



San Francisco Public Utilities Commission  
Citizens' Advisory Committee

MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, May 19, 2026

5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.

525 Golden Gate Ave., 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Tuolumne Conference Room

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

Meeting Recording:

<https://sfwater.zoom.us/rec/share/Z2k9CHiJuXEAF6pbXna2Hi831R4gAyz09Zn4piOI0qUI2ytrKvxxOHTf4GADQasU.7Fbf3r6ZYzVU7qU2>

Meeting Passcode

807056

**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:**

<b>Douglas Jacuzzi (Chair)</b>	Aaron Hebert (D9)
<b>(D4)</b>	VACANT (D10)
Cal Law (D1)	Jennifer Clary (D11)
Erin Roach (D2)	Andrea Baker (B-Small Business)
Sally Chen (D3)	Arthine Cossey van Duyne (B-Environ. Justice)
Lila Holzman (D5)	Katie Zheng (M-Large Water User)
Barklee Sanders (D6)	Sarah Atkinson (M-Environmental Org.)
Julia Alicia Hernandez (D7)	Thomas Smegal (M-Regional Water Customers)
Amy Nagengast (D8)	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](mailto:cac@sfwater.org)

**Daniel Lurie**  
Mayor

**Joshua Arce**  
President

**Stephen E. Leveroni**  
Vice President

**Avni Jamdar**  
Commissioner

**Kate H. Stacy**  
Commissioner

**Meghan Thurlow**  
Commissioner

**Dennis J. Herrera**  
General Manager

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call at 5:35 pm**

Present (9): Jacuzzi, Law, Holzman, Sanders, Nagengast, Hebert, Cossey van Duyne, Zheng, Atkinson,

Absent (7): Roach, Chen, Hernandez, Clary\*, Baker, Smegal\*, Dickerson-Smith\*

Staff/Presenters: Grace Tang and Pamela Husing

Members of the Public: Peter Drekmeier, Thomas Lee, Erin Boyle, Tyler Servais, Ian Monroe, Dave Warner, Anonymous, Winston Parsons

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



\*Member Clary marked present at 5:37pm, Member Smegal marked present at 5:40pm, Member Dickerson-Smith present at 6:04pm.

**2. Approve [April 28, 2026, Meeting Minutes](#)**

A motion was made (Hebert) and seconded (Atkinson) to approve the April 28, 2026 Meeting Minutes.

The minutes were approved by the following votes:

AYES (10): Jacuzzi, Law, Holzman, Sanders, Nagengast, Hebert, Clary, Cossey van Duyne, Zheng, Atkinson,

NOES(0):

ABSENT (6): Roach, Chen, Hernandez, Baker, Smegal, Dickerson-Smith

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
  - Member Law is appointed Power Subcommittee Chair
- [Ohlone Tribal Land Acknowledgement](#)

*Member Sanders marked absent at 5:42 pm Quorum maintained.*

Public Comment: None.

**5. Presentation and Discussion: [Interconnection Issues with PG&E & Public Power Expansion Update](#)**, Pamela Husing, Deputy AGM, Federal Agreements and Public Power Expansion, Grace Tang, Acquisition Analysis Manager, Power Enterprise,

- Resource – [publicpowersf.org](http://publicpowersf.org)

*Presentation:*

- Interconnection Issues with PG&E & Public Power Expansion Update
- Recap: Status Quo
- Recap: PG&E Wholesale Distribution Tariff (WDT)
- Remaining WDT Issues
- Public Power Expansion Update
- Public Power Expansion Milestones
- CPUC Valuation Proceeding: On-going
- Recap: California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
- CEQA: Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)
- Q&A

*Discussion:*

- **Member Nagengast** asked if there is a size delineation on what city projects get this treatment.

**Staff Tang** responded it is categorical, and most city department projects receive this treatment.

**Member Nagengast** commented that in future conversations it would be helpful to understand what projects encounter more challenges, and an example would be the million-dollar bathroom in Noe Valley, that had a lot of constraints.

**Staff Tang** responded that example would fall under this, and another example is an San Francisco Municipal Transit Authority (SFMTA) operator bathroom requiring equipment that is bigger than the bathroom itself.

- **Member Holzman** asked what it means to “kill a project”.

**Staff Tang** responded if a school wants to do decarbonization project, they would need to submit an application and PG&E may say this is a large load increase requiring upgrades to the distribution system and the city would need to pay that cost upfront that ranges from thousands to millions of dollars, depending on what part of the system needs to be upgraded and may get reimbursed later.

