San Francisco Water Power Sewer
Services of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

525 Golden Gate Avenue, 13th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
T 415.554.3155
F 415.554.3161

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

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Tuesday, October 20, 2026**
**5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.**
**525 Golden Gate Ave., 3rd Floor Tuolumne Conference Room**

**Zoom Recording:**
https://sfwater.zoom.us/rec/share/rOrsYOMvmNqFkZpNcoWGBtIfyE79h21TzhtvLsoHju7VG2BGGlzbQdmwOkST0lFe.YAP-2eOconFxvO0M

**Meeting Passcode**
292861

**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:***

| | |
|---|---|
| **Douglas Jacuzzi (Chair) (D4)** | VACANT (D10) |
| Cal Law (D1) | Jennifer Clary (D11) |
| Erin Roach (D2) | VACANT (B-Small Business) |
| Sally Chen (D3) | Arthine Cossey van Duyne (B-Environ. Justice) |
| Lila Holzman (D5) | Katie Zheng (M-Large Water User) |
| Alex Francois (D6) | Sarah Atkinson (M-Environmental Org.) |
| Julia Hernandez (D7) | Thomas Smegal (M-Regional Water Customers) |
| Amy Nagengast (D8) | Loretta Dickerson-Smith (M-Engineering/Financial) |
| Aaron Hebert (D9) | |

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

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

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call at 5:32 pm**
   Present (9): Jacuzzi, Law, Chen, Holzman, Hernandez, Nagengast, Clary, Cossey van Duyne, Zheng.

   Absent (6): Roach, Francois, Hebert, Atkinson, Smegal, Dickerson-Smith.

   Staff/Presenters: Commissioner Kate Stacy, Mallory Albright, Grace Kay

   Members of the public: Eileen Boken, Anonymous

   Ohlone Tribal Land Acknowledgement

**Daniel Lurie**
Mayor

**Stephen E. Leveroni**
President

**Kate H. Stacy**
Vice President

**Avni Jamdar**
Commissioner

**Meghan Thurlow**
Commissioner

**Joshua Arce**
Commissioner

**Dennis J. Herrera**
General Manager

2. **Approve September 15, 2026, Meeting Minutes**
   A motion was made (Clary) and seconded (Cossey van Duyne) to approve the September 15, 2026, Meeting Minutes.

   The minutes were approved without objection.

   Public Comment: None.

3. **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.
   - **Eileen Boken** commented the SFPUC is the only city department which has exclusive charge which is an exclusive authority and dates back to 2002. This limits oversight by the Board of Supervisors and other external bodies. This can be seen as a major factor in the SFPUC's questionable policies and financial decisions. When the City recently asked departments for their "pain points", one of SFPUC's responses was the need to expand exclusive charge provisions. This is not the way for SFPUC to regain the trust of the public. In a list of 115 "pain points", the CAC are 89 and 90, and the Rate Fairness Board are 91 and 92. Not all of these are minor changes and once again this is not the way for the SFPUC to regain the public's trust.

4. **Report from the Chair**
   - Welcome members, staff, and the public
   - The Full CAC Chair presented the Salmon Resolution to the SFPUC Commission on 10/13/2026 and had good public comment at the SFPUC commission topic on the agenda item.

5. **Discussion: SFPUC General Manager Search Feedback**
   - After reviewing the resources below the Council will discuss potential challenges the next PUC GM may face in the new role. The Council will also discuss any qualifications they see as important for the role.
   - *Resources:*
     - SFPUC General Manager Job Description & Posting
     - Department of Human Resource (DHR) Executive Recruitment Process Presentation to the Commission (Presented on July 14, 2026)
     - July 14, 2026, Commission Meeting Recording
     - SFPUC General Manager Recruitment Survey Questions (Closed on October 9, 2026)
     - SFPUC General Manager Survey Results

   *Discussion:*
   - **Member Holzman** commented that her understanding is applicants fill out the survey and asked if this is correct and what it is for.

     **Commissioner Stacy** responded there were two surveys, one went to SFPUC staff, and one was made available to the public, which produced over 200 responses from staff and just under 100 from the public. There is a consultant CPS HR who brought together all the results of the survey and provided the Commission with a summary, and this will be posted online.

