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Project Background and Information

The current Southeast Plant (SEP) biosolids digester facility is located on the southside of the plant at the corner of Jerrold Avenue and Phelps Street in the Bayview/Hunters Point community. A large percentage of the infrastructure is in need of replacement. One of the 60-year-old digester covers collapsed in 1996 due to corrosion and rainwater intrusion, and the digester is no longer functional. As evidenced by the recent cover tilting of Digester 9 (late April 2010), cover corrosion is an ongoing concern and the risk of cover failure will increase with facility age. Structural and mechanical failures could inhibit the ability of the SFPUC to meet the current biosolids regulatory requirements and impact San Francisco’s future ability to sustain and expand beneficial biosolids reuse. Community issues pertaining to the existing facility include odor, noise, and visual impacts. The surrounding environs are a mixture of residential, production, distribution, and repair (PDR), and industrial zones.

A new biosolids digester facility would include an upgrade to Class A digestion to provide a safer biosolids product for reuse. A Cambi thermal hydrolysis pretreatment process would be utilized to minimize the footprint of the new facility. Fats, oil, and grease (FOG) from city restaurants could also be digested with bayside sludge, and pilot testing of this process is currently being performed.

Planning includes the evaluation of site options and the development of facility layouts that incorporate digestion processes (including related solids and gas handling processes) and a possible advanced biosolids drying process (that could lead to a marketable biosolids product). The incorporation of FOG, food waste, and/or advanced drying into the new biosolids digester facility is still being evaluated. The digestion of FOG and food waste could provide additional renewable energy that could be used to run the treatment plant, reducing operation costs, and to help meet San Francisco’s goal of zero waste to landfills. A food waste process would require a connecting food waste pipeline to be constructed or increase the local truck traffic 2-3 times.

Rebuilding the new biosolids digester facility at the existing southside SEP site requires obtaining control of adjacent properties to facilitate moving the digesters and gas handling processes farther from the closest residences along Phelps Street and to accommodate additional treatment processes if necessary (such as advanced drying and food waste digestion). The addition of the Central Shops and Asphalt Plant sites (see the Preferred Site Options section) would fit nicely into the total SEP campus, which would help optimize plant operations and maintenance, renewable energy reuse, and water recycling in the future by having the new facility adjacent to the northside of the SEP. The placement of the digesters could be either at the southside SEP or the Central Shops site, but the Central Shops option results in both higher project costs and later project completion dates. Building the new facility at Central Shops would require a relocation of their operation and the construction of a new yard.

Constructing the new biosolids digester facility at an offsite location was also evaluated. After a review of potential offsite locations, the Pier 94 Backlands site (see the Preferred Site Options section) was considered to be optimal due to its closer proximity to the existing SEP (to reduce long-term pumping costs and connecting trench/tunnel construction costs), its industrial zoning, and distance from residential zones (1300 feet). The liquid treatment facility on the northside of the SEP would remain in its current location; the southside SEP could be available for other treatment or non-treatment uses. The Pier 94 Backlands site is the property of the Port of San Francisco and held in State Public Trust and designated for maritime use only. The
SFPUC would need to swap the trust designation onto another property of equal or greater value and purchase the Backlands site from the Port of San Francisco.

Acquisition of the Central Shops, Asphalt Plant, or Pier 94 Backlands sites is only in the very initial discussion phase. No formal acquisition process has begun. At this time, both the Central Shops and Pier 94 Backlands sites are under the purview of other City departments and programmed for other uses. The Asphalt Plant and SEP are SFPUC properties.

Southeast Digester Task Force

The Southeast Digester Task Force is a nine member advisory group that was convened to review information regarding the replacement of the aging SEP biosolids digester facility and voice their concerns and recommendations to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Wastewater Enterprise. The SFPUC Communications and Public Outreach Division attended community group meetings to discuss the digester project (see announcement flyer in Appendix A) and encourage community members to volunteer for the task force. The task force members were selected to provide a fair and open review process for the community regarding the development of the biosolids digester facility project and are active members of the Bayview/Hunters Point community. Some of the task force members are affiliated with local business, job training, environmental, and homeowners interests; the SFPUC Citizens Advisory Committee; the Southeast Community Facility; and the Representative of District 10 Supervisor. Their names and affiliations are listed below.

Leadership Organizations
Southeast Community Facility Commission – Commissioner Bobbrie Brown
Southeast Community Facility Commission – Commissioner Helen Yang (Replaced Commissioner Louise C. Jones due to illness)
SFPUC Citizens’ Advisory Committee – Alex Lantsberg
Representative of District 10 Supervisor – Michael Hamman

Job Training
Young Community Developers – Fathina Holmes

Business Community
Owner of Pet Camp store/Bayview Rotary Club Member – Mark Klaiman

Environmental Advocacy/Science Background
Arc Ecology (nonprofit business) – Michael McGowan (Staff Scientist)

Homeowners/Community Representatives
Espanola Jackson
Karen Pierce (Southern Waterfront Advisory Committee Member)

The Southeast Digester Task Force met the first Wednesday of each month from 6:00 to 8:00 P.M. with Wastewater Enterprise staff (including engineering and plant operations), Samuel A. Murray, Southeast Community Outreach Director, and Tyrone Jue, Acting Assistant General Manager for External Affairs. The meetings were held from February 2009 to June 2010. All meetings were open to the public. The agendas and minutes for the Southeast Digester Task Force meetings are provided in the Appendix B (Agendas) and Appendix C (Minutes).
Topics for discussion were agreed upon by the task force, and a list of the monthly meeting topics are provided in Appendix D (Discussion Topics). The information and data related to the discussion topics were provided to the task force by Wastewater Enterprise staff and other invited speakers. A summary of the discussion topics follows.

- Wastewater Enterprise staff presentations on the biosolids treatment process; biosolids reuse and land application issues; preliminary site information; site alternatives layouts, costs and schedules; bioenergy programs utilizing FOG and food waste digestion; sea level rise predictions due to climate change; and mitigation and community benefits
- Tours of the Southeast and Oceanside treatment plants, the Pier 94 Backlands site, a biosolids land application site, and a Sacramento advanced drying facility
- Presentation on the Healthy Development Tool by the Department of Public Health
- Presentation on the Wastewater Treatment Systems from Around the World by Professor George Tchobanoglous
- Presentation on Biosolids and Odor Control by Dr. Lue-Hing

Other pertinent information discussed with the Southeast Digester Task Force included the following:

- The need to replace the biosolids digester facility as soon as possible
- The size requirements for the proposed biosolids digester facility
- The use of a Cambi thermal hydrolysis pretreatment process to reduce the biosolids digester facility footprint
- Advanced biosolids drying processes could be used
- The uncertainty associated with obtaining the proposed sites that are not SFPUC properties

The task force reviewed and evaluated new facility sites, layouts, construction costs and schedules, operation and maintenance costs, architectural themes, and potential community benefits. Information pertaining to the site options preferred by the task force including process layouts and the pros and cons for each site option is provided in the following Preferred Site Options section. Comparison tables consolidating relevant information regarding these site options can be found in the Comparison Tables for the Preferred Site Options section.

A Southeast Digester Task Force consensus summary for six key issues is provided in the Consensus on Key Issues section for the following issues:

- Site evaluation and screening
- New facility layouts
- Project costs and schedules
- Architectural and visual improvements
- Community benefits
- Future possibility of food waste digestion

Task force comments concerning to their experiences with the biosolids digester facility project review process are found in the Closing Comments section and the future expectations for the Southeast Digester Task Force committee can be found in the Next Steps section. Written comments submitted to SFPUC staff from the task force are provided in Appendix E.
Preferred Site Options

The Southeast Digester Task Force reviewed 17 potential sites (see Figure 1) to locate the new biosolids digester facility. Site alternatives (see the Review of Sites Handout in Appendix F) were developed and most alternatives comprised a combination of sites to increase the total area to 15 acres. Two of the site options were preferred by the Southeast Digester Task Force (Figure 2 on page 5) and are:

- **Site Option 1** – The existing southside SEP plus adjacent properties including Central Shops (City Administrator’s Office property) and Asphalt Plant/Quint Street parcels
- **Site Option 2** – The Pier 94 Backlands (Port of San Francisco property)

The Southeast Digester Task Force developed a pros and cons summary for the site options with the aid of SFPUC staff. This summary provides the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission with a list of the Southeast Digester Task Force issues and concerns regarding the construction of the new facility. A description of the site options including the process layouts and the pros and cons for each site option is provided next.

![Figure 1: Seventeen Potential Biosolids Digester Facility Sites](image-url)
SITE OPTION 1

Site Option 1 utilizes the existing area of the current southside SEP biosolids digester facility, plus incorporates additional adjacent properties (Central Shops and Asphalt Plant/Quint Street parcels) to make the site large enough:

- To facilitate moving the digesters and gas handling processes farther from nearby residential areas especially along Phelps Street
- To accommodate additional treatment processes if necessary (such as advanced drying and food waste digestion).

There are many residential neighborhoods within a quarter of a mile of the SEP. The closeness of the digesters, a source of odors and visual impacts, to the residential neighborhood adjacent to Phelps Street between Jerrold and McKinnon avenues is a major issue with implementing Site Option 1. If Site Option 1 is selected, relocating the digesters farther from homes and closer to the railroad tracks can be implemented.

A proposed condominium-style architecture design for the new biosolids digester facility is illustrated in Figure 3 on page 6. Blocking the view of the digesters from the community would also be possible.

Utilizing Site Option 1, two facility layout options (Site Options 1a and 1b) were developed by Wastewater Enterprise staff with input from the Southeast Digester Task Force and differ in the location of the digestion processes and the possible advanced drying process.
SITE OPTION 1a

For Site Option 1a, the digestion processes are located on the current southside SEP parcel with a future possible advanced drying process on the Central Shops lot (Figure 4 on page 7). The estimated project cost is $1.37 B and completion date is 2020. If needed, a food waste digestion process could be incorporated into Site Option 1a; a Site Option 1a layout that includes food waste digestion can be seen in G.

The pros and cons summary for Site Option 1a is given below.

PROS for Site Option 1a

1. Lowest Project cost ($1.37 B)
2. Earliest Completion date (2020).
3. The southside SEP soil is the best of all the sites evaluated resulting in the lowest seismic risk and liquefaction potential and reduced foundation requirements for building below-grade digesters.
4. This site option could move the digesters ~ 400 feet farther away from the Phelps Street residences (closest homes to the plant) than the current location (~70 feet).
5. Operations and maintenance costs would be approximately 10% less (~$1 M/year) than Site Option 2.
6. Locating both liquid and solid facilities (one plant) at the same site allows for better utilization of SEP alternative energy sources and recycled water.
**CONS for Site Option 1a**

1. Closer proximity to residential zones than Site Option 2.
2. The prevailing wind direction (from the west/southwest) would be towards the Phelps Street residential neighborhood from the new digesters/gas handling processes (at southside SEP).
3. Uncertain whether Central Shops site can be acquired (could need another site near SEP for advanced drying process if Central Shops is not available).
4. Complicated construction staging to keep existing facility in operation during construction.
5. If the wholesale produce market opens for retail, there could be a potential perception problem.

![Figure 4: Site Option 1a – Digestion Processes Located at the Southside SEP Parcel](image)

**SITE OPTION 1b**

For Site Option 1b, the digestion processes are located on the Central Shops lot with the future possible advanced drying process on the current southside SEP parcel (Figure 5 on page 9). The estimated project cost is $1.88 B and completion date is 2022 (for the digestion processes) and 2027 (including the advanced drying process). If needed, a food waste digestion process could be incorporated into Site Option 1b; a Site Option 1b layout that includes food waste digestion can be seen in Appendix G.
The pros and cons summary for Site Option 1b is given below.

**PROS for Site Option 1b**

1. Locating the digesters closer to the railroad tracks at Central Shops puts the digesters farther away from the closest residences to the plant along Phelps Street (~900 feet) than the current location (~70 feet) or Option 1a (~400 feet).
2. Central Shops site has the second best soil (lower seismic risk and liquefaction potential) for below-grade digester construction of the site options.
3. Locating both liquid and solid facilities (one plant) at the same site allows for better utilization of SEP alternative energy sources and recycled water.
4. Operations and maintenance costs would be approximately 10% less (~$1 M/year) than Site Option 2.
5. The prevailing wind direction (from the west/southwest) from the new digesters would be towards the northside SEP and other industrial-type zones, rather than residential areas.