**Member Holzman** asked if PG&E was asking the city to pay for these costs.

**Staff Tang** responded yes, and the upgrades benefit PG&E’s system in general meaning many PG&E customers will be able to have larger loads because the city paid for the upgrade.

- **Member Cossey van Duyne** asked if there is any distinction based on the project owner, whether it was commercial or residential.

**Staff Husing** responded these are typically city departments which include the school district and related entities that the city serves through the wholesale distribution tariff (WDT) so the distinction on the commercial, industrial, residential, is layered within there. For example, if we have an affordable housing project the city is working on, it would be residential and have municipal connection, allowing us to serve it through WDT. We also have a redevelopment group that looks at housing and commercial development, for example Hunter’s Point Shipyard, where there is residential and commercial behind a big meter that is connected to PG&E. For SFPUC to serve customers as Hetch Hetchy Power, a fully integrated utility, we need to provide them through WDTs so PG&E imposes conditions such as the type of load you can serve, and where the connection points can happen and costs such as purchasing equipment that we have to install and then turn over to PG&E and pay their Income Tax Component of Contribution (ITCC) which is approximately 25% of the project cost, PG&E then owns this asset and charges us “Cost of Ownership” which means the city has to pay PG&E for owning and running the assets.

- **Member Atkinson** asked since the discussion is on the settlement discussion with WDT4 if the cost assignment were not an issue before April 2025.

**Staff Tang** responded they were and were issues with WDT 3 proceeding and these were not settled, and we got a favorable decision from the judge on the cost assignment

issues but because PG&E filed a new WDT and it is the same language, the issue has to be relitigated.

- **Member Clary** asked if this is regulated by Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and not the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC).

**Staff Husing** responded yes, the CPUC is retail rates and FERC regulate wholesale rates.

- **Member Cossey van Duyne** asked if an analysis has been done if these projects are cancelled from an economic and quality of life impact perspective.

**Staff Husing** responded this is a brilliant question and something we try to bring up and a resource is a quarterly report we present to the Board of Supervisors listing projects we are having issues with and the dollar impact. The individual impacts on funding, or community issues, are only known if we or the constituents work with the supervisors to get public hearings. There is no comprehensive analysis on the quality-of-life issues to Staff Husing's knowledge.

**Staff Tang** further responded in practice, what we've seen is if a project cannot afford to pay for the upgrades or PG&E's costs, they will go directly to PG&E for service and be served as a PG&E retail customer and will pay a higher rate. This analysis is in the Board of Supervisors report to show how much more they pay.

**Member Cossey van Duyne** commented this becomes an affordability issue, a loss of business opportunity issue and asked in a case building scenario who would do the research on your behalf in order to say the impact is having on the residents of the city because it is assuming it is paid now or later and there is a cost of capital in the middle and creating a lending structure.

**Staff Husing** responded she is not knowledgeable of all the agencies within the city who could investigate this and is not sure if certain parts of the city will do an analysis like this.

- **Member Law** asked whose project.

**Staff Tang** responded the way projects work in the WDT application process is PG&E does cost estimates for how much the project will be, SFPUC pays the amount and the project then goes into construction and once the project is energized, PG&E will send a true-up invoice.

- **Member Holzman** asked if the true-up has gotten worse over time or increased because of inflation.

**Staff Tang** responded PG&E used to never send us true-ups and has recently started within the last 5 years and have seen them increase over time and SFPUC will ask for more details to figure out why there was a large discrepancy between the estimate and the true-up, but PG&E will not give documentation to support the discrepancy.

**Member Cossey van Duyne** commented it could be due to supply chain issues and materials.

**Member Clary** asked if SFPUC pays the true-up without documentation.

**Staff Tang** responded we do not.

- **Member Atkinson** asked if staff have looked into how much time is being spent on litigation and if this is integrated into public power and acquiring the grid.

**Staff Husing** responded there is a city attorney budget for litigation that is baked into the Power Enterprise budget. It is one of the issues discussed when discussing the benefit of a publicly owned utility and litigation will still be an issue, especially on the boundaries with PG&E, but the litigation is greatly reduced.

- **Member Holzman** asked what the schedule of the Board of Supervisor reports is and if they are public.

**Staff Tang** responded they are public and on the Public Power website and the next one is coming out within the next few weeks.

- **Chair Jacuzzi** asked if there is any light at the end of the tunnel regarding the litigation and what does the most optimistic ending look like for the litigation.

