ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. The meeting was called to order at 5:40 p.m.
   Present: T.Jones; W.Farrell; R.Hansen; A.Jensen; T.Ko; A.Lantsberg; D.Cain; J.PruittHill; A.Jamdar; Absent: S.Bjorgan; D.Mokoro; N.Manuel; D.Pilpel; J.Clary; D.Romero; SFPUC Staff Present: K.Fernandez Smith; T.Young; Members of the public members: seven people, including Espanola Jackson, Shawn Harris, Lance Burton, Angela Armstrong, Vivian Alice, Chris Jackson, Francisco DaCosta

   Agenda changes: switched order of items #2 and #3.

2. Presentation and Discussion: Community Benefits Update, Kay Fernandez Smith, SFPUC Community Benefits Director

   Discussion and Q&A:
   T.Jones: I talked to the Subcommittee chairs and they have agreed to forego their reports so that we have more time for discussion on this item.
   R.Hansen: Under Urban Agriculture projects, how many acres are included? K.Fernandez Smith: I can get back to you on the specifics.
   R.Hansen: In the Southeast Community Facility (SECF), what grades are included in the Five Keys Charter School?
   K.Fernandez Smith: They work specifically with high school students and people who have come out of challenging situations and the juvenile justice system.
   R.Hansen: How many people are there right now?
   K.Fernandez Smith: They are not currently tenants in the space.
   R.Hansen: How big is the school in terms of students?
   K.Fernandez Smith: I can get back to you on that.
   R.Hansen: What does Education Outside do?
   K.Fernandez Smith: It’s a non-profit organization (NPO), and it used to be the Green Schoolyards Alliance. They work with schools to do the planning and site development of outdoor classrooms within a school. They also provide a corp team member who has knowledge and interest in working with young people focused on eco-literacy initiatives.
A. Jensen: I went back and pulled the Community Benefits policy. There are a couple of points that I'm interested in; one was developing processes to effectively stay involved in communities, but as perceived by whom? In terms of developing performance measures to report the results, how do you go about getting a read from the community to understand if they think the program is successful to them?

K. Fernandez Smith: We're still learning about the different stakeholder bodies we have, including the CAC, Southeast Community Facility Commission, etc. We're working closely with Communications because they also have a lot of stakeholders that they work with. We just finished some planning on identifying stakeholders and developing processes to engage with them. As we're working closely on the Sewer System Improvement Program (SSIP) with staff, we need to work with the bodies that we have and then think outside of that to learn who else we should be working with. We also have a different range of stakeholders that we know and work with. We have reached out to the San Francisco Foundation and other philanthropic organizations to understand community-based organizations (CBOs) in the communities that we impact and will continue to work with the Commission to learn about the organizations they work with. We're just at the beginning stages. In terms of measuring results of the program, if community members feel the work we do is effective, we need to first know what investments we're making. Because the enterprises work separately, many of them have already been making investments in the community. There hadn't really been a coordinating body or staff to bring all of those investments together. We need to do the inventory. The next phase is engaging the stakeholders to identify what the metrics would be. What does success look like to them?

A. Lantsberg: This is an unofficial plug for the Community Benefits Subcommittee. We are looking to meet in March and are confirming a location. In regards to the SECF improvements, have you put together or identified a process to develop a programming plan? Like something more long-term and more systematic that includes community outreach?

K. Fernandez Smith: A letter of interest has moved forward. The SECF is tied to the mitigation agreement with the SFPUC. The intent of the SECF would be that it would be a facility that has a strong component of workforce development. We have been thinking more about programming, there have been multiple letters of interest signed, and we're working with City College. The green houses and the facility have been operating on their own. If we're focused on workforce development with the tenants at SECF, we're going to be starting a contract assistant center as well house a component for green house facilities.

A. Lantsberg: Under the workforce development slide, Former Supervisor Maxwell asked the SFPUC in October 2010 to provide an inventory of Community Benefits. Is this inventory an update of existing items you had or something that is new?

K. Fernandez Smith: The inventory is what we're building. The programs have been there. We're pulling them from the different enterprises and divisions.

A. Lantsberg: What is the deadline for completing this?

K. Fernandez Smith: We don't have a deadline.

A. Lantsberg: It would be good to have a deadline so that it is done.

K. Fernandez Smith: Some of the sources are the add backs. We need to define what the timeframe should be. If you're requesting what the deadline of the inventory, it would be best to define a time.

A. Lantsberg: A request for our first Community Benefits Subcommittee is to have a draft inventory covering programs and workforce development 2010 and forward.

Public comment:
Francisco DaCosta: On the Water System Improvement Program (WSIP), which was a $4.6B program, the community got practically nothing. When we start the SSIP, we ask for 10%, but we got 5%, which is $300M. We can have all the talk we want, but the most important thing in San Francisco is to find out the adverse impacts on the community on the sewage treatment plant. You need to sit down with people who are adversely impacted and get an input and do something about it. When you do something about it, you have to have
timelines and quarterly reports. The CAC advises the SFPUC to do something about those impacts. That’s how we can get to a better place. Hopefully with the SSIP, that will be different from WSIP on public outreach.