     **Member Holzman** asked if the idea behind the survey is that it will inform the search based on the top listed priorities and the evaluation of candidates.

**Commissioner Stacy** responded it will inform the commissioners as to what questions to ask candidates, and they are not bound by the survey but see it as valuable information as they begin ranking and evaluating candidates.

- **Member Holzman** asked where we are in the process are and if there is a consultant selected and how many candidates have applied.

  **Commissioner Stacy** responded CPS HR was selected as the recruitment firm supporting this search. The application deadline for General Manager (GM) candidate was Friday, October 16 and does not know how many applicants applied.

- **Member Hernandez** asked if the Mayor does not agree with the candidates the SFPUC Commission recommends, can the Mayor select a candidate outside of this pool.

  **Commissioner Stacy** responded no. The Commission gives the Mayor three candidates per the City Charter and the Mayor then has to choose from this slate of candidates. The Mayor does not select someone without the recommendation of the Commission.

  **Member Chen** asked if they have a sense of the Mayor's priorities or process for making this selection.

  **Commissioner Stacy** responded the Mayor wanted the search to be as open and thorough as possible and they did not have strong direction for the Commission other than to make the search as inclusive, wide ranging and through as possible.

- **Chair Jacuzzi** asked if there is consideration of bringing in a GM who has professional technical experience in any of the three enterprises (Water, Wastewater, Power) and more connected to actual progress rather than legal ramifications of decisions being made.

  **Commissioner Stacy** responded no and the Commission only has had discussions on the public record and as a body has not given any direction on the type of person should be other than the job description.

- **Chair Jacuzzi** asked if the survey questions were generated by the Commission.

  **Commissioner Stacy** responded CPS HR generated the questions, and she is the designated point person for the Commission. She took a look at the questions and thought they were comprehensive.

- **Member Clary** asked if the CAC received a copy of the survey.

  **Staff Moncrease** responded no and it was not expressed to her there was an external survey. The external survey was distributed via social media platforms like LinkedIn, Instagram, Facebook, X.

  **Commissioner Stacy** further responded it was also available on SFPUC's website.

  **Member Clary** commented it is disappointing that there are 15 individuals who are interested in the running of the SFPUC and yet are not asked about their input.

**Member Holzman** further commented she is also disappointed to not know the survey was happening because part of the CAC's role is to help get community engagement and the CAC members could have helped promote the survey.

**Commissioner Stacy** responded this is why she is here today and wants the CAC's input and hopes input will be provided in discussion after the questions.

**Member Clary** commented if there is something going out to the public, it should be going to the CAC as well.

- **Member Clary** commented it has been almost 30 years since the last time a utility professional was in charge of the SFPUC and Ed Harrington's Deputy General Manager (DGM) was a water professional and asked if the Commission has any say in the way the Deputy General Manager is selected.

  **Commissioner Stacy** responded no.

  **Member Clary** commented her concern is that there will be another internal pick for General Manager and the Deputy General Manager decision will be another person who does not have the utility background and the SFPUC will continue to do things that other utilities may not consider like the debt load SFPUC carries. She thinks Ed Harrington had a point where it was the GM to handle the political system and as long as there is someone in the office that knows utilities, it is a good thing.

  **Member Law** commented it is reasonable to expect someone in charge to have experience with utilities.

- **Member Nagengast** asked what metrics are being used to ensure it was a broad, inclusive and representative pool.

  **Commissioner Stacy** responded they rely a lot on the consultant to make the outreach as broad as possible. She does not have a list of all the places the JD was posted but the Commission emphasized they are interested in a diverse applicant pool.

  **Member Nagengast** asked how the Commission making sure it has an applicant pool reflective of what they are looking for in an applicant pool for this position.

  **Commissioner Stacy** responded they will be looking at the applicant pool shortly and the consultant thinks they have had a robust number of applications submitted.

  **Member Nagengast** asked if there are metrics in place to quantify the applications submitted such as location, diversity, profession that it is sufficient enough to close or keep it open and do more outreach so that the applicant pool is representative of the position.

