



San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Citizens' Advisory Committee

SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, April 28, 2026

5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.

525 Golden Gate Ave., 2nd Floor O'Shaughnessy Conference Rooms B and C

Members of the public may observe and participate via Zoom virtual conference software.

Zoom meeting recording:

https://sfwater.zoom.us/rec/share/6yXv-

S\_JTz3TVNxdSw7M0p\_FYjnW8bFfJIRS1aNrOLD9N97kY2RWFj\_Rn0MhpxTt.sNXbUUufmKRDY8u

Meeting Recording Passcode:

840641

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

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

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

Joshua Arce
President

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Call to Order and Roll Call at 5:33 pm

Present (11): Jacuzzi, Law, Chen, Holzman, Hernandez, Hebert, Clary, Cossey van Duyne, Zheng, Smegal, Dickerson-Smith.

Absent (5): Roach, Sanders, Nagengast, Baker, Atkinson.

Members of the Public: Mary Butterwick, Dave Warner, Peter Drekmeier, Anonymous, Thomas Francis.

Stephen E. Leveroni
Vice President

Avni Jamdar
Commissioner

Kate H. Stacy
Commissioner

Meghan Thurlow
Commissioner

Dennis J. Herrera
General Manager



## 2. Approve [March 17, 2026, Meeting Minutes](#)

A motion was made (Clary) and seconded (Dickerson-Smith) to approve the March 17, 2026, Meeting Minutes.

The meeting 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.

Public Comment: None.

## 4. **Report from the Chair**

- Welcome members, staff, and the public
- [Ohlone Tribal Land Acknowledgement](#)
- Subcommittee Chair Appointments
  - Erin Roach is appointed Wastewater Subcommittee Chair and Aaron Hebert is appointed Water Subcommittee Chair.
- Recap of last meeting's Chair Address
- Welcome new CAC Members!

Public Comment:

- Dave Warner expressed appreciation to Jennifer Clary for her work as Water Subcommittee Chair and

## 5. **Discussion and Possible Action: CAC Officer Elections for CAC Secretary**

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

Member Hernandez is elected for Secretary by the following vote:

AYES (11): Jacuzzi, Law, Chen, Holzman, Hernandez, Hebert, Clary, Cossey van Duyne, Zheng, Smegal, Dickerson-Smith.

NOES (0):

ABSENT (5): Roach, Sanders, Nagengast, Baker, Atkinson.

Public Comment: None.

## 6. **Presentation and Discussion: [Resolution 101](#), Member Clary, Water CAC Chair**

- *Resources:*
  - [Example of Past Resolutions](#)

*Presentation:*

- How to write effective resolutions
- Who do we report to?
- What do we report on?
- PUC Objectives in City Charter
- I don't want to be a wonk! So why write a resolution?
- Whereas
- Example

- Therefore, be it resolved
- Example
- Thank you!

*Discussion:*

- **Member Holzman** commented that these seem to originate in the subcommittees and asked if the Full Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) votes on the resolutions.

**Member Clary** responded that resolutions are passed at the Full CAC, and they start in the subcommittees because that is where the specialized knowledge is. Whereas clauses are important because they are going to explain why the issue matters.

- **Member Cossey van Duyne** asked if there is a best practice among the CAC where there is a general briefing on the topic before the resolution process happens.

**Member Clary** responded yes, and the agency has become more responsive to brief the CAC on topics, and the CAC should think about what the job of a public body is to aid the agency in remaining responsive.

- **Member Holzman** commented the examples presented state “the CAC urges the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors” and asked when resolutions are passed what is the process of this resolution getting heard by anyone who has decision-making authority.

**Staff Moncrease** responded after a resolution is passed, the CAC secretary signs the cover letter to the resolution, and a copy gets sent to the Mayor, the General Manager of the SFPUC, the SFPUC Commission Secretary who passes it on to the SFPUC Commissioners, and the Board of Supervisors. Members may follow up directly with their appointing member and the SFPUC Commission to inform them the CAC has passed a resolution.