**CONS for Site Option 1b**

1. Latest completion date for the biosolids digester facility (2027), although the digestion processes portion would be completed in 2023.
   - Fails the mandate to rebuild the biosolids digester facility as soon as possible.
2. Closer proximity to residential zones than Site Option 2.
3. Uncertain whether Central Shops site can be acquired; obtaining the Central Shops lot is a critical requirement for Site Option 1b.
4. If the wholesale produce market opens for retail, there could be a potential perception problem.
SITE OPTION 2

For Site Option 2, the entire biosolids digester facility is located at the Pier 94 Backlands site (Figure 6 on page 11). This Port of San Francisco property is a former landfill area that is located on artificial fill and would require extensive clean up. It is due east of the Southeast Plant and located near the bay and Heron’s Head Park. Since the property is held in State Public Trust, obtaining the site would require approval by the State Land Commission and the State of California legislature, and a land swap of a non-trust parcel of equal value would be substituted for the Backlands site. This site is located the farthest from residential zoning (1300 feet) than the other site options. Locating the new biosolids digester facility at the Pier 94 Backlands site would require the construction of a sludge pipeline (open-cut trench or underground tunnel) to transport sludge, return waste streams, etc. to and from the SEP to the Backlands site.

The estimated project cost is $2.01 B and completion date is 2024. If needed, a future food waste digestion process could be incorporated into Site Option 2; a Site Option 2 layout that includes food waste digestion can be seen in Appendix G.

The Bureau of Architecture developed a layout for the new biosolids digester facility at the Pier 94 Backlands site illustrating an older institution-style architecture that was preferred by Port of San Francisco staff (Figure 7 on page 11).

The pros and cons summary for Site Option 2 is given on the following page.
**PROS for Site Option 2**

1. The Pier 94 Backlands site is the farthest away from residential zones (1300 feet).
2. Prevailing wind direction is (from the west/southwest) toward the bay and not towards residences.
3. Less disruption to the operation of the existing SEP solids process during construction at the Pier 94 Backlands site.
4. The site is a former landfill area that would be cleaned up by the City.
5. Construction job opportunities is expected to be greater than for Site Options 1a and 1b, as the project cost is higher.

**CONS for Site Option 2**

1. Highest project cost ($2.01 B).
2. Latest completion date for the digestion processes portion (2024).
   - Fails the mandate to rebuild the biosolids digester facility as soon as possible.
3. Connecting sludge pipeline (trench or tunnel) construction required.
   - Sludge transport time (from SEP to Pier 94 Backlands) may compromise treatability and odors.
   - Potential community/street disruptions during sludge pipeline construction.
4. Uncertainty for Public Trust site acquisition; approval by State Land Commission and the State of California legislature will be needed as well as acquiring another property for a land swap.
5. Port of San Francisco has expressed hesitancy for the use of the Pier 94 Backlands site for this project.
6. The current height zoning limit of 40 feet may need to be increased to 65 feet or a maximum of 80 feet.
   - New facility will result in views of the bay being obstructed from some areas.
7. Operations and maintenance costs would be approximately 10% more ($1 M/year) than for Site Options 1a and 1b.
8. The site is a former landfill area located on artificial fill and will require extensive hazardous waste clean-up to 30 feet and substantial site preparations to reduce the risk of liquefaction during earthquakes.
9. Locating both liquid and solid facilities (one plant) at different sites results in a duplication of efforts thereby increasing operating costs and the carbon footprint.
10. Putting a new Biosolids Digester Facility at Pier 94 is contrary to the avowed community desire to use the Backlands as a job producing asset.
Figure 6: Site Option 2 – Biosolids Digester Facility at Pier 94 Backlands Site

Figure 7: Institution-Style Architecture for a New Pier 94 Backlands Facility
Comparison Tables for the Preferred Site Options

Two comparison tables are included for reference on the following three pages. The first Comparison of Site Options table on pages 13 and 14 contains general information about the site options that the task force felt was relevant when determining the pros and cons for the individual site options. The second table, the Preliminary Project Costs on page 15, contains the project costs for each site option in both today’s dollars and escalated future costs based on the differences in the individual site option construction schedules.
## Site Description

**Current uses**
- Current biosolids digester facility at Southside Southeast Plant; City auto repair and maintenance shop at Central Shops; and demolition of the City’s Asphalt Plant.
- Former landfill site on public trust, Port of San Francisco-owned property that is currently having the surface prepared for use in the future as leasable space.

**Soil quality**
- Best soil for below grade construction of digesters; piles may not be required.
- Second best soil for below grade construction of digesters; piles may be required.
- Artificial fill and contaminated soil requires soil removal to prepare site for construction; piles will likely be needed.

**Surrounding environment**
- Near industrial, Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR), public, and residential zones, railroad tracks, and wholesale produce market.
- Near industrial, Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR), public, and residential zones, railroad tracks, and wholesale produce market.
- Near San Francisco Bay and maritime industrial and Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR) zone, and railroad tracks.

**Distance of new biosolids digester facility from the Northside Southeast Plant**
- Same plant site.
- Same plant site.
- 0.5 miles as the crow flies.

## Site Acquisition Issues

**Height limit**
- 65 feet for Southside Southeast Plant and Central Shops.
- 65 feet for Southside Southeast Plant and Central Shops.
- 40 feet for Pier 94 (may need rezoning).

**Property owners**
- Southside Southeast Plant and Asphalt Plant are on SFPUC owned parcels; Central Shops is a City-owned parcel under the purview of the City Administrator’s Office.
- Southside Southeast Plant and Asphalt Plant are on SFPUC owned parcels; Central Shops is a City-owned parcel under the purview of the City Administrator’s Office.
- Pier 94 parcel is owned by the City and is under the purview of the Port of San Francisco.

**State land trust issues**
- No.
- No.
- Yes; adds uncertainty to the acquisition process; Port of San Francisco Commission has expressed hesitancy toward siting the new biosolids digester facility at this site.

**Street closures**
- Yes (Quint Street).
- Yes (Quint Street).
- None.

## Facility Construction

**Completion year for the Digester Facility**
- 2020.
- 2023.
- 2024.

**Completion date for the Biosolids Drying Facility**
- 2020.
- 2027.
- 2024.

**Impacts to existing operation during construction**
- Construction staging necessary to maintain existing operations during construction; possible use of temporary facilities at the Southside Southeast Plant.
- Low impact from construction of digestion processes. Staging or temporary facility necessary for the construction of the dewatering/drying facility at the Southside Southeast Plant.
- No impact on existing the Southside Southeast Plant operation. Possible pipe gallery connection construction to Northside Southeast Plant (for trench/tunnel entrance station).

**Construction of a trench or tunnel for a sludge pipeline to connect with SEP**
- None.
- None.
- Open-cut construction would disrupt local businesses/residents/car traffic/bus routes in 1 to 2 block areas for ~ 1 year with possible vibration, dust, or noise. Using bore and jack construction under the railroad tracks and 3rd Street will minimize impacts. Tunnel construction impacts primarily due to truck/crane noises at end points; risk of ground subsidence/sink holes.

## Costs

**Total project cost (escalated to midpoint construction)**
- $1.37 billion.
- $1.88 billion.
- $2.01 billion.
## Comparison of Site Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Site Option 1a</th>
<th>Site Option 1b</th>
<th>Site Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Values</strong></td>
<td>Central Shops estimate: $76 per square foot as a placeholder at $17.3 million</td>
<td>Central Shops estimate: $76 per square foot as a placeholder at $17.3 million</td>
<td>Pier 94 Backlands estimate: $50 per square foot at $32.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Preparation Costs</strong></td>
<td>$108 million</td>
<td>$108 million</td>
<td>$125 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations and Maintenance (O&amp;M) costs</strong></td>
<td>No cost difference due to additional staff, pumping, chemicals, or energy/heat reuse availability</td>
<td>No cost difference due to additional staff, pumping, chemicals, or energy/heat reuse availability</td>
<td>O&amp;M costs would be 10% higher than for the other alternatives (approximately $1 million annually).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facility Operation Issues</strong></td>
<td>Rebuilding the biosolids digester facility at the Southeast Plant liquid treatment facility or at another site results in better utilization of SEP alternative energy sources and recycled water. Locating the advanced drying facility at Central Shops should not cause any operational concerns.</td>
<td>Rebuilding the biosolids digester facility at the Southeast Plant results in better utilization of SEP alternative energy sources and recycled water. Locating the digestion processes at Central Shops should not cause any operational concerns.</td>
<td>Rebuilding the biosolids digester facility at the Pier 94 Backlands site results in a duplication of efforts resulting in higher operational costs and larger carbon footprint. SEP loses biogas and heat energy source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worker Issues</strong></td>
<td>Safety remains the same with workers crossing Jerrold on foot, cart, or through existing pipe gallery (for new digestion processes facility located on the southside SEP).</td>
<td>Safety remains the same with workers crossing Jerrold on foot, cart, or through existing pipe gallery (for the new advanced drying facility located on the southside SEP).</td>
<td>Some SFPUC staff with need to travel over a half mile from SEP to Pier 94 during work hours. Site will need its own maintenance facility and increased O&amp;M staffing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effects of Process Operations</strong></td>
<td>Treatment of sludge should not be affected.</td>
<td>Treatment of sludge should not be affected.</td>
<td>Sludge conveyance will increase operating complexity. Sludge may be more difficult to treat and more odorous due to travel time to site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Impacts</strong></td>
<td>&lt;70 feet (Southside Southeast Plant); 900 feet (Central Shops)</td>
<td>&lt;70 feet (Southside Southeast Plant); 900 feet (Central Shops)</td>
<td>1300 feet (0.25 miles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevailing Wind</strong></td>
<td>From the west/southwest towards residences from Southside Southeast Plant, and towards Northside Southeast Plant and industrial zone from Central Shops</td>
<td>From the west/southwest towards residences from Southside Southeast Plant, and towards Northside Southeast Plant and industrial zone from Central Shops</td>
<td>From the west/southwest towards industrial zone and SF Bay, and away from residential zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future community impacts</strong></td>
<td>If the local wholesale produce market becomes retail market, there could be a perception problem with a sewage plant in the vicinity.</td>
<td>If the local wholesale produce market becomes retail market, there could be a perception problem with a sewage plant in the vicinity.</td>
<td>New biosolids digester facility could block view of the bay from some areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction job opportunities</strong></td>
<td>Lowest number of job opportunities based on project cost.</td>
<td>Lower number of job opportunities than Site Option 2 based on project cost. Higher number of job opportunities than Site Option 1a based on project cost.</td>
<td>Construction job opportunities would be better than for Site Options 1a and 1b based on project cost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Preliminary Project Costs

**OPTION 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Elements</th>
<th>Site Option 1a</th>
<th>Site Option 1b</th>
<th>Site Option 2</th>
<th>Shop Site Option 1b</th>
<th>Shop Site Option 1a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>$7,792,301</td>
<td>$13,165,900</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,214,559</td>
<td>$7,278,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>$62,450,044</td>
<td>$101,725,000</td>
<td>$108,227,467</td>
<td>$245,052,000</td>
<td>$124,709,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunneling</td>
<td>$18,460,000</td>
<td>$30,069,000</td>
<td>$31,343,809</td>
<td>$54,932,000</td>
<td>$31,343,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land/Facility Replacement</td>
<td>$37,898,720</td>
<td>$64,034,000</td>
<td>$37,898,720</td>
<td>$85,811,000</td>
<td>$37,898,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>$38,073,032</td>
<td>$62,017,000</td>
<td>$38,073,032</td>
<td>$66,726,000</td>
<td>$38,073,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Systems</td>
<td>$29,409,288</td>
<td>$47,905,000</td>
<td>$42,186,300</td>
<td>$95,520,000</td>
<td>$42,186,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency During Construction</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>$48,867,000</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>$139,703,200</td>
<td>$227,562,000</td>
<td>$211,999,470</td>
<td>$371,545,000</td>
<td>$211,999,470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**

(a) For City owned property, land acquisition costs will need to address any additional property that may be needed.
(b) For all sites, assume 50% of the existing soil can be reused on site.
(c) Contingency costs include those associated with the site (e.g., a new relocated Central Shops).
(d) The cost shown for the sludge conveyance pipeline to Pier 94 Backlands is an average.
(e) Project costs include associated contractor mark-ups and location adjustment factors.