  **Commissioner Stacy** responded she is not an expert in recruitment, and the Commission wants strong qualified applicants and hope they will come from a broad range of background, and it is a tough position.

- **Member Cossey van Duyne** asked if during the consultant qualification process, were they given a task to demonstrate how they would build and do an outreach plan to reach a diverse applicant pool.

**Commissioner Stacy** responded Department of Human Resources (DHR) has a list of prequalified HR consulting firms. DHR conducted a bid process to select the firm. The Commissioners stressed they wanted firms who would reach diverse applicants. DHR selected this firm and it was the same firm that ran the Recreation and Park recruitment. The SFPUC Commission was not involved in the consulting firm selection.

- **Member Cossey van Duyne** asked if there were Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) established for success in diversity.

  **Commissioner Stacy** responded she does not know if this was established and she has not been involved in doing this.

- **Member Cossey van Duyne** commented she was also disappointed in learning about the survey tonight and right now in order to meet targets set by SFPUC in terms of diversity, inclusion and general justice about being fair there have to be measurable tools. There are tools and targets being used but this is not being used as a selection process or outreach. When the firm does its analysis on the diversity of the candidates, it would be helpful to include how things were identified because based on the survey outreach there is area for improvement and growth which are things the next GM is going to need to proactively think about to successfully lead this organization. The next GM needs to understand and be responsive that the organization can no longer operate with siloed enterprises which is sometimes to the detriment of the neighbors and the citizens deal with the consequences of the lack of collaboration.

- **Member Clary** commented it would be great to receive a report back on the diversity on the application pool and the HR firm's effort to expand the diversity in the applicant pool and the Commission's thoughts on whether there is a need to solicit more diverse applicants.

- **Chair Jacuzzi** asked what the timeline is for the selection process.

  **Commissioner Stacy** responded the Commission will meet in closed session this Friday, the 23rd to review the pool of candidates with the consulting firm and DHR. There is another meeting scheduled for the first week of November to begin the interview process. This depends on the Commission's thought on the applicant pool.

- **Member Clary** commented there is a lack of diversity in leadership amongst the utility sector and city departments tend to hire from within, however, many managers and executive leadership will be retiring soon so it makes it more important to have utility expertise in the GM's office.

  **Member Chen** commented the Commission being able to answer the question how diversity in an open application process is important because once the process is done the Commission can say it's done its due diligence and be able to concretely point it out.

- **Member Cossey van Duyne** asked if the process is currently between step 4 and 5.

  **Commissioner Stacy** responded yes.

- **Member Clary** asked between step 5 and 6, will candidates be narrowed based on a measure or if anyone who is deemed qualified be invited to interview.

**Commissioner Stacy** responded the Commission is relying on the HR firm to sort through preliminarily who are not qualified at all and will help sort through the applications. They also conduct preliminary interviews to help sort through qualifications of candidates. The Commission may not interview every candidate.

- **Member Hernandez** commented she works at the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII) and one of their practices to ensure diverse contracting portfolio for a project is to give first consideration to local and minority businesses and asked if there is any first consideration given in the selection of the GM.

  **Commissioner Stacy** responded the Commission has not established a rubric like that at this point since this is a difficult position to fill and it may not be adequate to evaluate the candidates in a similar fashion to how contracting is done.

  **Member Hernandez** commented she understands the difficulty and what she likes about first consideration is that when comparing two applicants, there is consideration given to the one that is local or a minority business.

  **Commissioner Stacy** asked what first consideration means.

  **Member Hernadez** commented it is when you have a pool of candidates that are at the same level, they are considered for their diverse qualities and given extra points so they can bring their diverse perspective.

  **Member Holzman** asked if this happens when candidates are equally qualified in other ways.

  **Member Hernandez** commented yes.

- **Member Holzman** asked is the idea that the Commission will be informed by the results of the survey since the hiring firm has been narrowing the candidates using other qualifications.

  **Commissioner Stacy** responded CPS HR has been managing the survey so they have the information and so will Commissioners.