**Member Clary** further responded it is the role of the CAC members to follow up on the resolutions passed. The passed resolutions are found on the subcommittee agendas, so members know they need to follow up on it.

**Chair Jacuzzi** commented he has made it a policy for himself to follow up at the SFPUC Commission meetings to read the passed resolution to the commissioners.

**Member Law** commented they emailed their District Supervisor a copy of the resolution that was recently passed.

- **Member Cossey van Duyne** asked as the resolutions are coming to life if they also have an advocacy plan wrapped around them.

**Member Clary** responded usually yes because if you want to pass a resolution, you need to have intent and need to know how to create action and follow up. The resolution is the first step.

Public Comment: None.

**7. Presentation and Possible Action:** [Resolution on Salmon Restoration Projects](#), Member Clary, Water CAC Chair

*Discussion:*

- **Member Hebert** commented the Water Committee has discussed diversions from the Tuolumne River and the impacts on salmon population and for many, this is the principal of environmental impact on our water supply and 80-90% of the public attend CAC meetings are environmental advocates on this issue. This issue is a tradeoff between bullet proof water supply and salmon – it is not an easy issue. The Full CAC heard the presentation on the Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) and those demands drive the need for the volume and timing of water diversions.
- **Member Hebert** commented to include all wholesale customers served, the first paragraph should include “cities and Counties served by the diversions” and in the fourth paragraph; it should include that the Tuolumne Voluntary Agreement is also known as the Healthy Rivers and Landscapes Program due to the recent name change and the third paragraph, it should be changed to “that may” because there is the assertion since it is a voluntary agreement and will not get caught up in court, it is a faster way to solve this problem rather than compiling with the regulatory approach and in the further resolved clause that the wording to be changed to reflect SFPUC bi-annual budget is considered for adoption by June 2026 and a second further resolved paragraph included to reflect the public comment given at the UWMP presentation where the agency can do better at offsetting the water use and include a policy that include conservation measures that SFPUC staff can figure out how to do and a finally resolved clause should be included since the 2018 Bay Delta Plan set out some unimpaired flow standards for the Tuolumne River and set 30% as a standard of water if the damn wasn’t there and there is a season to fall-run Chinook Salmon and the CAC has received many public comments on how much water SFPUC need to store during a drought and many agencies use a five-year drought and public commenters reflect SFPUC’s math shows this drought is very unlikely to happen. .

*The first whereas clause was edited to include “Cities and Counties served by the diversions” and the third whereas clause was edited to include “that may” and the fourth whereas clause was edited to include “also known as Healthy Rivers and Landscapes Program” and the finally resolved clause was edited to include “considered for adoption in June 2026”.*

*A second further resolved clause was added Further resolved the SFPUC CAC urges the Commission to analyze then adopt a ‘net zero’ water policy that requires new development to offset its water use through conservation, mitigation fees, and other investments; and further urges BAWSCA member to conduction the same actions; and”*

*A finally resolved clause was added “SFPUC revise its design drought and drought operations to ensure an unimpaired 30% minimum flow as defined in the 2018 Bay Delta Plan , for salmon below Don Pedro dam are maintained from October through May for at least five years of the 8 ½ year design drought and flows below the minimum will not occur for more than two consecutive years in order to sustain salmon populations.”*

- **Member Holzman** commented there should be additional whereas clauses included to include more context as to why this issue matters.
- **Chair Jacuzzi** asked if the new red-lined version contains the graph in a previous draft and if it is referenced in the new draft of the resolution.

**Member Smegal** commented that the graph that could be referenced in the first paragraph and the graph does not show diversions, just salmon population and would be interested to see a graph that shows the salmon population versus the diversion because that is what is stated in the resolution.

**Member Clary** commented it could include a note that says, “see figure below” and salmon doubling goal is not discussed and should be included.

**Member Dickerson-Scott** commented this should be included as a reference so the public can have easy access to it.

- **Member Cossey van Duyne** asked if there is a graph of the design drought because the graph of doubling the salmon goal like there are targets separate from the design drought.