**Staff Husing** responded regarding the WDT litigation, this is an on-going process because there is an internal timeline that has transmission-related issues, interconnection renewal issues, WDT litigation and rate litigation that has to do with PG&E's wholesale rates. Staff were engaged in an issue back in 2015 called grandfathering where there was supposed to be special treatment for city departments and how they interconnect. This was litigated through FERC, the District of Columbia (D.C.) Court of Appeals, we won, and PG&E appealed and kicked it back to FERC where PG&E won at FERC and are now in settlement conversations and much of the settlement is irrelevant since we've negotiated other deals. The litigation will be ongoing if the relationship stays the same.

- **Member Hebert** asked how this affects Treasure Island.

**Member Husing** responded with regard to the purchase of the PG&E-owned grid, it does not apply to Treasure Island because PG&E doesn't own the grid there. SFPUC is the caretaker of the equipment. Treasure Island's equipment is being redeveloped and upgraded so as time goes by the electrical infrastructure is being upgraded. Treasure Island is its own entity because it is not connected directly to the distribution grid of San Francisco.

**Member Cossey van Duyne** asked what happens to the people on the other side of the island who are not part of the redevelopment and are being served by old infrastructure.

**Staff Husing** responded Staff Tang and she do not work on this issue, and her understanding is the redevelopment of Treasure Island includes the electrical infrastructure and does not know the timeline on when the old infrastructure will be upgraded.

**Member Clary** responded the old infrastructure will not be replaced and the old infrastructure is managed abandonment, and this is what was signed during the Jordan Administration.

- **Member Cossey van Duyne** asked who is going to be responsible to make sure residents get the same level of power for living a life.

**Staff Husing** responded she knows we are doing a lot of work on Treasure Island with redevelopers and Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) owns the existing infrastructure and SFPUC is a contractor to the existing infrastructure and SFPUC's linemen go respond when there are issues and goes down. Until the redevelopment goes through the whole island, it will not get resolved.

**Member Holzman** asked if the CAC can get a presentation on the redevelopment happening at Treasure Island.

**Member Clary** commented there is no redevelopment anymore since it was abolished in 2010 under Governor Brown.

**Staff Husing** responded redevelopment with a capital "R" was abolished but SFPUC has a redevelopment group working on Treasure Island and there are new developments and switch gears.

**Member Clary** commented what really needs to be done is for the Board of Supervisors to pay to renew service to the existing low-income housing that is currently scheduled for demolition.

**Member Cossey van Duyne** commented or have residents have decentralized power if they are not going to have centralized power.

**Staff Husing** responded she recommends asking for a presentation on Treasure Island highlighting redevelopment and what the schedule looks like.

**Chair Jacuzzi** asked who on staff they should work with to schedule this presentation.

**Staff Husing** responded she suggests going through leadership and Assistant General Manager Hale will assign staff.

- **Member Law** asked if there was a draft report presented last year and what has happened since.

**Staff Husing** responded the normal process takes about a year and right now the Department of Planning, who is the leading agency in this report, will be filing a final version soon.

- **Member Law** asked if the previous offer price was \$2 billion dollars.

**Staff Husing** responded it was \$2.5 billion and are now at \$3.4 billion dollars since it includes additional assets.

- **Member Clary** asked if a condition assessment has been done considering the major power outage that occurred in December.

**Staff Husing** responded SFPUC has done site visits with PG&E and have made conservative assumptions on the age of assets and useful life consideration. There is testimony that includes the new offer and includes revised asset inventory, real-estate appraisal, fair-market-value range, and are looking at a new separation plan which involves us taking more of PG&E's equipment.

- **Member Holzman** asked if the planning in taking over PG&E's assets also include how the SFPUC will expand to be able to serve San Francisco.

**Staff Husing** responded yes, and we have several workstreams that include engineering, litigation, finance, and operational readiness, which we are going through to look at functional areas to see what we are capable of now and how many more staff and systems do we need to integrate. There is a draft that was prepared a few years ago since we are still a moving target to a transaction deadline, and in the meantime, Power Enterprise has built more infrastructure. We purchase about 75-80% of energy consumed in San Francisco which is managed through CleanPowerSF for residential and Hetch Hetchy Power for commercial, we also schedule settle Independent System Operator (ISO) and have systems to do this. We have systems in place, and we would only need to expand.

**Staff Tang** further responded there are discussions happening in operational groups on how we can build things for growth and will scale up more easily with the acquisition in mind.

- **Member Clary** asked what will make PG&E turn over the system.

**Member Law** further asked if PG&E is allowed to delay their testimony in October.

**Staff Husing** responded they are supposed to and need permission to not testify. There has been some scrutiny on the CPUC about how slow it has been and hoping there is enough pressure now.

**Staff Tang** further responded PG&E may file a motion saying they cannot testify in October.

- **Member Clary** asked if we can eminent domain PG&E.