### Site Negotiations (Other Costs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Elements</th>
<th>Site Option 1a</th>
<th>Site Option 1b</th>
<th>Site Option 2</th>
<th>Shop Site Option 1b</th>
<th>Shop Site Option 1a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Negotiations</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunneling</td>
<td>$32,650,000</td>
<td>$32,650,000</td>
<td>$32,650,000</td>
<td>$32,650,000</td>
<td>$32,650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Replacement at New Site</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>$67,450,044</td>
<td>$154,597,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**

(a) For City owned property, land acquisition costs will need to address any additional property that may be needed.
(b) For all sites, assume 50% of the existing soil can be reused on site.
(c) Contingency costs include those associated with the site (e.g., a new relocated Central Shops).
(d) The cost shown for the sludge conveyance pipeline to Pier 94 Backlands is an average.
(e) Project costs include associated contractor mark-ups and location adjustment factors.
Consensus on Key Issues

The Southeast Digester Task Force reached a consensus on the following six key issues: site evaluation and screening, new facility layouts, project costs and schedules, architectural and visual improvements, community benefits, and future possibility of food waste digestion. The task force’s consensus of concerns and recommendations for each key issue category is given below.

Site Evaluation and Screening

Two of the site options were preferred by the Southeast Digester Task Force (see Figure 2) and are:

- **Site Option 1** – The existing southside SEP plus adjacent properties (Central Shops and Asphalt Plant/Quint Street parcels)
- **Site Option 2** – The Pier 94 Backlands

New Facility Layouts

If Site Option 1 is selected, relocating the digesters farther from homes and closer to the railroad tracks is preferred by the task force (see Figures 4 and 5).

If Site Option 2 is selected, the task force is concerned about the construction of a sludge pipeline (open-cut trench or underground tunnel) to transport sludge, return waste streams, etc. to and from the SEP to the Pier 94 Backlands site. It was felt that the disruption to traffic would be too long, based on their experiences during the Muni Third Street Light Rail Project. The new biosolids digester facility should also be built to minimize the obstruction of the view of the bay.

Project Costs and Schedules

The preliminary capital cost and schedule estimates for the new biosolids digester facility that includes both digestion processes and an advanced biosolids drying process are given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Escalated Project Costs*</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Option 1a</td>
<td>$1.37 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Option 1b</td>
<td>$1.88 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Option 2</td>
<td>$2.01 B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes estimates for land acquisition costs: the land purchase cost, and the land/facility replacement costs (for the Central Shops site) or the replacement of public trust land (for the Pier 94 Backlands site). Property negotiation costs or other unseen costs were not estimated or included in the total Project Costs. The Central Shops site was assessed at $75 per square foot. The Pier 94 site for Site Option 2 was assessed at $50 per square foot.
Even though there is a substantial difference between the costs and schedules for the different options, the task force’s opinion is divided on which of the site options would be best for the Bayview/Hunters Point community.

**Architectural Improvements**

For Site Option 1, the Southeast Digester Task Force preferred to have the buildings surrounding both the southside and northside of the SEP demonstrate a condominium-style architecture (see Figure 3), and the view of the digesters be blocked from the surrounding streets and community. Landscaping and other options (such as art) could be used for visual screening, where appropriate.

For Site Option 2, the older institution-style architecture that was preferred by the Port of San Francisco staff (Figure 7) was supported by the Southeast Digester Task Force.

**Community Benefits**

The Southeast Digester Task Force felt the local community should receive compensation for having the new Biosolids Digester Facility remain in the Bayview/Hunters Point area. Mitigations could include the following goals.

- Mandatory local hiring from the project impact area, requiring that no less than 50% of the operational job hours under the Biosolids Digester Facility Project will be performed by residents of zip codes 94124, 94134, and 94107, in that order or priority.
- The local hiring commitment must be included in a new Project Labor Agreement that will be negotiated between the SFPUC and labor groups (i.e., Southeast Jobs Coalition). A commitment to funding NGO (non-governmental organizations) is not necessarily a prerequisite to accomplishing this goal.
- The necessary resources should be allocated to job readiness, training and preparation, internships and opportunities, case management and retention, barrier removal, dues and equipment costs, and other services to be administered by community-based organizations that will help the SFPUC and its contractors meet the local hiring requirement. Local job creation should be balanced against any increased costs, delays, or inefficiencies created by making such job creation a priority.
- Continue existing apprenticeship program and job training program.
- State-of-the-art mitigation measures that reduce the environmental and air quality impacts that the new biosolids digesters facility will place upon the community.
- Increase environmental education outreach to students.
- Residents in 94124 should receive some mitigation for being close to the SEP, such as sewer rate discounts and free solar panels.

**Possibility of Future Food Waste Digestion**

A fully developed food waste digestion process plan was not available for the task force to review, and the Southeast Digester Task Force felt it merited a separate public review process. They did feel that if a food waste process were to be included in the new biosolids digester facility, all participants in the food waste project should share in the expense (capital and operations and maintenance costs).
**Closing Comments**

Task force comments concerning to their experiences with the biosolids digester facility project review process are listed below:

- This 17 month review process for the proposed biosolids digester facility has been an open, creative, listening process, and the opinions expressed in this report are an honest representation of the views of the Southeast Digester Task Force.
- The task force appreciates all the work of the SFPUC Wastewater Enterprise staff to inform, discuss, and help the Southeast Digester Task Force understand the proposed biosolids digester facility and its related issues.
- The task force appreciates all the work of the members of the community and task force members.
- The task force supports the project to move ahead to conceptual design and the environmental review process.

**Next Steps**

The Southeast Digester Task Force will suspend their monthly meetings as of June 2, 2010, but it is hoped that they will remain involved during the planning process of the Biosolids Digester Facility Project. Task force member names will be added to the project mailing list to be kept informed of key milestones during the environmental review and design phases of the Biosolids Digester Facility Project. Project information may also be obtained through the SFPUC Web site, www.sfwater.org.
APPENDIX A
What is the Digesters Task Force?

In 2008, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) moved into a multi-year environmental review process for the S.F. Sewer System Master Plan, a long-term planning document addressing needs of the city sewer system. One critical project outlined is the replacement of the seismically-unreliable, 50+ year-old Southeast Plant digesters (See “What is a digester?”).

The Southeast Digester Task Force is an advisory group comprised of community and business interests that will review and make recommendations about the replacement of the Southeast Treatment Plant digesters. The task force will meet concurrently during the S.F. Sewer System Master Plan environmental review to help shape the final project.

Some of the key issues the task force will review include:

- site selection
- placement and profile of the digester vessels;
- facility design themes;
- cost;
- architectural improvements;
- street facade;
- and overall community integration of the project.

Why replace the Southeast digesters?

The ten Southeast Plant digesters were built in 1951 and have been in constant operation for more than 50 years – well past their intended lifespan. The current digesters are seismically-unreliable and a source of odors. While several odor and process improvements have been completed or are currently in construction, more dramatic structural improvements are needed.
How can I get involved?

The Southeast Digester Task Force will meet monthly starting in February 2009. The meetings will be held at the Southeast Plant located at 750 Phelps Street in San Francisco. Meeting dates and times to be announced. If you have questions or wish to sign up for meeting notifications, please contact Samuel A. Murray at (415) 554-3275 or email smurray@sfwater.org.

What is a digester?

Digesters are heated storage tanks that treat sludge, the name for the solid waste separated from sewage. The process is similar to what happens in a cow’s stomach. Sludge is heated at 95°F for a minimum of 15 days to kill pathogens and naturally occurring anaerobic consume organic material. Once the treatment is complete, the material is called biosolids. All of San Francisco’s 80,000 tons of biosolids generated every year is 100% reused as soil amendment, as a soil substitute at landfills or as compost.

Another useful byproduct of the digestion process is methane gas. This gas is reused to provide 1/3 of the Southeast Plant’s energy needs through electricity and heating.

Learn more about digesters and the wastewater treatment process by taking a tour of a SFPUC wastewater treatment plant. Visit sfsewers.org today.
Southeast Digester Task Force Meeting
June 2, 2010
Meeting Agenda
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.
750 Phelps Street, Conference Room

Members
Bobbrie Brown, Michael Hamman, Fathina Holmes, Alex Lantsberg,
Michael McGowan, Mark Klaiman, Espanola Jackson, Louise C. Jones,
Karen Pierce, Helen Yang

Staff: Samuel A. Murray
1. Call to order
2. Roll Call
3. Review of May 5, 2010 minutes
4. Final Southeast Digester Task Force Summary Report
5. Public comments
6. Adjourn

Disability Access
The SEP Task Force meeting will be held San Francisco Treatment Plant at 750 Phelps Street, Conference Room. The Conference Room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the 16th and Mission. Accessible Muni bus lines serving this location are: 19, 23, and 24. Accessible Metro Lines is the T. For information about Muni accessible services call (415) 923-6142.
Southeast Digester Task Force Meeting
May 5, 2010
Meeting Agenda
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.
750 Phelps Street, Conference Room

Members
Bobbrie Brown, Michael Hamman, Fathina Holmes, Alex Lantsberg, Michael McGowan, Mark Klaiman, Espanola Jackson, Louise C. Jones, Karen Pierce, Helen Yang

Staff: Samuel A. Murray
1. Call to order
2. Roll Call
3. Review of April 7, 2010 minutes
4. Draft Southeast Digester Task Force Summary
5. Public comments
6. Adjourn

Disability Access
The SEP Task Force meeting will be held San Francisco Treatment Plant at 750 Phelps Street, Conference Room. The Conference Room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the 16th and Mission. Accessible Muni bus lines serving this location are: 19, 23, and 24. Accessible Metro Lines is the T. For information about Muni accessible services call (415) 923-6142.
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Southeast Digester Task Force Meeting

April 7, 2010

Meeting Agenda

6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.
750 Phelps Street, Conference Room

Members

Bobbrie Brown, Michael Hamman, Fathina Holmes, Alex Lantsberg, Michael McGowan, Mark Klaiman, Espanola Jackson, Louise C. Jones, Karen Pierce, Helen Yang

Staff: Samuel A. Murray

1. Call to order
2. Roll Call
3. Review of March 3, 2009 minutes
4. Draft Southeast Digester Task Force Summary
5. Public comments
6. Adjourn

Disability Access

The SEP Task Force meeting will be held Southeast Treatment Plant at 750 Phelps Street, Conference Room. The Conference Room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the 16th and Mission. Accessible Muni bus lines serving this location are: 19, 23, and 24. Accessible Metro Lines is the T. For information about Muni accessible services call (415) 923-6142.
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Southeast Digester Task Force Meeting
March 3, 2010
Meeting Agenda
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.
750 Phelps Street, Conference Room

Members
Bobbrie Brown, Michael Hamman, Fathina Holmes, Alex Lantsberg,
Michael McGowan, Mark Klaiman, Espanola Jackson, Louise C. Jones,
Karen Pierce, Helen Yang

Staff: Samuel A. Murray
1. Call to order
2. Roll Call
3. Review of February 3, 2009 minutes
4. Mitigation and Community Benefits
5. Public comments
6. Adjourn

Disability Access
The SEP Task Force meeting will be held San Francisco Treatment Plant at 750 Phelps Street, Conference Room. The Conference Room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the 16th and Mission. Accessible Muni bus lines serving this location are: 19, 23, and 24. Accessible Metro Lines is the T. For information about Muni accessible services call (415) 923-6142.
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Southeast Digester Task Force Meeting

February 3, 2010

Meeting Agenda

6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.
750 Phelps Street, Conference Room

Members
Bobbie Brown, Michael Hamman, Fathina Holmes, Alex Lantsberg, Michael McGowan, Mark Klaiman, Espanola Jackson, Louise C. Jones, Karen Pierce, Helen Yang

