San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Citizens’ Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes DRAFT

Tuesday, June 18, 2013
5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.
525 Golden Gate Ave., 2nd Floor O’Shaughnessy Conference Room

Members:
Richard Hansen (D1) Walt Farrell (D7) Avni Jamdar (M-Env. Group)
Vacant (D2) Javierree PruittHill (D8) Art Jensen (M-Reg’l Water Customers)
Doug Cain (D3) Dairo Romero (D9) Stephen Bjorgan (M-Eng./Financial)
David Pilpel (D4) Terrence Jones, Chair (D10) Vacant (M-Lg Water User)
Vacant (D5) Jennifer Clary (D11) Ted Ko (B-S. Business)
Nella Manuel (D6) Alex Lantsberg (B-Env Justice)

M = Mayoral appointment, B = Board President Appointment

Staff Liaison: Suzanne Gautier

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. The meeting was called to order at 5:41 p.m. by Vice Chair Stephen Bjorgan.
   Absent: Farrell, Manuel, PruittHill, Romero
   SFPUC Staff Present: Suzanne Gautier; Debonné Nelson
   Members of the public: Imelda Mangubat

2. Presentation and Discussion: Water System Improvement Program (WSIP) Update, Julie Labonte, SFPUC WSIP Director (15 minute presentation)

   J. Clary- WSIP had a significant mitigation program. Is that being run by you? We did some very innovative things on the environmental side. We invested close to $250 million on various environmental initiatives such as review, permitting, compliance during construction, etc. We have consolidated our habitat mitigation requirement into one program instead of piece-mealing-it. We also created an interagency permitting task force where we hired staff from a number of resource agencies full time. We were able to engage all resource agencies in advance for their feedback and priority filing.

   A. Lantsberg - What lessons have you learned individually and organizationally that could be applicable to the oversight and planning of SSIP? The inception part of the program is so critical. It’s important to be very thoughtful in putting in place very solid implementation strategies in regards to environmental review, contracting, delivery methods, etc. Our organizational structure allows for a nice balance of internal staff and consultants with the right involvement and support from upper management. WSIP is recognized as one of the best run programs. I’m hoping we can build on that and make the SSIP even better. Also, gaining and maintaining the trust of stakeholders – such as elected officials, wholesale customers, interest groups – you need to do the right thing. It takes an incredible amount of work and you can lose that trust easily.
D Pilpel: An agenda presentation suggestion: how mitigation monitoring and reporting happens.

3. Discussion and Possible Action: Draft Resolution Regarding Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs), Water Subcommittee (10 minute discussion) Discussion and Q&A:

J. Clary – Over the past two years, the Water Quality Division has been developing a program to test contaminants of emergency concern (CECs). The program goal is to monitor the contaminants that could be found in our drinking water. Examples are personal care products, flame retardants, pharmaceuticals, etc. We have found we are more likely to find these contaminants in the waste water stream, which will eventually be turned into recycled water, and used to irrigate our parks and other uses. We are asking that this CEC program be included in the Wastewater Enterprise.

Resolution as amended:
J. Clary - made a motion.
R. Hansen - 2nd.
Motion Passed. No opposition.

4. Discussion: Other Draft Resolution Topics: Stephen Bjorgan and Power Subcommittee (10 minute discussion)

S. Bjorgan – Is the Commission retreat still on and is Harlan creating the agenda?
D. Pilpel – Unfortunately, the Commission is not doing a day long retreat.
A. Jensen- We have had staffing reports in the past on sustainability. What is the problem that this is intended to solve?
J. Clary – The difficulty is that sustainability is a ‘wishy-washy’ word and the SFPUC’s sustainability plan is ‘wishy-washy.’
A. Jensen – I think the Commission should ask for specifically what they want. Have any of you been to the discussions of triple bottom line approach? I am not sure what issue of sustainability is not getting addressed.
D. Pilpel – I think either the presentation or a version of it should go to the Commission with an opportunity to direct some activity or we should not be measuring or reporting. Otherwise, it does not seem to be going anywhere.
A. Lantsberg - Rather than just saying that we should address sustainability in the retreat, we would have the best value by identifying the greatest issues and crafting a resolution that identifies places where the Commission can or cannot take action.

Request the Commission to establish a utility conservation pilot program paid from savings using line item billing on customers' water bills.

S. Bjorgan: There is a movement, Marin Clean Energy for example, PG&E for the commercial market, allowing for energy efficiency improvements to appear on your PG&E bill monthly. Your loan is stated on your utility bill. Given that we have a lot of interest in water conservation, and soon enough CleanPowerSF, I would like to propose that we have on-bill financing for energy efficiency improvements. It would be another line item on your water bill for any work you have financed, such as solar, etc.
T. Ko - If you took out a loan, instead of it going through the bank being paid as a check, it would appear on your water bill.
S. Bjorgan - We do not have any means to pay for waste water and water upgrades.
A. Jensen – The payments on the loan are through the water bill. The banks provide the loan.
D. Pilpel - Can you put lien on the property?
J. Clary – No you cannot, that is my point.
S. Bjorgan – We will come back with a presentation and re-evaluate the case study.
A. Lantsberg - Let’s consider giving the Commission and General Manager some examples and something to work off of.

5. Discussion: CAC Planning for Future Meetings (30 minute discussion)
   *Skipped

6. Approval of the March 19, 2013 meeting minutes
   * J. Clary & A. Lantsberg - no opposition

7. 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 (2 minutes per speaker)
   a. None

8. Report from the Chair (Stephen Bjorgan, Acting Chair) (5 minutes)
   a. None

9. Subcommittee Chair Reports:
   a. Power Subcommittee (Ted Ko) (5 minutes)
      • -Allocation to be district by district vs. school by school for prop 39 funds for energy efficiency upgrades.
      • -We discussed bond financing and models around encouraging energy efficiency for municipal buildings. It resulted in the idea that you cannot really push it easily as SFPUC can actually lose money from power sales. We are considering a few possible resolutions for later.
   b. Water Subcommittee (David Pilpel) (5 minutes)
      • -We discussed CDD and Camp Mather. Next month we are planning to discuss land/natural resources and monthly billing.
   c. Wastewater Subcommittee (Javierre PruittHill) (5 minutes)
      i. Not available. Absent.

10. Future Agenda Items (5 minutes)
    Harlan Kelly, Jr. here to talk about future, strategic plans
    CAC planning
    J. Clary - We should talk about the concerns of our own district – the people we represent - and the voice of the customer.
    A. Jensen – I can give my parting perspective. I suggest we observe the Commission. We need to go to the meetings, watch the meetings, listen to them deliberate and listen to the questions that they ask. It is important to get a perspective as to what they are doing.

11. Announcements/Comments – The next regularly scheduled meeting for the Full CAC will take place on Tuesday, July 16, 2013.

12. Adjournment at 7:10pm.