  **Member Holzman** commented the priorities listed in the survey are interrelated and climate should be embedded within the other categories and the “either or” strikes her as challenging and it is important that the incoming GM be able to think strategically beyond the current issues in front of them and break down the silos. Treasure Island should also be listed as a priority for the incoming GM and should include a question about this topic during the interview process and PG&E acquisition should also be included as a priority. She hears questions from the community about the PG&E acquisition such as if SFPUC will actually do a better job and this GM would need to have the skillset to grow the capabilities to oversee the PG&E acquisition.

- **Member Nagengast** asked how the internal and external surveys were different.

  **Commissioner Stacy** responded they were identical.

- **Member Cosey van Duyne** commented she wonders which of the review entities consider how a candidate aligns with the Mayor’s priorities as opposed to the utility’s priorities as opposed the community’s priorities. The SFPUC touches communities and

land beyond San Franciso, and the Mayor will likely only be thinking about how this position impacts San Francisco.

**Commissioner Stacy** responded this is a big and important question and since the Mayor needs to select from the Commission's selection, this incorporates both points of view. The Commission and the Mayor both hear from and care about the communities impacted by SFPUC.

**Member Cossey van Duyne** thanked Commissioner Stacy for her response and commented she does this because if this survey was only responded by a few number of people, SFPUC touches beyond San Franciso and wonders if the communities outside of San Franscico impacted by the SFPUC got the survey to provide input on the next GM and to get their input the SFPUC needs to go to them so the comment provided by Commissioner Stacy may be heartfelt by the Commission but the action does not match the sentiment. The GM has more at stake than the fiscal responsibility and general footprint of the agency within the 7 miles of San Francisco and feels that the Commission cannot usher up the right candidates to the Mayor the right now.

- **Chair Jacuzzi** commented he would like to see a GM who has a higher degree to Non-Government Organizations (NGOs) that look after our resources and listen to the greater voice of the public in managing our resource of water is at the core of SFPUC and it is a finite resource.

Public comment:

- **Eileen Boken** commented it has been a longstanding city practice for department heads to be treated as political patronage. The SFPUC has been no exception. To regain the trust of the public, the Commission should focus on candidates within depth utility industry experience. As the SFPUC GM JD states beginning in paragraph 2 sentence 2, "This person will bring credibility." This begs the question of whether this person can come from within or should it come in externally. In an internal HR survey conducted pre-pandemic and presented to the Commission, many SFPUC employees believe it is an echo chamber. SFPUC should also stop trying to sue its way out of everything: it sued the State over the Bay Delta Plan; it sued the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) which went to the Supreme Court and weakened the Clean Water Act nationally. SFPUC should deal with the environmental issues. 30 percent of SFPUC's operating budget is debt services and in less than 5 years, it will 50 percent. This brings the issue of exclusive charge.

6. **Presentation and Discussion:** **The Future of the Diablo Canyon Power Plant**, Mallory Irene Albright, Regulatory & Legislative Affairs, Power Enterprise

*Resources:*

- **SFPUC Resolution No. 20-0153**

*Presentation*:

- The Future of the Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP)
- About the Diablo Canyon Power Plant
- Nuclear Regulato5ry Commission's (NRC) Role
- Controversies Surrounding Diablo Canyon
- Public Support and Benefits
- Decommissioning Attempt
- August 2020 Rotating Outages
- SB 846 (Statues of 2022) Extension of Operations

- Impacts to CleanPowerSF Ratepayers
- 2026 NRC Relicensing
- Political Assessment of the Future of Diablo Canyon
- State's Outlook for Load Growth
- Rising Procurement Costs on the Horizons
- Benefits, Drawbacks, and Unknowns
- Thank you!
- Further Reading

Discussion:

- **Member Law** asked if in the decommissioning attempt, was there anything identified to replace Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP).

  **Staff Albright** responded she is not familiar with the joint accord, and we know we have 100 percent greenhouse gas free goals by 2045, and we had increasing renewable portfolio standard, she suspects lawmakers did not intend to keep this plant online.

  **Staff Kay** further responded there is something in the state legislation that directs the CPUC in anticipation of decommission DCPP, the CPUC was ordered not to include the energy from DCPP into state planning and buildout of renewables to meet state goals. The idea was we would accelerate renewable energy to replace capacity DCPP provided.