Staff: Samuel A. Murray

1. Call to order
2. Roll Call
3. Review of January 5, 2009 minutes
4. Sea Level Rise
5. Review of proposed site layouts-potential improvements over existing biosolids facility
6. Public comments
7. Adjourn

Disability Access
The SEP Task Force meeting will be held San Francisco Treatment Plant at 750 Phelps Street, Conference Room. The Conference Room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the 16th and Mission. Accessible Muni bus lines serving this location are: 19, 23, and 24. Accessible Metro Lines is the T. For information about Muni accessible services call (415) 923-6142.
Southeast Digesters Task Force Meeting

January 6, 2010

Meeting Agenda
6:00 – 8:00 p.m.
750 Phelps Street, Conference Room

Members
Bobbrie Brown, Michael Hamman, Fathina Holmes, Alex Lantsberg, Michael McGowan, Mark Klaiman, Espanola Jackson, Louise C. Jones, Karen Pierce, Helen Yang

Staff Liaison: Samuel A. Murray

1. Call to order
2. Roll Call
3. Review December 2, 2009 minutes
4. Presentation, discussion of the FOG and other bioenergy projects and future impacts
5. Discussion of possible field trips to biosolids facilities or slide show
6. Public comments
7. Adjournment

Disability Access
The SEP Task Force meeting will be held Southeast Treatment Plant at 750 Phelps Street, Conference Room. The Conference Room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible Bart station is the 16th and Mission. Accessible Muni bus lines serving this location are: 19, 23, and 24. Accessible Metro is the T. For information about Muni accessible services call (415) 923-6142.
Southeast Digester Task Force Meeting

December 2, 2009
Meeting Agenda

6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.
750 Phelps Street, Conference Room

Members

Bobbrie Brown, Michael Hamman, Fathina Holmes, Alex Lantsberg, Michael McGowan, Mark Klaiman, Espanola Jackson, Louise C. Jones, Karen Pierce, Helen Yang

Staff: Samuel A. Murray

1. Call to order
2. Roll Call
3. Review of November 4, 2009 minutes
4. Discussion of future meeting topics
5. Project cost refinement- follow-up from November meeting
6. Discuss tentative field trips to biosolids facilities
7. Public comments
8. Adjourn

Disability Access

The SEP Task Force meeting will be held San Francisco Treatment Plant at 750 Phelps Street, Conference Room. The Conference Room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the 16th and Mission. Accessible Muni bus lines serving this location are: 19, 23, and 24. Accessible Metro Lines is the T. For information about Muni accessible services call (415) 923-6142.
Southeast Digester Task Force Meeting  
November 4, 2009  
Meeting Agenda  
6:00 p.m. – 10:00 p.m.  
750 Phelps Street, Conference Room

Members  
Bobbrie Brown, Michael Hamman, Fathina Holmes, Alex Lantsberg, Michael McGowan, Mark Klaiman, Espanola Jackson, Louise C. Jones, Karen Pierce, Helen Yang

Staff: Samuel A. Murray

1. Call to order  
2. Roll Call  
3. Review of September 2, 2009 minutes  
4. Discussion of future meeting topics  
5. Comparison of Sites Alternatives for New Biosolids Center  
6. Public comments  
7. Adjourn

Disability Access  
The SEP Task Force meeting will be held San Francisco Treatment Plant at 750 Phelps Street, Conference Room. The Conference Room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the 16th and Mission. Accessible Muni bus lines serving this location are: 19, 23, and 24. Accessible Metro
Southeast Digester Task Force Meeting
September 2, 2009
Meeting Agenda
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.
750 Phelps Street, Conference Room

Members
Bobbrie Brown, Michael Hamman, Fathina Holmes, Alex Lantsberg, Michael McGowan, Mark Klaiman, Espanola Jackson, Louise C. Jones, Karen Pierce, Helen Yang

Staff: Samuel A. Murray
1. Call to order
2. Roll Call
3. Review of August 5, 2009 minutes
4. Discussion of proposed approach for evaluation of four site alternatives
5. Presentation from San Francisco Department of Public Health about Healthy Development Measurement Tools
6. Public comments
7. Adjournment

Disability Access
The SEP Task Force meeting will be held San Francisco Treatment Plant at 750 Phelps Street, Conference Room. The Conference Room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the 16th and Mission. Accessible Muni bus lines serving this location are: 19, 23, and 24. Accessible Metro Lines is the T. For information about Muni accessible services call (415) 923-6142.
Southeast Digester Task Force Meeting

August 5, 2009
Meeting Agenda

6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.
750 Phelps Street, Conference Room

Members
Bobbrie Brown, Michael Hamman, Fathina Holmes, Alex Lantsberg,
Michael McGowan, Mark Klaiman, Espanola Jackson, Louise C. Jones,
Karen Pierce, Helen Yang

Staff: Samuel A. Murray

1. Call to order
2. Roll Call
3. Review of July 1, 2009 minutes
4. Presentation, discussion of Southeast digester sites alternatives
5. Michael McGowan will give a report on the Solano County land application and
Sacramento advanced biosolids drying facility.
6. Public comments
7. Adjournment

Disability Access
The SEP Task Force meeting will be held San Francisco Treatment Plant at 750
Phelps Street, Conference Room. The Conference Room is wheelchair accessible.
The closest accessible BART station is the 16th and Mission. Accessible Muni bus
lines serving this location are: 19, 23, and 24. Accessible Metro Lines is the T. For
information about Muni accessible services call (415) 923-6142.
Southeast Digesters Task Force  
July 1, 2009  
Meeting Agenda  
6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.  
750 Phelps Street, Conference Room  

Members  
Bobbrie Brown, Michael Hamman, Fathina Holmes, Alex Lantsberg, Michael McGowan, Mark Klaiman, Espanola Jackson, Louise C. Jones, Karen Pierce, Helen Yang  

Staff Liaison: Samuel A. Murray/ Tyrone Jue  

1. Call to order  
2. Roll Call  
3. Review June 3, 2009 minutes  
4. Presentation, discussion and evaluation of Southeast digester sites alternatives  
5. Public comments  
6. Adjournment  

Disability Access  
The SEP Task Force meeting will be held San Francisco Treatment Plant at 750 Phelps Street, Conference Room. The Conference Room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the 16th and Mission. Accessible Muni bus lines serving this location are: 19, 23, and 24. Accessible Metro Lines is the T. For information about Muni accessible services call (415) 923-6142.
Southeast Digester Task Force  
June 3, 2009  
Meeting Agenda  
6:00 p.m.-8:00 p.m.  
750 Phelps Street, Conference Room

Members  
Bobbrie Brown, Michael Hamman, Fathina Holmes, Alex Lantsberg, Michael McGowan, Mark Klaiman, Espanola Jackson, Louise C. Jones, Karen Pierce, Helen Yang

Staff Liaison: Samuel A. Murray

1. Call to order
2. Roll Call
3. Review May 6, 2009 minutes
4. Presentation, discussion and evaluation of Southeast digester site alternatives
5. Tentative Meeting Schedule and Outline update
6. Public comments
7. Adjournment

Disability Access  
The SEP Task Force meeting will be held Southeast Treatment Plant at 750 Phelps Street, Conference Room. The Conference Room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the 16th and Mission. Accessible Muni bus lines serving this location are: 19, 23, and 24. Accessible Metro Lines is the T. For information about Muni accessible services call (415) 923-6142.
Southeast Digester Task Force  
May 6, 2009  
Meeting Agenda  
6:00 p.m.-8:00 p.m.  
750 Phelps Street, Conference Room

Members  
Bobbie Brown, Michael Hamman, Fathina Holmes, Alex Lantsberg, Michael McGowan, Mark Klaiman, Espanola Jackson, Louise C. Jones, Karen Pierce, Helen Yang

Staff Liaison: Samuel A. Murray

1. Call to order

2. Roll Call

3. Review April 1, 2009 Minutes

4. New Bayside Digester Facility
   • Proposed treatment process selection
   • Biosolids Reuse (Class A disposal)
   • Possible facility sites

5. Tentative Meeting Schedule and Outline update

6. Public comments

7. Adjournment

Disability Access
The SEP Task Force meeting will be held Southeast Treatment Plant at 750 Phelps Street, Conference Room. The Conference Room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the 16th and Mission. Accessible Muni bus lines serving this location are: 19, 23, and 24. Accessible Metro Lines is the T. For information about Muni accessible services call (415) 923-6142.
Southeast Digester Task Force Meeting

April 1, 2009

Meeting Agenda

6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.
750 Phelps Street, Conference Room

Members

Bobbrie Brown, Michael Hamman, Fathina Holmes, Alex Lantsberg, Michael McGowan, Mark Klaiman, Espanola Jackson, Louise C. Jones, Karen Pierce, Helen Yang

Staff: Samuel A. Murray

1. Call to order
2. Roll Call
3. Review of February 4 and March 4, 2009 minutes
4. Selection of Southeast Digester Task Force Chair and Vice Chair
5. Discussion of agendas and future meeting with staff
6. Public comments
7. Adjournment

Disability Access

The SEP Task Force meeting will be held San Francisco Treatment Plant at 750 Phelps Street, Conference Room. The Conference Room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the 16th and Mission. Accessible Muni bus lines serving this location are: 19, 23, and 24. Accessible Metro Lines is the T. For information about Muni accessible services call (415) 923-6142.
Southeast Task Force Meeting
March 4, 2009
Meeting Agenda
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.
750 Phelps Street, Conference Room

Members
Bobbrie Brown, Tathina Holmes, Michael Hamman, Michael McGowan, Alex Lantsberg, Mark Klaiman, Espanola Jackson, Karen Pierce, Helen Yang

Staff: Samuel A. Murray
1. Call to order
2. Roll Call
3. Introductions of new SEP Digester Task Force members (5 minutes)
4. George Tchobanoglous, Ph.D. University of California, Davis. Specialty: Small, decentralized wastewater treatment systems (25 minutes)
5. Cecil Lue-Hing, Ph. D. Director of Research and Development for Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago (Retired) Specialty: Wastewater biosolids and odor control (25 minutes)
6. Selection of SEP Digester Task Force member Chair and Vice Chair (10 minutes)
7. Discussion of pass tours on Friday, February 20, 2009. Pier 94 and the Southeast and Oceanside Treatment Plants (15 minutes)
8. Adjournment

Disability Access
The SEP Task Force meeting will be held San Francisco Treatment Plant at 750 Phelps Street, Conference Room. The Conference Room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the 16th and Mission. Accessible Muni bus lines serving this location are: 19, 23, and 24. Accessible Metro Lines is the T. For information about Muni accessible services call (415) 923-6142.

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 Samuel Murray at (415) 554-3275 or our TTY at (415) 554-3488 to make arrangements for the accommodation. Late requests will be honored, if possible.
Southeast Digester Task Force Special Meeting

February 20, 2009

Agenda

9:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Members

Bobbrie Brown, Fathina Holmes, Alex Lantsberg, Michael McGowan, Mark Klaiman, Espanola Jackson, Louise C. Jones, Karen Pierce

Staff: Samuel A. Murray

This is a special meeting of the Southeast Digester Task Force to tour the Southeast Treatment Plant, Oceanside Treatment Plant, and Pier 94. The tour will begin at the Southeast Treatment Plant from approximately 9:00 am. Tour participants will be shuttled between the three locations.

Please RSVP with Samuel Murray (415) 554-3275 if you plan on attending.

Disability Access

The SEP Task Force meeting will be held at San Francisco Treatment Plant at 750 Phelps Street, Conference Room. The Conference Room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the 16th and Mission. Accessible Muni bus lines serving this location are: 19, 23, and 24. Accessible Metro Lines is the T. For information about Muni accessible services call (415) 923-6142.