**Staff Husing** responded yes, and the city has a right to do.

**Member Law** asked if this is something we want to avoid.

**Staff Husing** responded yes, we want to avoid this and want a business transaction since we are interconnected with the electrical grid and need to work together.

**Member Law** asked what would happen if we reached the point of eminent domain.

**Staff Husing** responded there are two parts, there is right to take and value. The right to take is a court proceeding to see whether the city has a right to take something. The value will have another court proceeding if there isn't a binding number established, which is why it is important for us to make our case and be successful.

- **Chair Jacuzzi** asked if San Francisco takes over the grid, is there any concern of the other 25% and growth beyond that.

**Staff Husing** responded yes and no. We need to be concerned because we need to plan but as far the additional 25%, that is part of our operational readiness of how we want to manage that portfolio. The purchasing team is signing contracts for renewable energy and bringing staff online and we need to be ready to hire staff and want to be the

employer of choice for individuals, especially at PG&E since they have knowledge of the grid.

- **Member Hebert** asked if staff could comment on how San Francisco having control over the grid help the demand on clean energy goals and distributed energy.

**Staff Husing** responded there are few things that are fundamental to the public utilities model: one is it frees up capital since we don't pay taxes, have a lower cost of borrowing and we control all the rate payer's fund. Right now, PG&E, as the retail provider for most of the city, has shareholders and has a fiduciary responsibility to shareholders, not rate payers. With the added capital, you have more control over what to do with money and can invest in other areas like microgrids and renewable energy, based on feedback from the public. The second is CPUC regulates PG&E and sets their rules and are not allowed to treat us differently compared to other parts of their territory. The third is the interconnection issues discussed will also be gone.

**Member Nagengast** commented PG&E owns our natural gas assets and those are not being acquired.

- **Chair Jacuzzi** asked if any of the physical separation along the border of San Mateo County happening.

**Staff Husing** responded it would not happen until we have a transaction, and it is not at the border, but it is to serve loads within the City that we are serving. For instance, we are beefing up our infrastructure to serve our own customers but for purposes of separation, this work is not happening until a transaction.

- **Member Clary** commented she represents District 11 where a lot of this work will happen and if it does happen, it would be good to understand the impact it will have on the neighborhood.

**Staff Husing** responded absolutely, and Department of Planning has done the typical outreach and will come again once the final impact report. SFPUC's Public Power outreach team have done presentations at a number of community-based organizations (CBOs) and communications will be doing more presentations to business groups, we have a public power ambassador program and encourages everyone to look at [publicpowersf.org](http://publicpowersf.org).

- **Member Clary** asked who the communications staff is assigned to the project.

**Staff Husing** responded it is a small team.

**Staff Tang** responded members can talk to Elisa Furey- Rodriguez and she normally attends the CAC meetings.

- **Member Law** commented they worked with Staff Furey-Rodriguez and given a presentation on Public Power in their neighborhood, but a challenge is coordinating between SFPUC and CBOs and it would be helpful if there were presentations we already scheduled and sending CBOs to them rather than coordinating individual presentations.
- **Member Holzman** commented that she appreciated hearing the work stream around operational readiness and most people she knows are in favor of the acquisition, and the

only concern is will it be better and asked what are the unintended consequences, and what will happen when there are issues like outages and who will be the oversight body to the SFPUC.

**Staff Husing** responded this is a valid concern and SFPUC is regulated by Local Regulatory Agency which means the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor to an extent, and for various aspect the rate oversight board. As we are going through this process and settling, we are trying to identify where the public can voice their concerns outside of the Board of Supervisors and public power agencies in general have higher satisfaction rates and lower consistent rates, 13% across the board, and less outages since the structures are more direct to the people who consume the power.

- **Member Law** commented when it comes to accountability, the public will be able to submit their complaints directly compared to PG&E.

**Staff Husing** responded she used to work at the CPUC and does not know who to submit complaints about PG&E to.

Public Comment:

- **Thomas Lee** commented they live in District 11 and would love to connect with the D-11 member and echo the comment about promoting distributing energy and San Francisco is behind a lot of sister CCAs and would like to see more of this happening. Regarding public power expansion and asked if anyone has done an analysis of how much rates would go down and considering the state of the equipment that exists within city and county, has there been a cost analysis of how much it would be to modernize it.

**Staff Husing** responded we do not have a transaction amount yet and we have regulatory accounting treatment, we have done extensive modeling behind the scenes high staking of the cost of utility however, we are not in a position to clearly give a percentage. Currently, our Hetch Hetchy Power rates are consistently lower than PG&E's rates. Regarding the equipment, in our modeling we are making conservative estimates for yearly investments in the equipment.