- **Member Holzman** asked if this means if you are a CleanPowerSF customer, the electricity you are paying for does not include DCPP.

  **Staff Albright** responded yes, the power contracted for CleanPowerSF customers has no nuclear energy included.

  **Member Clary** asked if this was a paper decision.

  **Staff Albright** responded yes.

- **Member Clary** commented we have made significant progress in renewable energy since 2020.

  **Staff Albright** responded yes and we are seeing unprecedent delays which comes from the tariffs because the electric market has been deregulated.

  **Staff Kay** further responded the California Independent System Operator (CAISO) queue for the renewable sources is pretty clogged right now. All the CCAs are building a lot in order to meet goals.

  **Member Clary** asked how much time is needed.

  **Staff Albright** responded it depends on the circumstances and there are many factors working against us.

- **Member Holzman** asked if the extensions mentioned are just until 2045.

  **Staff Albright** responded yes.

- **Member Clary** commented right now we are paying $100 million dollars a year for PG&E executive and if they wanted to extend it for another 15 years, can we say we are not paying you another $100 million dollars for executive compensation or will we keep the same deal.
  **Staff Albright** responded this will be answered further in the presentation.

- **Member Clary** asked if there is a plan to update the CAISO infrastructure.

  **Staff Albright** responded yes.

- **Member Clary** asked if there is an ask for the CAC to do anything.

  **Staff Albright** responded no, this is just informational.

  **Staff Kay** further responded the goal of this presentation was to inform the members of the conversations around clean energy since it is evolving over time, and it would be great to hear what the community feels about this issue since CAC members are embedded in the community.

  **Member Holzman** commented it sounds like we can do something in the future, like a resolution and bill positions.

- **Chair Jacuzzi** asked if the log jam is anticipated to be a trickle.

  **Staff Albright** responded it will be a trickle. CAISO over the last years have tried to remedy interconnection queue issues.

Public Comment:

- **Eileen Boken** commented the issue with nuclear waste is it affects the coastal waters because of the hot water coming out of the plants and wasn't 2020 the year the State shut us down intentionally and PG&E will continue to rule the system.

  **Staff Albright** responded it was more the energy crisis in the 2000s and this was no supply to send West to California since the heat waves spanned so many states.

**7. Staff Report**

- No staff report

Public Comment: None.

**8. SFPUC Communications (Information Only)**

a) Future Agenda Items & Resolutions
b) Correspondence Log
c) Water Supply Conditions Update
d) Annual Alternative Water Supply Program Report
e) Annual Street Light Program Update
f) Water System Improvement Program Quarterly (Q4) Report FY 2025-26
g) Green Infrastructure Grant Quarterly Report Pursuant to Board of Supervisors Ordinance 207-24

Public Comment: None.

9. **Please visit www.sfpuc.gov/cac for announcements, comments, and confirmation of the next scheduled meeting, agenda, and materials.**

   Public comment: None.

10. **Adjournment at 7:05 pm.**

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

**Disability Access**

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

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

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

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

**ACCESO A IDIOMAS**
De acuerdo con la Ordenanza de Acceso a Idiomas “Language Access Ordinance” (Capítulo 91 del Código Administrativo de San Francisco “Chapter 91 of the San Francisco Administrative Code”) intérpretes de chino, español y/o filipino (tagalo) estarán disponibles de ser requeridos. Los minutos podrán ser traducidos, de ser requeridos, luego de ser aprobados por la comité. La asistencia en idiomas adicionales se tomará en cuenta siempre que sea posible. Para solicitar asistencia con estos servicios favor comunicarse con Lexus Moncrease al (415) 517-8465, o cac@sfwater.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@sfwater.org sa hindi bababa sa 48 oras bago mag miting. Kung maari, ang mga late na hiling ay posibleng pagbibigyan.

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

**Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)**
Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, by mail to Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244 San Francisco, CA 94102-4683; by telephone 415-554-7724, by Fax 415-554-7854, or by email: sotf@sfgov.org

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