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 Samuel Murray at (415) 554-3275 or our TTY at (415) 554-3488 to make arrangements for the accommodation. Late requests will be honored, if possible.
Southeast Digester Task Force  
February 4, 2009  
Meeting Agenda  
6:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.  
Southeast Plant, 750 Phelps Street, Conference Room  

**Members**  
Bobbrie Brown, Fathina Holmes, Espanola Jackson, Louise C. Jones, Mark Klaiman, Alex Lantsberg, Michael McGowan, Karen Pierce

**Staff Liaison:** Samuel A. Murray

1. Call to order  
2. Roll Call  
3. Introductions *(10 minutes)*  
4. Objectives of Southeast Digester Task Force *(20 minutes)*  
5. Future meeting dates *(5 minutes)*  
6. Selection of date for tours of the Southeast and Oceanside Treatment Plants and Pier 94 Backlands *(5 minutes)*  
7. Discussion on selection of Task Force Chair *(5 minutes)*  
8. Adjournment

**Disability Access**  
The SEP Task Force meeting will be held San Francisco Treatment Plant at 750 Phelps Street, Conference Room. The Conference Room is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART station is the 16th and Mission. Accessible Muni bus lines serving this location are: 19, 23, and 24. Accessible Metro Lines is the T. For information about Muni accessible services call (415) 923-6142.

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 Betsy Rhodes at (415) 554-3275 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) 554-6060.
APPENDIX C
Southeast Digester Task Force
June 2, 2010
Meeting Summary

Members Present:
Espanola Jackson
Michael McGowan
Mark Klaiman
Michael Hamman
Karen Pierce
Helen Yang

Members Excused:
Alex Lantsberg
Bobbrie Brown
Fathina Holmes

Meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm

Review of May 5, 2010 minutes.

The Southeast Digester Task Force members reviewed, discussed, and signed the Final Report.

Discussion about proposed presentation to San Francisco Public Utilities Commission for June 22, 2010 meeting.

Meeting adjourns at 8:00
Southeast Digester Task Force  
May 5, 2010  
Meeting Summary

**Members Present:**
Alex Lantsberg  
Bobbie Brown  
Espanola Jackson  
Fathina Holmes  
Michael McGowan  
Mark Klaiman  
Michael Hamman  
Helen Yang

**Members Excused:**  
Louise C. Jones  
Karen Pierce

Meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm

Review of April 7, 2010 minutes.

The Southeast Digester Task Force members reviewed and discussed the Draft Summary. Task Force members’ comments were collected and passed on to staff. Final Draft Report will be discussed at June 2, 2010 meeting.

Discussion about proposed presentation to San Francisco Public Utilities Commission for June 22, 2010 meeting.

Meeting adjourns at 8:00
Southeast Digester Task Force
April 7, 2010
Meeting Summary

Members Present:
Alex Lantsberg
Espanola Jackson
Fathina Holmes
Mark Klainman
Karen Pierce
Helen Yang

Members Excused:
Louise C. Jones
Bobbrie Brown
Michael McGowan
Michael Hamman

Meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm

Review of March 3, 2010 minutes.

The Southeast Digester Task Force members reviewed and discussed the Draft Summary Report and Pro and Cons of Site Options. Task Force members’ comments were collected and passed on to staff. Final Draft Report will be discussed at May 5, 2010 meeting.

Discussion about proposed presentation to San Francisco Public Utilities Commission for June 22, 2010 meeting.

Meeting adjourns at 8:00
Southeast Digester Task Force
March 3, 2010
Meeting Summary

Members Present:
Alex Lantsberg
Michael McGowan
Espanola Jackson
Michael Hamman
Fathina Holmes

Members Excused:
Louise C. Jones
Bobbrie Brown
Mark Klainman
Karen Pierce
Helen Yang

Meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm

Review of February 3, 2010 minutes.

The Southeast Digester Task Force members received draft summary report which will be discussed at the April 7, 2010 meeting.

Harlan Kelly Jr of SFPUC gave a presentation on future mitigation and community benefits. And after the presentation Southeast Digester Task Force members decided to email suggestions on this matter to Samuel A. Murray for the Southeast Digester Task Force Summary and this matter will be discuss at next meeting.

Meeting adjourns at 8:00 pm.
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Southeast Digester Task Force  
February 3, 2010  
Meeting Summary

**Members Present:**  
Mark Klainman  
Michael McGowan  
Karen Pierce  
Michael Hamman  
Fathina Holmes  
Helen Yang

**Members Excused:**  
Louise C. Jones  
Bobbrie Brown  
Espanola Jackson  
Alex Lantsberg

Meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm

Review of January 6, 2010 minutes.

Jon Loiacono of SFPUC gave a presentation on Sea Level Rise in San Francisco. Topics discussed included global warming, historical sea level data, areas of future flooding, future sea level rise predictions, and impacts on San Francisco’s sewer system.

Rahmstorf (2007) projects global mean sea level to rise between 1.6 and 4.6 ft by 2100. Short and long term solutions for the sewer system were discussed.

Southeast Digester Task Force had a discussion on proposed site layouts and potential improvements over existing biosolids facility.

The Southeast Digester Task Force members requested a draft summary report at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourns at 8:00 pm.
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Southeast Digester Task Force  
January 6, 2010  
Meeting Summary

Members Present:  
Mark Klainman,  
Michael McGowan  
Fathina Holmes  
Helen Yang

Staff: Samuel A. Murray

Meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

Review of December 2, 2009 minute.

Discussion of tentative meeting schedule.

The Digester Task Force members decided not to go on field trips, but would prefer seeing video or slide show of Millbrae FOG codigestion, Sacramento thermal dryer, and other examples of biosolids facility design. This was a follow up from December meeting.

The SFPUC Bioenergy Program staff presented information about current and future FOG (fats, oils and grease) and food waste projects, and their potential impacts on the Digester Project.

Meeting adjourned at 7:15.
This is the second page....
Southeast Digester Task Force
December 2, 2009
Meeting Summary
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

Members present:     Members excused:
Espanola Jackson     Bobbrie Brown
Mark Klaiman         Louise Jones
Karen Pierce         Fathina Holmes
Michael McGowan
Michael Hamman
Helen Yang

Staff: Samuel A. Murray

Meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

Review of November 4, 2009 minutes

Discussion of future meetings:
Bioenergy projects including FOG- Fats, Oils, Grease and the possible future impacts
Discussion of the possible fields trips, video or side show of the biosolids facilities

Facility Tour Suggestions:
• Discovery Bay- Solar drying facility
• Millbrae- FOG codigestion
• Sacramento- Thermal dyer and pelletizer
• Video or slide show of innovative architectural and visual designs

SFPUC Southeast Digester Team presented revised SFPUC Biosolids Center Preliminary Project Cost. This was a follow up from November meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.
This is the second page....
Southeast Digester Task Force
November 4, 2009
Meeting Summary

Members Present:
Espanola Jackson
Mark Klainman
Alex Lantsberg
Michael McGowan
Karen Pierce
Michael Hamman
Fathina Holmes
Helen Yang

Members Excused:
Louise C. Jones
Bobbrie Brown

Meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm

Review of September 2, 2009 minutes.

Site alternatives comparison. The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) staff explained the addition of Site Alternative 5, with digesters located at Central Shops and dewatering and advanced drying facilities at Southside SEP, which is significantly different than Alternative 2 although they consist of the same parcels. The staff provided a detailed comparison table and presented a summary of comparison.

- Site characteristics and preliminary facility layout for each alternative. The Caltrans parcels were noted as under increasing risk of flooding with predicted sea level rise.

- Sludge pipeline construction. Pipe connection is required for a biosolids facility located either at Caltrans parcels or Pier 94 Backlands. Two feasible construction methods, Open Cut and Tunneling, were discussed. A number of alignment options for Pier 94 were presented. The staff also discussed potential public impacts. The staff assured that it would not be necessary to close the Third Street intersection for construction. The Task Force members still expressed some concerns given the soil condition of the area.

- Project schedule and cost: The staff explained the critical steps of the project schedule and how environmental review, land acquisition and construction sequencing affect the project completion date. In general, the project cost is greater the longer it takes to complete the project. The Task Force members provided suggestions to refine the cost estimates.

- Site alternatives highlights

After staff presentation, the Task Force decided to eliminate two alternatives out of the five. They were Alternative 1 (Southside SEP + Caltrans) and 3 (Caltrans + BFS + Parcels A&B). The remaining alternatives are:

- Site Alternative 2: Southside SEP + Central Shops (digesters at Southside SEP)
- Site Alternative 4: Pier 94 Backlands
- Site Alternative 5: Central Shops + Southside SEP (digesters at Central Shops)

The Task Force was also interested in more information to better define community impacts, such as indicators that are more specific than “distance from residential houses,” and measurement of performance improvements.

Meeting adjourn at 8:40 pm.
Southeast Digester Task Force  
September 2, 2009  
Meeting Summary  
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

Members present:  
Espanola Jackson  
Mark Klaiman  
Fathina Holmes  
Michael McGowan  
Michael Hamman  
Alex Lantssberg  
Helen Yang

Members excused:  
Bobbrie Brown  
Louis C. Jones  
Karen Pierce

Staff: Samuel A. Murray

Meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

Review of September 2, 2009 minutes.

Suggested Approach for Evaluation of Four Site Alternatives for New Digester and Solids Handling Facility

Humphrey Ho reviewed the parameters of the four sites and stated that it will be discussed in November. Things to be discussed:

- Preliminary site layouts
- Site Conditions
- Land acquisition
- Sludge/waste pipeline(s) alignment
- Constructability
- Regulatory impacts and CEQA impacts
- Ability to buffer from residents and neighbors
- Project duration
- Cost
- O & M impacts
- Other site opportunities

Lili Farhang from the San Francisco Department of Public Health Program did a presentation on Health, Equity and Sustainability. Lili Farhang gave an introduction to the Health Development Measurement Tool. The presentation outlines, Introduction and Overview, components and organizational role of SFDPH in Southeast Digester process and sample HDMT indicators. The goal of Healthy Development Measurement Tool (HDMT) is to support comprehensive and health – responsive planning using a systematic and objective method. The Method: Multi-objective, voluntary evaluation metric and checklist that incorporates measurable community health indicators and
development targets. Lili Farhang stated that these HDMT has three primary components: Community Health Indicator System, Healthy Development checklist and menu of Policies and design strategies. The elements of the tool are: Environmental stewardship, Sustainable and safe transportation, Social Cohesion, Public Infrastructure/Access to goods and services, adequate and healthy housing and healthy economy.

For more information about the program of Health, Equity and Sustainability, you can go the website www.TheHDMT.org and www.sfphes.org.

The Southeast Digester Task Force decided not to have a meeting in the month of October and that next meeting would be Wednesday, November 4, 2009 at 6:00 p.m.

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.
Southeast Digester Task Force  
August 5, 2009  
Meeting Summary  
750 Phelps Street, Conference Room  
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

Members Present:  
Michael Hamman  
Mark Klaiman  
Espanola Jackson  
Michael McGowan  
Karen Pierce  
Alex Lantsberg

Members Excused/Absent:  
Louise C. Jones  
Fathina Holmes  
Bobbrie Brown  
Helen Yang

Meeting was called to order at 6:10 p.m.

Review of July 7, 2009 minutes:  
Presentation, discussion and evaluation of Southeast digester site alternatives.  
Jon Loiacono conducted the presentation. Jon Loiacono walked through each of the site alternatives that were considered for the Southeast digester siting. The size needed for the biosolids center would be 12-15 acres. This includes a sludge handling facility of 7-10 acres that would upgrade treatment of San Francisco biosolids to Class A from Class B. The additional 5 acres are needed in the future for an advanced biosolids drying facility resulting in dried pellets for consumer and commercial uses similar to the brands Tagro or Tillo.

After discussion of the area requirements, Jon Loiacono reviewed the 16 sites considered and which of the sites that did not meet this size criterion. This included North Point Facility, Norcal, Mirant, Tuntex, Circosta, and Griffith Pump Station. Jon Loiacono proceeded to review remaining available sites and reasons for not considering them for the biosolids center.

The remaining sites, Southside Southeast Plant, Caltrans Parcel A & B, Bruce Flynn Pump Station, Central Shops, and Pier 94 backlands were then reviewed after combining adjacent sites to meet the size criterion. At the suggestion of task force members, the sites were renamed from Onsite and Offsite to Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Alternative 1: Southside Southeast Plant and Caltrans  
Alternative 2: Southside Southeast Plant and Central Shops  
Alternative 3: Caltrans, Parcels A & B, and Bruce Flynn Pump Station Lot  
Alternative 4: Pier 94 Backlands

Jon Loiacono discussed the estimated time needed to begin construction on the biosolids center project. An estimated 9-11 years would be needed in Alternatives 1-3 for environmental review, design, and land acquisition before construction could begin. An
additional 2-4 years is anticipated to be needed for the trust swap and State legislative process to acquire Pier 94.