Espanola Jackson: I’m disappointed that the community college is not included in your presentation. I’m the founder for the Black Human Rights Leadership Council in SF and we meet on Wednesday. Any groups that you’re meeting for about Community Benefits in Bayview must come through this committee. There are too many groups are getting funds that aren’t really doing things in my community. When we had a task force meeting, I requested 10% for the Southeast. We have the five digesters coming into our community. We are the only community with a sewage plant, but we want to see benefits coming to that community. I have concerns with Phelps and Evans streets. It is a toxic area. I don’t hear any environmental groups come in to talk about that area. I want you come present at the Black Human Rights Leadership Council. I’ll let you know when to come. I want the names of all the non-profit organizations (NPOs) that you’re talking to in Bayview Hunters Point.

Chris Jackson: I am on the Board of Trustees at City College. My first comment is that we’ve been talking to the SFPUC about Community Benefits. It’s a little disappointing about education initiatives about a group I’ve never heard of. We pay for janitorial and police service at SECF, even though we’re tenants. We also have a shuttle service, yet none of this is in the educational initiative. Now we have 1,200 students at SECF. In your presentation, you made no mention of the largest tenant. Two years ago, SFPUC presented at SECF. There were no dollars in that presentation. Two years later, it’s still the same. We need the dollar amounts included to show investments made into the community. I don’t understand some of the points you made here, we need actual numbers. We need actual numerical values. I can’t tell if you’re giving us 10% or 5%, I have nothing to bounce off of to understand if this is a good deal or not. In addition, with Community Benefits in contracts, how are those being enforced? How do you know that those are being delivered to the community or not? I work with high school students and they aren’t working with the SFPUC. Until you put numbers here, it’s just words. When it first started, there were 28 students enrolled in an one year program and most of them got jobs with the SFPUC soon after. Now there are about 10 students and it takes longer to get through the program and it’s not guaranteed with a job. In terms of public art, in our community where there are huge educational disparities and workforce development issues, I believe the 2% should go into the more immediate needs other than art. I hope that even in the art, we should look at other types of art other than murals, but tie it to vocation. In terms of City College, we’ve never said we weren’t going to be in Southeast. City College works hard to commit that we can be in the SECF. With all those challenges in that facility, we still commit to the SFPUC and the community in that campus. I want to see a value placed in this presentation and future presentations.

K.Fernandez Smith: Based on the last report from my staff, we haven’t received a response to the letter of interest yet, so I will strike that language from here. We value our relationship with City College. I’m happy to look into the other programs, 9910 program, etc. and then put some hard numbers around those programs. Some of the programs have start and end dates due to the ad backs and funding.

Espanola Jackson: When that college was built, it was built because of mitigation. It was built for education and training. You try to cut back on space to make it an office building, but that college is not going to be an office building on that. We need all of the space. SFPUC did try to raise the rent and that’s a community building. The city is responsible for the upkeep of the building because of the Commission we have there. The college isn’t going anywhere because that’s what it was built for. We want all of the classrooms back that have been taken away.

Vivian Alice: I am a resident at Bayview Hunters Point and a member of Black Human Rights Council. You mentioned partnerships, stakeholders – who are the stakeholders? It seems like the money circulated are the same groups of people. The other groups aren’t served at all. The grassroots people aren’t being served at all – we’re the ones doing the work.
Angela Armstrong: I am the founder of the Hunter Point Art Gallery and Cultural Center. I spoke with Jessie Buendia this afternoon. She said this meeting was going to address “bricks and mortars”. As you can see here, you can see that the Southeast community is primarily African Americans. There are cultural centers are all over the City, and we’ve taken work with SFUSD, gone to Art Commission meetings, but we don’t see the money. The government owns the building. The Mission Rebels building was turned into the Mission Cultural Center. We tried to the Opera House, and it turned into the City's opera house. We tried to get other groups, but they said Bayview Hunters Point is not safe. We want a program where our students can learn music, and videos, and we get that but the programs are taken out of our own communities, and become inaccessible.

Lance Burton: Anyone who is supporting this program to keep in mind about the mitigation and administrative codes put into place back in the 1960s to pull people and enable them up. Have that in mind when you consider the Southeast community, to have people who can enable those who don't have resources that many of us have. There are people in the community that can help them get to where they need to be. That college that we’re talking about needs to have the most attention paid because they have the capability that can grow things from.

Shawn Harris: I am a member of the Southeast community. We’re talking about corruption. In your presentation, we saw you back pedal regarding the contracts. It goes to the Community-Based Organizations (CBOs), not to the programs. These contracts have been given and there is a lot of corruption when it came down to cashing in the checks. We want you to reevaluate the stakeholders. The only stakeholders we're talking about are parents.

A.Jensen: I was not disappointed in this presentation and thank you for coming. The main question here: Is the program successful as perceived by whom? It must be the community. What are the measures of that? We need to track the dollars and be attentive. There may be some issues discussed that go beyond the SFPUC’s purview. The SPFUC should contact the other parts of the City to fix.