**Member Clary** responded there is a goal to double the salmon from the 1992 Bay Delta Plan, and we are so far below it and may be difficult to achieve so we are looking at avoiding extinction advocating to maintain salmon existence as well as customer existence.

**Member Cossey van Duyne** asked what the scenario is where if it drops below it, there will be extinction.

**Member Clary** responded that three consecutive years of low flows mean no salmon going out and no salmon coming back.

**Member Cossey van Duyne** commented this should go somewhere and make sure that the claims are supported by factual scientific evidence.

**Member Holzman** asked if footnotes should be included to cite references.

**Member Clary** responded we can but do not have to.

- **Chair Jacuzzi** commented in fifth whereas clause the Act is referenced as the “Delta Reform Act” not the “Bay-Delta Reform Act” and suggested a rewrite to include the graph.
- **Member Smegal** commented there are other sources of salmon besides the Tuolumne, and it seems the resolution is stating the Tuolumne is the cause for the commercial salmon season being closed.

**Member Clary** responded it is a contributor.

- **Chair Jacuzzi** commented that both the Stanislaus and Mokelumne River have had record runs in 2023 and 2024 in contrast the Tuolumne River and asked if the doubling goal was specific to the Tuolumne River.

**Member Clary** responded that the doubling goal is not specific to the Tuolumne River.

*The fifth whereas clause was changed to “Whereas, since the adoption of the Bay-Delta Reform Act in 2009, salmon populations in the Tuolumne River have not recovered; in fact, salmon returns have continued to decline, and we are far from reaching the State and Federal doubling goals (see figure ES-1 graph). This has contributed to the cancellation of the California commercial salmon fishing*

*season in 2023, 2024, 2025 and is now scheduled to be open only on a limited basis for 2026;” The graph ES-1 was included at the bottom of the resolution.*

- **Member Zheng** commented that fishing season was open for two weekends last year.

**Chair Jacuzzi** responded it was only for recreational use.

**Member Holzman** commented 2026 is not over yet so should it be listed.

**Chair Jacuzzi** responded 2026 season is already established.

**Member Smegal** commented it should also include cancelation of the salmon fishing season in 2008, 2009, and 2023 – 2025.

**Member Holzman** commented the resolution references the adoption of the Bay-Delta Reform Act which was adopted in 2009.

**Chair Jacuzzi** commented that this would be more appropriate in the second whereas clause because it is what initiated the 2009 Act.

**Member Clary** commented she would not include it in the second paragraph since it was run by water environmentalists and community groups who did not get much.

- **Member Smegal** commented the SFPUC budget was adopted, and no changes can be made.

**Member Clary** responded this should be clarified that it was adopted by the Commission and sent to the mayor’s office and scheduled for approval by the Board of Supervisors in June. From the presentation to the Water Subcommittee, funding is already included in the budget presentation so it should read to say it supports rather than recommends.

*The first further resolved clause was edited to “Further Resolved, the SFPUC CAC supports project funding included in the SFPUC bi-annual budget to be considered for adoption by the Board of Supervisors in June 2026;”*

- **Member Smegal** commented he does not understand what the second further resolve clause has to do with the resolution.

**Member Clary** responded to justify this further resolved clause, two whereas clauses would need to be included and the comment period for the UWMP just ended so there is not much influence now.

**Member Hebert** commented this could be a separate resolution and the reason for this clause is not to change the numbers but to have them analyze the “net-zero water policy” and this can be discussed at the Water subcommittee.

*The second further resolved clause was removed from the resolution.*

- **Member Smegal** commented in the last resolved clause, San Francisco does not have control over those items listed and they are partners with the irrigation districts and should include the language that the first whereas clause about working with its partners.

- **Member Clary** responded the SFPUC owns the design drought and are responsible for 51% of releases above the minimum flows.

*The Finally resolved clause was edited to “Finally resolved, that we the SFPUC CAC urges the SFPUC revise its design drought operations and work with the Modesto and Turlock Irrigation District...”*

- **Member Smegal** asked if the mention of the design drought in the final paragraph was necessary.

