

**Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC)
FINAL MINUTES**

Tuesday, June 26, 2012
5:30 – 7:00 p.m.

1155 Market Street, 4th Floor

Members:

Stephen Bjorgan (M-Engineering/Financial)	Jessica Buendia (D6)	Doug Cain (D3)
Donald Carmignani (D2)	Jennifer Clary (D11)	Walt Farrell (D7)
Richard T. Hansen (D1)	Art Jensen (M-Regional Water Customers)	Terrence Jones CAC Chair (D10)
Alex Lantsberg (B-Environmental Justice)	Diane Mokoro (D5)	David Pilpel (D4)
Javiree PruittHill (D8)	Dairo Romero (D9)	Vacant (M-Lg Water User)
Avni Jamdar (M-Environmental Group)	Ted Ko (B-S. Business)	

M = Mayoral appointment, B = Board President appointment

Staff Liaisons: Jean Walsh and Teresa Young

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call** - Chair Jones called the meeting to order at 05:32 p.m. when the panel achieved quorum.
Present: A.Jensen; T.Jones; D.Pilpel; D.Cain; D.Mokoro; J.Buendia; A.Jamdar; T.Ko; A.Lantsberg; D.Romero; J.Clary; R.Hansen; W.Farrell
Absent: D.Carmignani; J.PruittHill; S.Bjorgan
2. **Introduction to new CAC member: Diane Mokoro – D5**
3. **Approval of the May 22 meeting minutes**
A.Lantsberg moved; J.Clary seconded. Minutes approved by acclamation.
4. **Public Comment:** none.
5. **Presentation: Sewer System Improvement Program (SSIP) Validation. Karen Kubick, SSIP Program Director** (combined discussion with item 6 – see below)
6. **Wastewater Subcommittee Chair Report and Possible Action: Resolution Regarding SSIP Validation** (attachment/handout) – A.Lantsberg
Rewrote resolution passed at Wastewater Subcommittee based on feedback from staff and committee members and is presenting the “substitute” resolution for consideration by the Full CAC, dated 6/26/12.

Combined Q&A for items 5 and 6.

D.Pilpel: Suggestion to include minor changes on first and second resolves to “PUC CAC”. On the second resolve, would the CAC also gather public input?

Edwin M. Lee
Mayor

Anson Moran
President

Art Torres
Vice President

Ann Moller Caen
Commissioner

Francesca Vietor
Commissioner

Vince Courtney
Commissioner

Ed Harrington
General Manager



A.Lantsberg: The intent was to insist the SFPUC staff to have an ongoing dialogue with CAC.

D.Pilpel: Suggestion to rework second resolve, so that CAC continues dialogue with staff and staff continues to gather input.

J.Clary: Now understanding what the validation process is, it is the process of presenting the program to the Commission for their endorsement.

K.Kubick: Parsons and AECOM have been revisiting and reevaluating each project component and what staff has been doing to meet the different levels of service.

J.Clary: A part of the evaluation of SSIP projects was whether green infrastructure was going to be able to eliminate or minimize the size of the gray infrastructure. Has that been presented at wastewater subcommittee?

K.Kubick: That has not yet been presented. That content will be in workshop 2, when we talk about the urban watershed approach. We're looking at the west side and size of the problems, grey and green, and doing the same with the bay side.

J.Clary: (directed at A.Lantsberg) You are asking us to approve the SSIP, which does not include the urban watershed plan, but grey infrastructure only. The framework that came out last week was simply a set of policies.

A.Lantsberg: The program validation effort was going to look at the process comprehensively, and green infrastructure is part of the evaluation process. I was looking to endorse the evaluation process, not the SSIP in itself.

K.Kubick: We do have specific green projects in the program. This was not in the larger presentation. We're now finalizing the treatment presentation that will go forward to commission on 7/24.

J.Clary: Have you made any decisions to eliminate or minimize grey infrastructure due to green infrastructure analysis?

K.Kubick: It looks like we will be, depending how the commission weighs in on it. On the west side, we lifted out of the early grey projects and we're looking at flooding differently. We had a charrette with the AGMs, DGM and GM and spent several hours looking at what the problems are and the green infrastructure project list from 2007. We selected projects robust enough to go through final modeling. That's how the process will be: representing grey, green, and how we view performance.

A.Lantsberg: My intent is not to endorse whole program but to highlight aspects of it, to move the urban watershed framework forward.

J.Clary: Is the watershed framework specifically part of the SSIP?

K.Kubick: Yes.

J.Clary: Suggest resolution should say what we want as part of the validation process – dialogue with staff, cost and benefits, rate impacts and nothing about CSD reduction.

K.Kubick: We are going to propose several levels of improvement to the commission. Some watersheds don't have as many problems. We will propose that to the commission and they will settle on projects tied to levels of improvement.