A.Jamdar: It would be good to get a sense of the figures associated with the program.

A.Lantsberg: One thing you can commit to that in the subcommittee meeting, you would commit to coming. Try to stay away from subjective interpretations of what you’re doing. Come with hard numbers and facts. We’ve heard about this as a stand-alone program for two years and what people see is that we’re just talking about it. We need hard backup, so that we can move forward in a productive manner.

R.Hansen: This was an exciting meeting and I hope you come back.

A.Lantsberg: I am organizing an event at the Bayview Opera House on March 7, 2013.

3. Discussion and Possible Action: Publish and update annually the complete water permit process and fee scheduled required for construction or renovation of a building. Doug Cain, CAC Power Subcommitte Chair, presented

Discussion:

R.Hansen moved to adopt the resolution. A.Lantsberg seconded.

D.Cain: A suggestion is to change “general permits” to SFPUC permits instead of just water permits on the “therefore” paragraph.

A.Jensen: You’d also need to change the title. Is this resolution achievable?

D.Cain: It can at least begin to make this a clear entity on the front page, customer service portal, and Department of Building Inspection (DBI).

A.Jensen: If we come back a year from now with progress reports on the website you may not be satisfied. I don’t know if this is an easy fix or it is about redesigning the permit process.

A.Lantsberg: I’d like to offer a friendly amendment. In regards to the interim report in the next quarter, lay out within 90 days in terms of what needs to be done to implement this.
R.Hansen: I suggest amending it to 90 days and thereafter.
A.Jensen: I’d support that language. Give it a reasonable timeframe.
D.Cain: To do a report within 90 days as opposed to the progress made.
T.Jones: Does anyone in the group object as it stands?
A.Jensen: I’d like to offer another friendly amendment on the fourth whereas. I’m not sure how it can be demonstrated. I suggest that the City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) can shorten lead times.

Public comment:
Public member #1: You must remember that SFPUC is an enterprise department. Permitting comes out of the jurisdiction within the CCSF. What you are doing is general in nature, but you’ll need to contact the permitting department within CCSF so that it is in sync. When you go to sfgov.org, this is an issue. If you do this, then everything must be in sync. Your resolution is very general in nature. It is putting things back on track and bringing some sort of uniformity.
D.Cain: The SFPUC permitting process is separate from DBI. My understanding is that there is no syncing to be done. There just needs to be more SFPUC materials along with and other department materials.
A.Jensen: I would put that on the SFPUC to follow through with coordination.
Public member #2: We are here at the meeting, so if you would like to briefly enlighten us, why do I need to come to the SFPUC when I start a business?
D.Cain: You don’t come here, you go to DBI.
Public member #3: The mayor recently introduced SF Innovate, the tool that is used to assist small businesses with the list of permits needed, is this taking that into consideration? Is there alignment with that?
D.Cain: I don’t know. The SFPUC should take that upon itself. I’m going to follow up to make sure that the SFPUC coordinates and streamlines this process.
Public member #4: Once all of the fees are listed and you knock down all of the line items and you see a hidden fee…
T.Jones: What this resolution will do is be forwarded to the Commission. We’re asking that they look at it. It’s guidance to the Commission.
D.Cain: We’re trying to stop hidden fees.
Espanola Jackson: The statement you just made that if you send this resolution, staff doesn’t need to do something. Make sure staff needs to do something.

Vote in favor to adopt/approve the resolution: T.Jones; W.Farrell; R.Hansen; A.Jensen; T.Ko; A.Lantsberg; D.Cain; J.PruittHill; A.Jamdar;
Against the motion to approve the resolution: none.
Motion passed, resolution adopted/approved.

4. Approval of the January 15, 2013 meeting minutes – skipped due to time.

5. Public Comment: none.

6. Staff Update (Teresa Young) – skipped due to time.
Public comment: none

7. Report from the Chair (Terrence Jones) – skipped due to time.
Public comment: none

8. Subcommittee Chair Reports:
a. Power Subcommittee (Doug Cain) – skipped due to time.
b. Water Subcommittee (David Pilpel) – skipped due to time.
c. Wastewater Subcommittee (Javiera PruittHill) – skipped due to time.
d. Environmental Justice & Community Benefits (Alex Lantsberg) – skipped due to time.
Public comment: none
9. Discussion and Possible Action: Change Full CAC meeting date from fourth Tuesday of the month to third Tuesday of the month
   Vote in favor of moving the meeting to new date: T.Jones; W.Farrell; R.Hansen; A.Jensen; T.Ko; A.Lantsberg; D.Cain; J.PruittHill; A.Jamdar;
   Vote in opposition to the new meeting date: none.
   Motion passed. T.Young to update the website.
   Public comment: none

10. Future Agenda Items – skipped due to time.
    Public comment: none

11. Announcements/Comments – The next regularly scheduled meeting for the Full CAC is on Tuesday, March 19, 2013.
    Public comment: none

12. Adjournment at 7:04 p.m. D.Cain moved; J.PruittHill seconded.