts us and the Mayor has a strategy where we are still waiting on COVID reimbursement funds which are going to have a big impact on the City's budget and there will be impact on the ways the SFPUC uses federal funding for some of the elements of our capital plan and if capital projects are the number one driver of projected rate increases and the colliding of our affordability line, the loss of any Federal funding would rely upon those capital investments have adverse impact on rates.

- **Question 4:** As the current SFPUC approach to the Tuolumne River in-stream flows in drought years is insufficient to support salmon populations, and strategies of habitat restoration and predator control are limited in capacity to support these populations, how can the SFPUC identify a new approach that will increase in-stream flows in drought years?

Commissioner Arce thanked members of the public, Peter Drekmeier and Dave Warner who often send communications on this topic and Tom Smegal's feedback through BAWSCA. He continued that this is related to the way the SFPUC plans the design drought scenario and the way we draw from the river. Two Commission meetings ago, Water AGM Steve Ritchie presented a breakdown of how we project for our water needs and there was a quote presented from former Commissioner Anson Moran that paraphrased said there is no such thing as being too conservative preparing for the regions water needs in terms of how much we are going to need in the future and planning for an emergency in a drought and brought up a corollary that is 1 end of the spectrum where there is no limit to being conservative in terms of how much water is needed to be saved and the other end is to take only what you need because to exceed creates a negative impact for the environment, biodiversity and ultimately for rates and the challenge is not getting this wrong. The agency plans for 8.5 years of drought and feedback from other agencies maybe that it is too mega of a drought and with what is ahead in terms of climate change, the agency cannot get this wrong. The Commission has highlighted their desire to be versed in this planning process and understand when the SFPUC plans for draws away from the rivers.

Member Perszyk responded that even if the habitat is restored if there is no water the baby fish die, then all the fish die. If there is more habitat then there is going to be more water because the land will pull the water instead of it being taken away. In drought years, this is still an issue because the river flows get down to 12 to 13% and everything dies.

Member Clary responded that Commissioner Vice President Arce response sounds briefed by the Irrigation Districts because since the turn of the century, we have had 3 mega droughts that's created a huge problem because typically a water agency will plan for 3 drought years out of 10 and if during the drought years, the agency pulls a little extra water for use taking it away from the environment, the idea is the fish will recover but they don't have time to recover because of the recurring droughts and the discussion on habitat and predatory fish doesn't address the basic issue that the climate has changed and the need to change water management so entire species are not destroyed. Every water agency over 3,000 connections have to file an urban water management plan every 5 years which SFPUC staff are working on it now and it is a requirement to have a drought contingency plan where it is a rolling 5-year requirement to show where your water supply is going to come from. An 8.5-year drought is a relic of the last century and the SFPUC needs to start thinking about the rolling 5-year drought and at what point does it take water away from the fish because it cannot be left at 10 to 12% because in 3 years there will be no salmon.

Member Perszyk further commented that this will be a Full CAC meeting topic this year and is looking into direct potable reuse water in the next 8 to 10 years and if we are making more water, can we put more water back into the river.

Member Clary commented that if flows are released into the river, there is State requirement that San Francisco is responsible for 51%.

- **Member Soboll** asked what this means.

Member Clary responded even though San Francisco only receives about 10% of the flow, they must disproportionately pay for additional releases.

- **Commissioner Arce** asked what portion of his response sounded briefed by the Irrigation Districts.

Member Clary responded the predatory fish response is the standard response and the idea that you replace water with habitat is a classic voluntary agreement response.

- **Member Perszyk** asked if there were any additional comments or questions.

CAC members all thanked Commissioner Vice President Arce for the discussion.

Public Comment: None

8. Staff Report

- There are vacancies in Districts 2, 9 and 10

Public Comment: None

9. SFPUC Communications

- [SFPUC Wildfire Mitigation Plan 2024](#)
- [Capital Financing Plan FY 2024-25](#)
- [Quarterly Audit and Performance Report, FY 2023-24, Q4](#)
- [Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan 2025 Update](#)
- Water Enterprise
 - [Water Supply Conditions Update \(September 3, 2024\)](#)
 - [Water Enterprise Capital Improvement Program Report, FY 2023-24, Q4](#)
 - [Hetch Hetchy Capital Improvement Program Report, FY 2023-24, Q3](#)
 - [Alternative Water Supply Annual Progress Report](#)
 - [Alternative Water Supply Planning Annual Progress Report](#)
 - [2009 Water Supply Agreement Quarterly Update](#)
 - [Onsite Water Reuse Program Update, FY 2022-23](#)
 - [Recent Wastewater Enterprise Bond Sale Results](#)
 - [Supplemental Appropriation of Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response \(ESER\) 2010 and 2014 General Obligation Bonds Interest Earnings](#)
 - [Water System Improvement Program Annual Report](#)
- Wastewater Enterprise
 - [Water Enterprise Capital Improvement Program Update, FY 2023-24, Q3](#)
- Power Enterprise
 - [CleanPowerSF Update, FY 2023-24, Q4](#)
 - [PG&E Interconnection Report, FY 2023-24, Q4](#)

Public Comment: None

10. Future Agenda Items and Resolutions

- [CAC Advance Calendar](#)

Public Comment: None

11. Announcements/Comments Please visit www.sfpuc.org/cac for confirmation of the next scheduled meeting, agenda, and materials.

- State Bill SB 350 was introduced to establish a statewide low-income rate assistance program.
- **Member Pinkston** responded she would like to do a donation drive to get residents blankets and socks since it is the coldest winter.

Member Sanders responded that portable backup batteries would have a direct impact since it would allow residents to run heaters and heated blankets.

Public Comment: None

12. Adjournment at 7:14pm

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