**Member Clary** responded no because the problem with the design drought is it allows water to be taken away from fish so if we are going to continue having mega droughts, there needs to be a way to ensure everyone survives it and if you are going to have design droughts, you need to make sure we are not going to have more than two years of lost salmon population.

- **Member Cossey van Duynes** asked why it needs to state how to do it.

**Member Clary** responded that the SFPUC design drought has become a bone of contention with the environmental community that we want to figure out how to create a consensus where there is understanding of why it is planned this way but should include protection for the salmon population.

- **Member Jacuzzi** asked why the recommended flows are not included in the resolution.

**Member Hebert** responded that the life cycle of fall-run Chinook is primarily during these months, and water is most needed during these months from a fishery standpoint and there are other fish like spring-run Chinook that are not included during this period. The strategy behind this finally resolved clause is to find a compromise the SFPUC is willing to make targeted to the salmon population.

- **Member Holzman** asked if this can be explained in a whereas clause.
- **Chair Jacuzzi** asked if this can be restated to include all the recommended flows during the entire year.

**Member Hebert** responded we need to think about what compromise looks like.

- **Member Holzman** commented it should include 2 to 3-year life cycle.

*A sixth whereas clause was included and read “Whereas Fall-run Chinook salmon are primarily present in the Tuolumne from October-May and have a three-year migration cycle”.*

- **Member Smegal** commented the design drought is the way they operate the system to limit the diversions of water for consumers.

**Member Clary** responded her understanding was it was more for storage than diversion.

**Member Smegal** commented there is a requirement to store a certain level that cannot be released for consumption and there will be rationing at a certain level.

**Member Clary** responded that the calculations will need to be updated.

*The finally resolved clause was changed to "...the SFPUC to update its design drought operations"*

- **Member Cossey van Duyme** suggested stating the goal of what the CAC would like and having the SFPUC figure out how to achieve it so not to tell them how to do their jobs.

**Member Clary** responded it is not telling them how to do their jobs; we are just trying to keep the salmon alive and the SFPUC has a different understanding of what is needed to keep them alive.

*The finally resolved clause was updated to include "The SFPUC should ensure..."*

- **Member Clary** commented her goal is once the resolution is passed, the SFPUC figures out how to not have low-flows for more than two years but a few more years of low-flows are needed to make the system work.

**Member Hebert** further commented one of the assertions of the Voluntary Agreements is habitat is great, but it is not flow and science says they need flows, and this resolution shows what that flow looks like.

**Member Smegal** commented San Francisco has stated their approach to flows are different.

- **Member Zheng** asked if they put the flow requirements on hold and if the voluntary agreements are flow based.

**Member Smegal** responded there was a lawsuit, so it hasn't been implemented.

**Member Hebert** further responded they have aspects of flow like pulse flow but generally are not putting 30 or 50% unimpaired flow.

**Member Clary** further responded that the reason they are no longer called voluntary agreement is because every environmental group walked away from the table.

- **Member Smegal** commented that the design drought does not impact the salmon

**Member Clary** responded it does because it impacts the unimpaired flows.

**Member Jacuzzi** further responded a compromise could be to leave the design drought as it but guarantee the flows another way.

- **Member Smegal** commented San Francisco's approach to when the fish need the water is the principle behind the Healthy Rivers and Landscapes and this proposal is in front the State Water Board.

**Member Clary** responded that their principle is leading to very low numbers and asked if this body is trying to make proposals that are unachievable.

*The finally resolved clause was updated to state "...the SFPUC Citizens' Advisory Committee urges the SFPUC to amend its design drought and drought operations as necessary to ensure that minimum flows for salmon are provided in*

*at least 5 years in an 8 and half year drought and that flows below the minimum will not occur for more than two consecutive years.”*

- **Member Smegal** commented the clause should include the irrigation districts back in.

*The finally resolved clause was updated to include “...working with the Modesto and Turlock Irrigation Districts, as necessary...”.*

- **Member Holzman** commented May – October should be removed from the Whereas clause.

*The third whereas clause was edited to remove “October- May”.*

- **Member Clary** commented they should include the edit in the resolution heard during public comment.