At the suggestion of the Task Force, staff will review Alternative 2 and look at the possibility of moving the digesters to Central Shops instead of using that only for advanced drying. Other key discussion surrounded the cost savings of utilizing the existing Southside Southeast site, and the required underground utilities and anticipated disruption on 3rd Street to accommodate the new tunnel needed to pump sludge and recycle waste streams to/from the Pier 94 backlands site or the Caltrans site.

**Biosolids Field Trip 7/7/09 with SFPUC staff and Michael McGowan**

**Biosolids Reuse in Solano County**

On the morning of 7/7/09, we witnessed the delivery and application of the SEP Class B biosolids to the grazing fields of a Solano County farm. We learned that the biosolids can only be spread from 6 am to 2 pm during the day from April to October and that land application must not occur if the wind speed is greater than 25 mph for over 90 minutes. There was an anemometer on the field to measure wind speed. The delivery truck dumped the biosolids on a field and the odors noted were mild. A top-loader lifted the biosolids into a spreader that drove a short distance to a field and sprayed small clumps of biosolids into the air resulting in a thin layer being applied to the field. A rotating disc tilled the biosolids into the soil.

We learned that the farmers can feed 2-3 times as many sheep on the fields where biosolids have been applied and that the free biosolids are appreciated by the farmer. The biosolids are high in nitrogen and water and low in metals. The rest of the year the biosolids are primarily delivered to the Hay Road Landfill and reused as alternative daily cover.

**Synagro Residential Management Company**

In the afternoon, we visited the privately owned Synagro facility next to the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District treatment plant in Elk Grove. At this time, the Synagro plant dries and pelletizes about one third of the digested biosolids produced at the treatment plant. Synagro is a DBOOT facility which means that Synagro designed, built, owns, and operates the facility for 20 years before it will be transferred to Sacramento RCSD for ownership.

The Synagro facility is a small, highly automated, clean, and well-run facility that is operated 4 days a week by a staff of 3 people on 12 hour shifts. Any odors seemed to be kept within the facility due to air scrubbers. The final product is a Class A biosolids pellet in which the volume and weight is significantly reduced from the incoming sludge, is sterile, has a high energy content, and is valuable as a commercial and residential lawn and garden grade fertilizer. The dried pellets are approximately 1/8 inch spheres with a
lighter smell than most organic fertilizers and are high in nitrogen and phosphorus. It was reported that the pellets sell for $100 to $400 per ton in Florida.

The next Southeast Digester Task Force meeting, Wednesday, September 2, 2009.

The Meeting adjourns at 7:55 p.m.
Southeast Digester Task Force  
July 1, 2009  
Meeting Summary  
750 Phelps Street, Conference Room  
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

Meeting was called to order at 6:10 p.m.

Review of June 3, 2009 minutes.

Presentation, discussion and evaluation of Southeast digester site alternatives. Karen Kubick conducted the presentation. Kubick walked through each of the site alternatives that were considered for the Southeast digester siting. The size needed for the biosolids center would be 12-15 acres. This includes a sludge handling facility of 7-10 acres that would upgrade treatment of San Francisco biosolids to Class A from Class B. The additional 5 acres are needed in the future for an advanced biosolids drying facility resulting in dried pellets for commercial uses similar to the brands Tagro or Tillo.

After discussion of the area requirements, Kubick reviewed the 16 sites considered and which of the sites that did not meet this size criterion. This included North Point Facility, Norcal, Mirant, Tuntex, Circosta, and Griffith Pump Station. Kubick proceeded to review remaining available sites and reasons for not considering them for the biosolids center.

The remaining sites, Southside Southeast Plant, Caltrans Parcel A & B, Bruce Flynn Pump Station, Central Shops, and Pier 94 backlands were then reviewed after combining adjacent sites to meet the size criterion. At the suggestion of task force members, the sites were renamed from Onsite and Offsite to Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Alternative 1: Southside Southeast Plant and Caltrans  
Alternative 2: Southside Southeast Plant and Central Shops  
Alternative 3: Caltrans, Parcels A & B, and Bruce Flynn Pump Station Lot  
Alternative 4: Pier 94 Backlands
Kubick discussed the estimated time needed to begin construction on the biosolids center project. An estimated 9-11 years would be needed in Alternatives 1-3 for environmental review, design, and land acquisition before construction could begin. An additional 2-4 years is anticipated to be needed for the trust swap and State legislative process to acquire Pier 94.

At the suggestion of the Task Force, staff will review Alternative 2 and look at the possibility of moving the digesters to Central Shops instead of using that only for advanced drying. Other key discussion surrounded the specialized underground utilities and disruption on 3rd Street for the tunnel for the Pier 94 backlands project, cost savings of utilizing existing Southside Southeast, and need for a new tunnel to pump sludge and dewatered materials to and from Alternatives 3 and 4.

Mike McGowan volunteered to attend the July 7 site visit with SFPUC staff to the Solano County land application site and Sacramento advanced biosolids drying facility. He will report on the trip at the next task force meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.
Southeast Digester Task Force
June 3, 2009
Meeting Summary
750 Phelps Street, Conference Room
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

Members present:   Members absent:
Mark Klaiman    Fathina Holmes
Karen Pierce    Louise C. Jones
Michael Hamman   Michael McGowan
Espanola Jackson
Bobbie Brown
Alex Lantsberg
Helen King

Meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

Review of June 3, 2009 minutes.

Presentation, discussion and evaluation of Southeast digester site alternatives. Jon Loiacono conducted the presentation. He started by giving an introduction of the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant (SEP). The plant serves more than 750,000 people, and can treat up to 250 million gallons of wastewater per day. Built in 1952, SEP was expanded between 1977 and 1982 to include secondary biological treatment. The role of the Wastewater Enterprise is to manage, operate and maintain the City’s stormwater and sewage collection system, and three wastewater treatment facilities.

Jon provided an initial review of potential sites for the placement of a new biosolids center. A new biosolids center, which includes solids thickening, digestion, dewatering, digester gas management/cogeneration and advanced biosolids drying, would require at least 12 to 15 acres of land. Site selection criteria were developed and utilized for comparing and analyzing the possible sites. Evaluation of each site using these criteria was presented (matrix tables were distributed). The site criteria used in evaluating potential sites are as follows: attainability of site, constructability, distance from existing facilities, pump stations, sewer pipelines, geotechnical/hazardous waste issues, minimum acreage, and opportunity for multiple uses, community impacts, terrain/elevation, transportation access, wind direction and zoning.

The sites evaluated (see attached map) include: Asphalt Plant, Bruce Flynn Pump Station Lot, Caltrans, Candlestick Point Recreation Area, Central Shops, Circosta, Griffith Pump Station Lot, Hunters Point Shipyard Parcel E, Islais Creek Parcels A and B, Mirant, Norcal, North Point Wet Weather Facility, Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant, Pier 94 Backlands, Seawall Lot, Selby Wedge, Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant and Tuntex Area. The initial screening of the individual sites resulted in several possible site
alternatives; some of which are a combination of several adjacent sites to provide the required acreage.

The Southeast Digester Task Force members indicated that they would like to see a short descriptive narrative for all the sites, and the advantages and disadvantages of each site. SFPUC staff will prepare this information for next month’s meeting.

The next meeting will continue to go in depth about how the evaluation criteria were used to narrow down and formulate the various site alternatives.

The general topic for July 1, 2009
Presentation and continued discussion on the evaluation of Southeast Digester site alternatives.

Meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.
Potential Project Sites
Southeast Digester Task Force
May 6, 2009
Meeting Summary
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.
750 Phelps Street, Conference Room

Members present:
Mark Klaiman
Michael McGowan
Karen Pierce
Michael Hamman
Fathina Holmes
Laurie Schoeman (for Alex Lantsberg)

Members Excused:
Espanola Jackson
Bobbrie Brown
Alex Lantsberg
Louise C. Jones
Helen Yang

Meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

Review of April 1, 2009 minutes.

New Bayside Digester Facility
The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission staff conducted a presentation on San Francisco’s Biosolids Program Present and the Future. The presenters gave an outline of the regulatory framework of biosolids.
- Land application
- Landfill beneficial re-use
- Advanced biosolids treatment and products.

For more information on the San Francisco Biosolids Program, Present and Future please look at the attachment for more details.

Staff proceeded to give a presentation on the anaerobic digestion process and the various advanced technologies advanced considered. Processes were evaluated using the goals and objectives of the Sewer System Master Plan.

The goals and objectives of the Sewer System Master Plan are:
- Protect public health and the environment
- Protect worker health and safety
- Minimize impacts to ratepayers
- Improve seismic reliability
- Improve system reliability and redundancy
- Reduce community impacts
- Promote environmental stewardship
- Enhance sustainable use of natural resources.
The existing solids handling facility, and in particular the anaerobic digesters, at the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plane (SEP) cannot reliably meet these goals. Presentation is saved as an attachment to these minutes.

The last presentation by SFPUC Staff discussed the seventeen sites identified and evaluated for siting of a new Biosolids Center. A minimum 12 to 15 acres is needed for a new Biosolids Center.

Potential sites were screened using standard criteria considered important in the placement of wastewater facilities. A summary of the site criteria is given in the attachment which explains attainability of the site, constructability, and distance from existing facilities, pump stations and pipelines, geotechnical hazardous waste issues, minimum acreage, opportunity for multiple uses, public acceptance, terrain elevation, transportation, wind direction, and zoning.

After discussion, the next meeting will go in-depth about how the evaluation criteria was used to narrow down the number of sites to the preferred site locations.

**The general topic for June 3, 2009**

Presentation and discussion on the evaluation of Southeast digester site alternatives.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.
Southeast Digester Task Force
April 1, 2009
Meeting Summary
6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.
750 Phelps Street, Conference Room

Members present:      Members Excused:
Espanola Jackson      Bobbie Brown
Mark Klaiman       Louise C. Jones
Alex Lantsberg
Michael McGowan
Karen Pierce
Michael Hamman
Fathina Holmes
Helen Yang

Meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

Selection of Southeast Digester Task Force Chair and Vice Chair
The Southeast Digester Task Force members voted to not have a chair or vice chair. The task force members voted to have Samuel A. Murray facilitate the meetings.

Discussion of Future Topic
The May 6, 2009 meeting topics are:
New Bayside Digester Facility
Treatment process selection (Class A disposal)
Other design features- Odors, noise traffic impact

The project team will bring a tentative list of meeting schedules and outline.
Southeast Digester Task Force members requested to see architectural features as a topic at future meetings.

Tasks Force members want the Health Department give an assessment presentation at the Southeast Digester Tasks Force meeting, and Task Force member Karen Pierce will e-mail Samuel Murray questions the Health Department to address.

The Task Force Member wants to have someone to do a presentation on composting.

The Southeast Digester Task Force members agreed that they want to see George Tchobanglous, Ph. D. University of California, Davis and Cecil Lue-Hing, Ph. D. Greater Chicago to come back in December to assess the findings of the Task Force.
Public Comments
Southeast Digester Task Force members prefer meeting during the week. However they are willing to meet on a Saturday only if necessary. The project team stated that they would be willing to give a Southeast Digester Tasks Force member tours on Saturdays.

The Task Force wants an update about the Sewer System Master Plan. The Project Team agreed will provide a CD copy of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission presentation on Sewer System Master Plan to each task force member when this meeting occurs. The project team will give a brief summary about the presentations on the Sewer Master Plan.

Staff will prepare a contact list of all Southeast Digester Task Force members.

The meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.
Southeast Digester Task Force  
March 4, 2009  
Meeting Summary  
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

Members present  
Bobbrie Brown  
Michael Hamman  
Fathina Holmes  
Espanola Jackson  
Mark Klaiman  
Alex Lantsberg  
Helen Yang

Members excused  
Karen Pierce  
Louise C. Jones  
Michael McGowan

Meeting was called to order at 6:00 P.M.