- **Ian Monroe** commented he has climate and clean energy for his career and is part of Energy Discuss SF, longest running community energy professionals in the bay area. He is fully supporting what the city is doing and one of the constant themes that arise in his work is how much a sticking point PG&E, especially around misalignment in PG&E's profits and incentives compared to what needs to happen in clean energy and electrification deployment. One thing they would like to see the City do more of is vehicle to grid and even with our current approximate 40 thousand electric vehicles (EV's) there is enough storage capacity of roughly 3 gigawatt hours which could power the city for 4 to 6 hours. We get 100% EV penetration which is roughly what the law is pushing towards us and creates enough storage capacity for 1 to 2 days. He also wants members to be aware of the Artificial Intelligence (AI) fraud campaigns that likely are going on in this space. In LA, the quality management district had a large public comment AI fraud campaign funded by the gas companies killed the rules pushing towards electrification and may be happening at the Bay Area Air Quality District where they are pushing to regulate electrification for water heaters and HAVC. Sierra Club exposed what is happening at the Bay Area Council where a PG&E staff is a founding member.
- **Winston Parsons** commented he is a supporter of public power and works in construction. If the acquisition is successful, there is a lot of skepticism in the general plumbing community and in the next year gas water heaters will not be available for

purchase in the Bay Area and an obstacle to this electrification to homes. If we truly have public power, a selling point would be the money previously meant for PG&E's shareholders could be allocated to supporting older generations in San Francisco to electrify their homes.

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

*Discussion:*

- **Member Clary** commented member Hebert's name should be next to the resolution as he is the Water subcommittee chair.
- **Staff Moncrease** commented SFPUC staff made edits to the resolution and are included in the draft copy being presented.
- **Member Nagengast** asked if someone made the graph and where did that data come from.

**Member Clary** responded it came out of the State Water Board's report.

**Member Nagengast** commented this should be referenced in the resolution.

- **Member Clary** commented if more edits are needed, this should be pushed to next month's agenda.

**Member Smegal** commented it may be agendized for the Water Subcommittee meeting.

**Staff Moncrease** responded the Water Subcommittee is meeting in July to give Water Subcommittee Chair Hebert time to onboard.

**Member Nagengast** commented the resolution has some urgency to it and there are budget meetings currently happening.

**Member Clary** commented at this point that it is not urgent for the budget.

**Chair Jacuzzi** commented staff's edits should be reviewed before deciding whether to vote or move to the next meeting.

- **Member Hebert** commented staff's edits are fine to include and did not change what we are trying to resolve and is in favor of moving to a vote.
- **Member Smegal** commented in the Finally Resolved clause it should be changed to read "eight and a half year drought".

*The Further Resolved clause was edited to "...eight and a half year drought..."*

- **Member Clary** asked if there is a draft or final report for the Tuolumne River.

**Member Smegal** commented draft report.

- **Member Nagengast** asked how far we are from reaching a State and Federal doubling goal.

**Member Clary** commented it is not achievable under this proposal.

**Member Nagengast** commented we are far from reaching State and Federal doubling goals so being more accurate would be good.

**Member Clary** commented we cannot be more accurate because we do not have an approved plan because their plan doesn't give a plan to double and what is presented is the analysis done

- **Member Holzman** asked what the purpose is of the word "early" in staff's edit for the fifth Whereas clause.

**Member Smegal** commented it is their definition of the projects and early implementation are projects before the State Board decides.

**Member Hebert** responded like the Healthy Rivers and Landscapes program.

- **Member Nagengast** asked what "CDFW Grand tab" means.

**Member Clary** commented California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

**Chair Jacuzzi** further commented grand tab refers to a method of counting.

- **Member Clary** has the source of the graph to be included in the resolution and will send to Staff Moncrease after the meeting.

*A motion was made (Hebert) and seconded (Clary) to accept the edits to the resolution.*

The resolution passed pending the addition of references for scientific data cited in the resolution by the following votes:

AYES: (10) Jacuzzi, Law, Holzman, Nagengast, Hebert, Clary, Cossey van Duyne, Zheng, Atkinson, Dickerson-Smith.

NOES: (1) Smegal.

ABSENT: (5) Roach, Chen, Sanders, Hernandez, Baker.

Public Comment:

- Dave Warner commented thank you so much for this resolution, it is terrific.

## 7. Staff Report

- No staff report

Public Comment: None.

## 8. 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.

### **9. [Future Agenda Items and Resolutions](#)**

Public Comment: None.

### **10. 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.

### **11. Adjournment at 7:19 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: [soft@sfgov.org](mailto:soft@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.