J.Clary: One of my concerns with SSIP was that none of the levels of service mentioned environmental impacts or benefits. Whatever we approve, we're still on the hook that all we get is whatever mitigation is required in the environmental review. I'm not comfortable with that since it puts the wastewater enterprise at a lesser level than the WSIP.

J.Buendia: I have commentary around the process of learning from the previous WSIP program. That we engage residents and staff, that lessons learned from that process that could be incorporated into this process. Was there a document? If so, then allude to it in a resolution.

K.Kubick: We have been having more meetings focused on watershed work and currently wrapping up focus groups. We did a phone survey and focus group of work 4-5 years ago and we're updating that. Internally, over the last 2 years, we held workshops on Wednesdays to get groups to understand green issues, treatment issues, etc. We have held workshops over the last six months about validation.

System performance by basin, alternatives, treatment, etc. sequence, how many contractors we can sustain at once, must haves, want to haves. Sat down with individual commissioner and gave tours. We are walking through presentation with them again. We have daily interaction with the GM and AGMs and are making use of as many WSIP tools as possible, but only within San Francisco. We have a digester task force that will pick up again, involving neighbors and locals that worked with staff often.

A.Jensen: Suggestion on resolution – two above the last resolve (last resolve will go away) – validation isn't done yet. Instead, it could be reworded as “should address” the cost and benefits and reword “should be accompanied” by a comprehensive communications plan. Validation and SSIP aren't complete.

T.Ko: For Karen, is there any coordination with program with Mayor's cleantech efforts? Any suggestions on how to partner with these cleantech hubs and companies?

K.Kubick: Yes, we're starting a market assessment right now. For example, food waste. We bring in something to bring up the amount of gas and produce fuel for city fleet. Looking at cost, life cycle cost, supply, quality, and market. On the urban watershed side, this is a longer process, about 13-14 months, where we look at each watershed. That means pulling together all of the City's general and project plans, neighborhood plans, any work that is cemented down and the Mayor's objectives, standards and policies (along with other City agencies). On the public side, we have a stormwater ordinance that we may make more stringent in the future. Partnerships may be where private developers are putting in something that meets our stormwater guidelines.

T.Ko: How about technology partnerships with companies?

K.Kubick: There is a R&D group and we recently finished a partnership with NASA. We have a group of PhDs to test new technologies. We're looking at LEED efficient energy to offset natural gas and green technologies. We generally do projects on a small scale pilot, and then enlarge it.

A.Jamdar: Is there an overall cost estimate of the SSIP? How about any sense of increase for rates? How many jobs will appear?

K.Kubick: The original was \$7B. \$4B first ten years, then \$3B the second. When we go through the validation workshops with the Commission, we will land somewhere. The total combined bill has a trajectory. We are unsure about the number of jobs. We need to have that for the commission, a rough idea.

A.Lantsberg read revised resolution.

J.Clary: Suggested adding a resolve to include quantifiable goals and levels of service to ensure environmental protection. Reference the June 12th letter from Blue Green Way to the commission.

J.Clary moved; D.Pilpel seconded.

A.Jensen: Clarification in the letter on point 4 – assume that that means no change or less important.

J.Clary: That's correct.

D.Mokoro: Does this mean that we must agree with the statements within the referenced letter as well?

A.Jensen: Suggestion to add this in a later resolution or ask them to consider rather than adopt.

Public comment: none.

No objections. Resolution adopted by acclamation.

Staff comment: R.Fox: If CAC members are unable to participate in the July 10 and 24 workshops, we could identify another opportunity for members to learn about topics covered in the workshops. After 7/24 where urban watershed and pilot projects, request CAC to adopt a resolution to support the actual program that commission will endorse or not endorse.