Roll call and introduction of new member:  
Helen Yang

Introduction:  
Tommy T. Moala Assistant General Manager, Wastewater Enterprise thanked everyone present for becoming a member of the Southeast Digester Task Force. He stated that the Southeast Digester Task Force ideas and recommendations will be important to the future of the project. Moala also gave a special thanks to George Tchobanoglous Ph.D. and Cecil Lue-Hing, Ph. D. for coming to the Southeast Treatment Plant to give a special presentation to the Southeast Task Force and the members of the community.

Discussion of Friday, February 20, 2009 Tour of Pier 94 and the Southeast and Oceanside Treatment Plants.  
The Southeast Task Force Members stated that the tour gave them a better insight of how the treatment plants operation worked and what the purpose of the digesters were. Also the tour helped them to understand the proposed future locations of the digesters.

Presentation and Discussion of Global Digesters.  
Guest speakers: George Tchobanoglous, Ph.D. University of California, Davis, discussed small decentralized wastewater treatment systems and Cecil Lue-Hing, Ph. D. Director of Research and Development for Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago discussed Wastewater biosolids and odor control. For more information on this presentation you can look on the website www.sfsewers.org.
Southeast Task Force members asked questions to Dr. Tchobanoglous and Dr. Lue-Hing about digester technologies and forms of odor control in the collection system and treatment plants.

**Selection of Digester Task Force Chair and Vice Chair.**
The Southeast Task Force members decided to select the Chair and vice chair at the next meeting on Wednesday, April 1, 2009.

The Southeast Task Force and staff also plan to discuss topics for future meetings.

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 P.M.
Southeast Digester Task Force
February 4, 2009
Meeting Summary
6:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.

Members present
Espanola Jackson
Mark Klaiman
Alex Lantsberg
Michael McGowan
Karen Pierce

Members excused
Bobbrie Brown
Fathina Holmes
Louise C. Jones

Meeting was called to order at 6:05 P.M.

Roll call and member’s introduction

Introduction:
SFPUC Wastewater Enterprise Operation and Maintenance Manager Tony Flores thanked everyone present and for becoming a member of the Southeast Task Force. Tony Flores stated that the Southeast Digester Task Force ideas and recommendations will be important to the future of the project. Also staff, would be present at the meetings for support.

Here are a few items that group will be working on:
- Old infrastructure
- Seismic liability
- Biosolids
- Anaerobic digesters

Objectives of Southeast Task Force.
Jon Loiacono discussed the objectives of the Southeast Task force. He stated that the SFPUC has been working on the Sewer Master Plan since 2005 and planned on making it public in March 2009. He discussed monies that will be spent on the aging sewer and what will be done to the Southeast Plant with the biggest part of the project is dealing with the digesters. Need recommendations on how to handle the project. He explained that sludge in the ground will decompose naturally in time. The digesters speed up the process of decomposition. Another objective is whether to rebuild the digesters at the same site or at Pier 94. He announced that Samuel A. Murray will be the direct contact for Southeast Digester Task Force.
Future Meetings.
Southeast Digester Task Force decided to meet first Wednesday of every month. Southeast Treatment Plant, 750 Phelps St. San Francisco, CA, conference room. Time: 6:00 P.M. – 7:30 P.M. Members of Technical Advisory Committee will be able to attend the meeting on Wednesday, March 4, 2009 to answer questions.

Selection of date for tours of the Southeast and Oceanside Treatment Plants and Pier 94 Backlands.

Friday, February 20, 2009, 9:00 A.M. Meet at Southeast Treatment Facility Plant at 750 Phelps St., conference room. Tour will last 3 hours. All members are encouraged to attend.

Discussion on selection of Task Force Chair

Southeast Digester Task Force decided that they would select the chair and vice chair in the next meeting.

Task force suggestions:
Task force decided that if Alex Lantsberg is unable to attend the meeting he will send a representative of the Citizens Advisory Committee.

Karen Pierce requested that the health department does an assessment based on their new reporting standard.

Espanola Jackson would like to discuss mitigations as a future topic.

Mark Klaiman requested more detailed information about digesters. Staff responded that he will receive more detailed information as we move along the process.

The SFPUC staff will develop a contact list for all members.
Sewer System Master Plan  
DIGESTER TASK FORCE  

Suggested Meeting Topics

Unless noted otherwise, meetings will be held at the Southeast Plant (750 Phelps Street) on the first Wednesday of every month.

** TENTATIVE MEETING SCHEDULE AND OUTLINE **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>General Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12          | January 6, 2010| ▪ FOG**/Food Waste/ Bioenergy Program(s).  
  ▪ Current SFPUC efforts.  Possible future impacts.  
  ▪ ** FOG – Fats, Oils and Grease |
| 13          | February 3, 2010| ▪ Sea Level Rise (Jon Loiacono)  
  ▪ Review of proposed site layouts - potential improvements over existing biosolids facility |
| 14          | March 3, 2010  | ▪ PowerPoint presentation on other biosolids facilities  
  ▪ Mitigation and Community Benefits |
| 15          | April 7, 2010  | ▪ Mitigation and Community Benefits (cont’d)  
  ▪ Summarize task force input, to date.  
  ▪ Draft outline for summary document |
| 16          | May 5, 2010    | ▪ Review summary document |
### PREVIOUS MEETING TOPICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>General Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1          | February 4, 2009 | - Introductions  
              - Objectives of task force. Member expectations  
              - Future meeting dates. |
| 2          | February 20, 2009| *Meet 9:00 am at Southeast Plant -*  
              - Tour of Southeast Plant (2 hours)  
              - Tour of Oceanside Plant (60 min)  
              - Site visit to Pier 94 Backlands (30 min) |
| 3          | March 4, 2009    | *Special presentation from George Tchobanoglous and Cecil Lu-Hing from Technical Advisory Committee*  
              - Overview of digester facilities around the world  
              - Including different features and operations  
              - Other digester types and digester processes |
| 4          | April 1, 2009    | - Task Force Chair Selection  
              - Future Meeting Topics |
| 5          | May 6, 2009      | New Bayside Digester Facility  
              - Proposed treatment process  
              - Biosolids Reuse (Class A disposal)  
              - Possible facility sites |
| 6          | June 3, 2009     | Presentation, discussion and evaluation of Southeast digester site alternatives |
| 7          | July 1, 2009     | Presentation, discussion and evaluation of Southeast digester sites |
| 8          | August 5, 2009   | - Recap -Presentation, discussion and evaluation of Southeast digester sites  
              - Report on Solano County land application and Sacramento advanced biosolids drying facility (field trip) |
| 9          | September 2, 2009| - Proposed approach for Evaluation of 4 Site Alternatives (review list of parameters to be discussed)  
              - Presentation from Department of Public Heath staff on Healthy Development Measurement Tool Existing |
| 10         | November 4, 2009 | - Comparison of Site Alternatives for New Biosolids Center |
Dear Mr. Murray:

Young Community Developers has enjoyed the recent discussion about community benefits planned for implementation as the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission implements its plan to improve the digesters currently located at the Southeast Wastewater Treatment Plant.

We have engaged in the process of community stakeholder meetings and planning around how to maximize the benefit to the community that this project might provide, as well as how to mitigate the past and anticipated burden that wastewater treatment has placed on this community. The following represents our proposed starting point as the community benefits discussion moves forward at the SFPUC:

- Relocate the digesters away from the current location and affected neighborhood, but not at the proposed Pier 92 location in the Backlands
- Mandatory local hiring from the Project Impact area, requiring that no less than 50% of the job hours under the Digester Improvement Project will be performed by residents of zip codes 94124, 94134, and 94107, in that order or priority.
- The local hiring commitment must be included in a new Project Labor Agreement that will be negotiated between the SFPUC and our partners in labor.
- No less than $5 million of the total project cost will be allocated to job readiness, training and preparation, internships and opportunities, case management and retention, barrier removal, dues and equipment costs, and other services to be administered by community-based organizations that will help the SFPUC and its contractors meet the local hiring requirement.
- State-of-the-art mitigation measures that reduce the environmental and air quality impact that the new digesters will place upon the community.

Young Community Developers looks forward to implementing these policies through a community benefit stakeholder process with you, the Commission, and all those who wish to see this project become a successful partnership between the City and residents of Bayview-Hunters Point and the whole city.

Sincerely,

Fathina Holmes,                          CC: Ed Harrington, SFPUC General Manager, Southeast Coalition,
Program Manager                          SFPUC Commissioners, OEWD, Bernida Reagan, Merriwether & Williams
A. Alt #2
1. Questions regarding residences:
   i. How many residences in a 300’ radius?
   ii. How many residences in a 600’ radius?
   iii. How many residences in a 1,200’ radius?

2. Approximate annual operational savings vs. other options?

3. Regarding the safety of crossing the street what precautions do you take now? Are they effective? Do you have a lot of injuries crossing the street? Why would the new facility be more dangerous that the present situation? What would a signal or overpass cost?

4. What are the objections to vacating Quint Street? How much traffic is on Quint Street?

5. With this alternative would the Asphalt Plant be used?

6. With this option how much empty land would be available when the existing digesters and drying facility are demolished?

B. Alt #5
1. It appears that the only advantage to this option is to move it away further away from residences at a cost of 300 million dollars and seven additional years. This makes it imperative to know the answer to Alt #2.1 above. You can buy a lot of houses for 300 million dollars.

C. Alt #4
1. The PG&E Power Plant site is being proposed for 1500 housing units how far is this site from that proposed development?

2. With Alt #2 would it not be possible to consolidate all bioenergy proceses at that site if it included the Asphalt Plant?

3. Regarding Pro Argument #4: What “other uses” are compatable adjacent to a sewer plant?

4. See Alt #2 question #6 above. Wouldn’t other options also have room for future growth?
5. Comments:
   i. The stigma associated with a sewer plant will diminish your property values and make it more difficult for the PORT to find prospective developers for the surrounding area.
   ii. Create an enclave in the middle of PORT property that will make future operations and infrastructure developments more difficult.
   iii. Reduce significantly the "Critical Mass" necessary for attracting large tenants to the Backlands site.
   iv. It is contrary to the avowed community desire to use the Backlands as a jobs producing asset for our community.

*Michael Hamman*

mhamman@igc.org
Hi Sam,

Here are some suggestions on the draft:

1. The labeling of alternatives as 2, 4, and 5 is unnecessarily complicated. What about 1a, 1b, and 2, corresponding to the two southeast options and the Pier 94 one?

2. Put the pros and cons of the alternatives into two summary tables so it is easier to make comparisons. I suggest one table with 1a vs. 1b and another one with 1 vs. 2. Put the common elements for each comparison in the top of the table with the differences in the bottom rows of the table.

3. List the name of the street when saying “Proximity to neighborhoods (across the street).” Proximity to a neighborhood is a general characteristic but the folks who live there are going to want to know if it is their specific street.

4. Be more specific when describing wind direction. Not everyone is familiar with the convention that wind direction is the direction from which it comes. To avoid confusion it is good to say something like, “the prevailing wind direction is from X street towards Y street.” Also, are there site specific wind data? Wind can be steered by hills and buildings so it rarely moves through the city in the same direction as the so-called prevailing wind direction. I believe the city building department requires site specific wind data and wind models.

5. Please include more community impact comparisons such as truck traffic and diesel air pollution as well as jobs: short term and permanent.

6. What about appearance? Will views of the bay be blocked at Pier 94?

Thanks for the work putting together the draft. Hope to see more soon.

Mike

Michael F. McGowan, Ph.D.
Arc Ecology
4634 Third Street,
San Francisco, CA 94124

415 643-1190 X308
mikemcgowan@arceology.org
April 12, 2010

Sam Murray
Public Relations, Digester Task Force
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
750 Phelps Street
San Francisco, California 94124

Dear Mr. Murray:

In accord with your statement during the April 7, 2010 Digester Task Force Meeting, the following are additional thoughts on the Draft Pros and Cons for Site Options and the Draft Summary Report presented as well as on statements made during the meeting. I have not provided these comments in any particular order but do try to relate the comments to specific sections of the documents or statements made.

1. Site options 1a and 1b: in the con discussion there is reference to historic impacts of operations to the residential neighborhood. There is no mention that in either 1a or 1b (as presented) that the digesters will be located further from such residential neighborhood (it was presented that they may up to 6 times further from such residents). It would be valuable to understand how rapidly negative impacts dissipate over distance to be able to better evaluate if increasing such distance 6 fold mitigates such impact.