**Member Smegal** further commented it was his impression the CAC was being vague about this point.

**Member Hebert** responded he understands SFPUC’s argument about pulse flows and the scientific basis report is clear on the definition of how much water is coming and sending 30% is low on what SFPUC could ideally do.

**Member Smegal** commented if this is the opinion of the State Board, then it is clearly defined.

**Member Herbert** commented he would include it as a reference point and are urging the SFPUC to do this, not requiring them to do so.

*The final resolved clause was edited to include “30% minimum flows”.*

- **Member Smegal** commented it now sounds like they are urging SFPUC to maintain 30% minimum flows year-round and “October – May” should be included again.

*The final resolved clause was edited to include “during salmon season”*

*The vote on the resolution was postponed until the next meeting.*

#### Public Comment:

- **Dave Warner** thanked the CAC members for making this resolution and asked what the minimum flows are and whether 30% should be included in the therefore clause.
- **Peter Drekmeier** thanked the CAC members for bringing this resolution forward and commented the 2010 flow criteria study found that 60% of unimpaired flow between February through June in the lower San Joaquin River and its tributaries would fully protect fish and wildlife and restore salmon population and 30% falls into the range that was adopted in 2018. State Water Board Director Laurel Firestone at workshop on Tuolumne River Voluntary Agreement workshop in November pointed out that their job would be easier if they could bump what they are willing to contribute to 30% otherwise amendments need to be made to what was adopted into law in 2018. In 2019, we should the Commission they could voluntarily contribute 40% unimpaired flows for at least 2-years and if a third dry year was hit, they could remove the voluntary contribution and SFPUC responded they could release the water, but it would end up in Don Pedro and

the irrigation districts could hold on to it. Lastly, the length of the design drought is not the problem, it is the severity of it, it has been the driest six years on record and then it is years 1976 and 1977. That period was 72% and severity is measured by water that is needed out of storage. If they took the six years of record, took the driest year on average, and add in '76 and '77, they would have a nine and half year drought but the issues would go away or they could take the average year in '87-92 and add two years of those, SFPUC would still have an eight and half year drought but would be much less severe.

## 8. Staff Report

- No Staff Report

Public Comment: None.

## 9. SFPUC Communications

### *General*

- [SFPUC Wildfire Mitigation Plan 2025](#)
- [Capital Financing Plan FY 2025-26 to FY 2034-35](#)
- [Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan 2025 Update](#)

### *Water Enterprise*

- [Long-term Vulnerability Assessment and Adaptation Plan](#)
- [Water Enterprise Capital Improvement Program Report, FY 2024-25 Q4](#)
- [Hetch Hetchy Capital Improvement Program Report, FY 2024- 25 Q4](#)
- [Alternative Water Supply Annual Progress Report](#)
- [2009 Water Supply Agreement Quarterly Update](#)
- [Onsite Water Reuse Projects](#)
- [Supplemental Appropriation of Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response \(ESER\) 2010 and 2014 General Obligation Bonds Interest Earnings](#)
- [Water System Improvement Program Report, FY 2024-25, Q4](#)

### *Wastewater Enterprise*

- Recent Wastewater Enterprise Bond Sale Results – no update
- [Wastewater Enterprise Quarterly Report \(Q4 FY2024-25\)](#)

### *Power Enterprise*

- [CleanPowerSF Update](#)
- [PG&E Interconnection Report, FY 2023-24, Q4](#)

Public Comment: None.

## 10. [Future Agenda Items and Resolutions](#)

Public Comment: None.

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

Public Comment: None.

## 12. Adjournment at 7:13 pm.

For more information concerning the agendas, minutes, and meeting information, please visit [sfpuc.gov/cac](http://sfpuc.gov/cac). For more information concerning the CAC, please contact by 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@sfgwater.org](mailto:cac@sfgwater.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@sfgwater.org](mailto:cac@sfgwater.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@sfgwater.org](mailto:cac@sfgwater.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@sfgwater.org](mailto:cac@sfgwater.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: [sotf@sfgov.org](mailto: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.