7. **Water Subcommittee Chair Report, Presentation and Possible Action: Introduction from J.Clary on Russian Hill Neighborhood Group and Karen Donovan.** Resolution Regarding Long-term Use and Management of Francisco Reservoir. Bruce Keane delivered the presentation.
J.Clary moved; D.Romero seconded to move forward on discussion.
K.Donovan: This is designated as open space in the City’s general plan – land use. It is very much in the city’s interest to continue this as open space use. The resolution is urging SFPUC to work with local communities to maintain in its current open space designation.
Questions/comments:
D.Cain: The precedent was made at 17th/Folsom (SFPUC land) when the neighborhood wanted to make this a park and arrangements were made with Rec & Park (R&P) and SFPUC. The intent here is for SFPUC to turn over the land for no compensation. The issue here is that a “poor” neighborhood had to pay for their park and a “rich” neighborhood doesn’t.
K.Donovan: This parcel itself is different from 17th/Folsom because this is designated as public open space. The 17th/Folsom parcel was operating as a parking lot. This resolution isn’t seeking to address cost issues; they should be addressed later after some consensus is formed with regard to the process.
D.Pilpel: I read this as it being a comprehensive and thoughtful process. I’m also concerned about money, but that would be part of the comprehensive and thoughtful process. Does anyone have a sense of the fair market value for the parcel? Is there great debate over market cost of the parcel?
K.Donovan: I assume when we get to that, there will be debate.
Bruce: SFPUC will discuss the fair market value, knowing that there will not be development value and it will be used for open space.
D.Cain: There is clear development value at this property and SFPUC has put a price on this. This discussion has been left out of this issue.
D.Romero: I was part of the 17th/Folsom project. We wanted a neighborhood park. The reason the commission gave it to us is because it was a property owned by SFPUC. They couldn’t give it for free. That project was more difficult to get money to do the park, and programming and maintenance of it. I agree that it should be the same situation. If the Russian Hill parcel belongs to SFPUC, they have to do the same thing as 17th/Folsom.
A.Jensen: While I respect this issue of who pays for what, the conversation would be absurd in other cities. It all belongs to the City and County of San Francisco.
J.Clary: The issue is if the water committee should bifurcate the discussion and agree this should be a park. The next discussion should be a process to take place between the community and SFPUC.
D.Cain: The CAC is voting on that the land can be used only as a park and for no other purposes, correct?
K.Donovan: Correct, we are urging SFPUC to have discussions with the neighborhoods and stakeholders.
D.Mokoro: I read it as supporting it only as a park.
D.Pilpel requested a copy of the presentation from Bruce.
J.Clary: The real issue is if we want to support the community’s efforts. Money is another thing to figure out. Are we okay with moving this forward?
D.Cain: The question is if we have a park, who will operate and maintain it?
K.Donovan: The text as J.Clary was noting does not to state this will be a park forevermore, but for SFPUC to work with the community. It was developed with senior management on specific language.
D.Romero: We should support the community. Connect the neighborhood with district supervisor and get money from the state to build the park. The general idea is to have more open space for the community and that resonates with me to support this resolution.
Public comment: none.

J.Clary: Motion before us is the resolution with a minor amendment in the second to the last resolve.

D.Cain: Suggested on the second to last whereas on first page to take out private development, because that's what happened on 17th/Folsom and the source of funding.

In favor: D.Romero, D.Pilpel, J.Clary, A.Jamdar, A.Lantsberg, A.Jensen, D.Mokoro, T.Ko, T.Jones; R.Hansen

Not in favor: D.Cain, W.Farrell, J.Buendia

Resolution passes.

8. **Possible Action:** Discussion and vote on permanently moving Full CAC meetings from the 4th Tuesday of the month to the 3rd Tuesday or Wednesday so they occur in advance of the SFPUC Commission meetings on the 2nd and 4th Tuesday of the month. Vote postponed.

J.Clary: In favor of moving to third Wednesday

T.Ko: In favor of not having meetings on the third Tuesday.

A.Jamdar: In favor of keeping current date.

D.Pilpel: It's difficult to move to a different date and time for 17 people. Because it's on the same day as the commission meeting, it may be good to work our schedule to commission items we're discussing on the second and fourth Tuesday ahead of time. In favor of keeping current date.

T.Jones: In favor to keep current date. People who aren't here need to weigh in.

R.Fox: We will try to work on queuing things up with CAC to keep this date.

9. **Possible Action:** Discussion and vote on moving all CAC meetings from 1155 Market, 4th Floor to a new location at 525 Golden Gate Avenue, 2nd Floor, starting July 24, 2012

D.Pilpel moved; J.Clary seconded.

10. **Report from the Chair:** Update on June 26 CAC Quarterly Report to Commission
T.Jones passed out document – new members, two resolutions passed first of the year, nine points that were collected from subcommittee chairs (A.Lantsberg, J.Clary, D.Cain), rates.

T.Jones thanked J.Walsh for CAC calendar as it helps setting future agenda items. CAC can put items on the calendar to go through subcommittee chairs.

11. **Staff Updates:** (Jean Walsh)

J.Walsh: Asked if anyone had problems viewing attachments with the agenda. Staff is trying a new system to attach meeting materials. We hope to have a system with links on the website.

A.Jensen: Some of the commission agenda links don't work.

J.Walsh: We'll do some testing to make sure links work. Agendas will now have links in the documents. 525GG opening events occurred last week. We are moving in July and the next meeting will be in the new building.

12. **Future CAC Agenda Items:** Next regularly scheduled Full CAC meeting Tuesday, July 24.

Looking at calendar – Validation workshops.

J.Clary: July 10 – not just SSIP validation meeting- annual retreat. Each enterprise took a specific policy question. Won't be televised.

J.Clary: Would like to present two resolutions next CAC meeting: non-potable and drink tap ordinances.

J.Walsh: finance team can come and talk about the RFP going out for the five year rate study.

J.Clary – fifteen minutes for both resolutions.

T.Jones – two main agenda items per meeting.

Clary's resolution and finance team on rates.

D.Pilpel – in-city construction and how we address it – outreach and neighborhood concerns, trees, digging up street. August or a future meeting. If no quorum, move to September.

13. Adjournment at 06:57 p.m. T.Jones moved; A.Lantsberg seconded.