2. Site options 1a and 1b: in the con discussion there is no discussion as to how new technology will serve to reduce the likelihood of any future operational impact to the neighborhood. Moreover, there would benefit to understanding if after making such technological improvements if any negative operational impact of the SEP is more likely to be caused by other (non-digester) SEP operations. For example, after the technological improvements are made to the digesters is it more likely that any negative impacts will be caused by the settling ponds (which are not going to be relocated no matter what site option is selected) or the new digesters. Further, if it is determined that potential negative impacts are at least as likely to be caused by the settling ponds a better understanding of the neighborhood (in both geographic and business/residential terms) impacted by such would be valuable.

3. Site options 1a and 1b: in the con discussion there is reference to the low likelihood of attaining the Central Shop location. It should be noted that such acquisition is only required to locate the drying facility and such does not need to be located on the Central Shop location to retain
operational efficiencies. In fact, under certain construction scenarios such a drying facility could be located on the current SEP location thus negating the need to acquire any additional property and lowering the cost of implementing site options 1a and 1b.

4. Site 2 pros: there is a reference that the SEP could be used for other uses. Based on the current industrial use of the SEP and the past community practices resulting in the extended delay in the reuse of large parcels of industrial land in the community, the future use(s) may be extremely limited, greatly delayed, or both.

5. Site 2 pros: There has been no presentation of information to support that the digesters could partner with other facilities to share renewable energy and water resources. For example, does this statement mean that the digesters produce power in excess of what is needed to run the digesters and could thus provide power to these neighbors? If so, there has been no discussion of such excess capacity. Or, does this statement mean that the neighbors have such excess capacity and are willing to provide it to the digesters. Likewise, if the later, there has been no presentation by the neighbors of such willingness.

6. Site 2 pros (added by statement) that this selection “due to basic Keynesian economics” must lead to more jobs\(^1\) (the argument being that since the construction costs are higher there must be more jobs created). Based on the numbers provided to the Task Force such a conclusion may or may not be supportable. The Task Force has not been provided with a detailed breakdown of the additional $750,000,000 that it will cost to implement Site 2 to vs. 1a. Specifically, there is no breakdown of how much of that additional $750 million is being spent on infrastructure (i.e., pipes)\(^2\) vs. labor.

7. Site 2 cons: the discussion references the increase O&M cost of $1 million a year but does not provide a total cost of such an increase over the life of the digesters. To fully understand the cost impacts of selecting Site 2, such information is necessary.

8. Site 2 cons: there is a reference that this location would take the longest to implement but fails to articulate how this directly contradicts one of the primary mandates of the Task Force “to replace the biosolids digester facility as soon as possible.” (Summary Report Page 2).

9. Site 2 cons: there should be a discussion on the inherent inefficiencies of operating two campuses (“soft costs” in addition the “hard costs” incurred in additional O&M costs). For example, operating 2 campuses limits the opportunity for discussion among operators and reduces the flow of ideas

10. Site 2 cons: there should be a discussion of the negative environmental impacts of operating 2 campuses including, but not limited to, the increased carbon footprint as operators travel between campuses and the increased need for power to pump materials to and from the second location.

11. Site 2 cons: There should be a discussion that there is no inherent nexus between the placement of the digesters at Pier 94 and the core maritime mission of the Port. While having the digesters as tenants of the Port may afford the Port with capital to better implement its core mission;

---

1 While the statement did not specific, I am assuming that the statement was a reference to local job creation.

2 Clearly using more pipe will create more jobs somewhere but not locally and as such does not support the statement that increased construction costs will create more local jobs.
there is no reason to think that another tenant would provide any less capital (and could potentially provide a greater amount) to achieve that same or greater success of the core mission.

12. Community Benefits in the Summary Report: While there may be neighborhood members who have suffered impacts of the SEP operation, any non-job creation community benefits should be directed only to those who have suffered. If one is located outside the impact zone of any negative impact no such benefit should be provided. Moreover, no one who moved into the neighborhood (both within and beyond the impact zone) subsequent to the expansion of the SEP should be entitled to any such benefit. Such persons knew of the SEP at the time they decided to move into the neighborhood and presumably factored such presence into the decision to locate within the neighborhood.

13. Community Benefits in the Summary Report: Local job creation should be a priority of the project; however, such priority should be balanced against any increased costs, delays or other inefficiencies created by making such job creation a priority.

14. Community Benefits in the Summary Report: As local job creation is the priority, funds should be allocated to achieve that priority via a local hiring commitment. A commitment to the funding of NGOs, contracting with, or negotiating any other agreement with such groups is not necessarily a prerequisite to accomplishing this goal.
15. Community Benefits in the Summary Report: Should there be a determination to use the services of any NGO in the implementation of the community benefits such NGOs should be subject to rigorous selection and review criteria to confirm that such NGOs can implement the community benefits in an efficient and cost effective manner.

16. Community Benefits in the Summary Report: There is no reason to specify a percent of funds expended or a total amount of funds that should be allocated to any NGOs to achieve the successful implementation of such Community Benefits. Guaranteeing a set sum provides no incentives to operate in an efficient manner. NGOs should be compensated based on the success of their program(s) to provide job ready candidates who are able to sustain employment for a given period of time and not be ensured a payment without being obligated to produce results.

17. Community Benefits in the Summary Report: No individual or group represented by an individual on the task force should benefit in any way from the implementation of any community benefits.

I want to thank you for the opportunity to have been part of the Digester Task Force as well as to submit the above thoughts.

Respectfully,

Mark Klaiman
Pg. 13 Community Benefits:

A. I feel very strongly that any reference to “Community Benefits” is inappropriate for this group. These comments are NOT in reference to the specific benefits enumerated, but to the Digester Task Force making any recommendations on this subject.
   1. First and foremost ANY recommendation regarding this should come from a much more broadly based group. It should be discussed at the other community organizations such as the PAC where such discussions will reach a wider audience.
   2. This was not in our original purview and the group was not selected with expertise of this subject.
   3. This subject was not discussed at the Task Force until just a month ago when the entire meeting was taken up with presentations there have not been through discussions among ourselves nor has any outreach been done to engage the community in this discussion.

B. I object to this being referred to as a consensus document as we have never voted or otherwise agreed either on these principles, nor, even on the notion that we should comment on this at all. It is most defiantly NOT a consensus statement!

C. There has been no study done to see if there is an available labor pool equal to 50% of all jobs. At the height of construction there will be many hundreds employed in a great many trades. What evidence is there that 50% is the correct number why not 55% or 45%?

D. This group specifically looked and rejected the Circosta site. Where did this recommendation to acquire the site come from? If that site is obtained what measures will be taken to replace the metal recycling function of the Circosta facility and what will the impact to the city be to relocate that function?
Sam,

Very nice summary report.

Here are some editorial suggestions:

p. 2 Manager is misspelled as Manger

p. 3 Please add that there was also a thorough presentation and discussion of the effects on the project of sea level rise due to climate change.

p. 12 "was relevance" should be "was relevant"

p. 18 clarify the statement that the committee did not favor a food waste digestion process at the sites. Should this say instead that we didn't favor a separate, stand-alone food digestion process separate from the main waste digestion? If so, please state clearly because as written it seems to imply that we were against food waste digestion.

p. 19 the "17 month" process should also be referenced at the beginning of the report where it only stated we worked for 1 year (12 months).

p. 19. How are we going to be kept informed? A monthly email with web links? Please commit to a specific notification method.

Cheers,

Mike
Attached please find the final draft of the *Review of the Biosolids Digester Project* report for your final review. We sincerely thank you for the time and effort you contributed to create this report.

We did our best to make sure that the draft faithfully documents your consensus on the issues discussed at the last two meetings. Please focus your review on the correctness of the text, instead of introducing new arguments that the group did not discuss.

Please return your comments by close of business Wednesday May 26, 2010. Signing of the final report will be on Wednesday, June 2, 2010.

Please see attachment

Michael F. McGowan, Ph.D.
Arc Ecology
4634 Third Street
San Francisco, CA 94124
415 643-1190 X-308
415 643-1142 FAX
mikemcgowan@arcecology.org
Hi Sam,

Thanks for sending the draft report. I reviewed the document and identified the following points that I need addressed before I sign off on a consensus document:

1. **Project cost (throughout the report):** The number should be expressed in current dollars whenever it is mentioned. It's great that the present value is noted in the spreadsheet (p.15) but I believe the use of future values throughout the document biases decision-making.

2. **Mention of potential housing at the former power plant site (pp 11 & 17) should be stricken.** The concept is speculative at best, certainly more speculative than the Port’s ideas about an eco-industrial park. The land is zoned for heavy industry and there are no applications pending that would change that zoning. The Task Force decided to avoid discussion of hypothetical land use changes and thus should treat PG&E’s speculative ambitions no more favorably than we do the Port’s.

3. **Reference to PAC Concept plan should be stricken (pp 12 & 14)** - I didn’t have a chance to comment on this at the meeting before I left, but this statement doesn’t comport to what the PAC’s Concept Plan actually says regarding its vision for the Backlands and the digester rebuild. With the exception of conceptual discussions of a park that the Port has ruled out, the *PAC’s Concept Plan November 12, 2000 FINAL DRAFT* envisions the Backlands as “a mixed-industry area that emphasizes the use of cargo facilities along the waterfront and clustering of eco-industrial facilities.” (p. 153) and states “a resource/waste-sharing eco-industrial park could potentially be developed in the upland area or “backlands” of the Port Property on Cargo Way.” Where the Concept Plan mentions the digesters, it states the following: “major capital improvements being investigated by the PUC include demolishing the existing digesters and moving the “solids handling” facilities to a location north of Jerrold Street away from residential properties.” None of these statements conflict with moving the digesters to the Backlands. Moreover, there is no denying that building anything in the Port's Backlands, whether an eco-industrial park and/or a solids handling facility will create jobs in that specific area and in the Bayview Hunters Point community overall. This is true regardless of whether the site of the current digesters is redeveloped for job producing uses in the event that the Backlands are chosen. In
light of the Concept Plan’s official statements it is best that our Report avoid any mention of it.

4. **Mandatory Local Hiring in Community Benefits, p. 18**: As much as I'd like to, I can’t support these first two bullets. Targets, training, and strong first source requirements are absolutely critical. But a duty to hire a minimum number irrespective of availability or capability is simply not a good practice for critical infrastructure that requires specialized skills, whether in construction or operation.

5. **Food Waste, p.18** I think it's more accurate to say that the Task Force “could not reach consensus” on this item rather than state that it “does not support” it. I certainly support further investigation of the concept.
Sam:

On the section on "Community Benefits" I recall a lengthy discussion of this and an agreement was reached that the Task Force would ask that the community would receive mitigations for accepting the negative consequences of having the city's sewer processing facility in their midst. That such benefits might include the following: **Insert your list here.** You have us demanding those specific programs and that is **NOT** what we agreed to.

I must agree with Alex that such specific demands are:

- Not universally supported by all members of the community
- Beyond our expertise.
- We were not provided sufficient information to make an informed decision regarding specifics such as the percentage of local Millwrights hired by the future project. We were never told how many journeyman Millwrights live in the 94124 now let alone in ten years when this is built. We were not informed as the numbers for any construction trade so how can we recommend 50%? The true number might be 30% or 70% we don't know, and I doubt if anyone knows at this juncture so to demand a specific percentage at this time is impossible.
- We meet for over a year and this topic was not introduced until the very end of our term and I believe to railroad such a set of demands through our Task Force is very ill advised as it only jeopardizes the consensus reached on so many other topics. This topic threatens to rip the Task Force apart and is so unnecessary as the topic of community benefits will receive a through vetting by a larger constituency than this Task Force.

Michael Hamman  
mhamman@igc.org

On 5/20/2010 4:06 PM, Murray, Sam wrote:

Dear Digester Task Force Members:

Attached please find the final draft of the *Review of the Biosolids Digester Facility Project* report for your final review. We sincerely thank you for the time and effort you contributed to create this report.

We did our best to make sure that the draft faithfully documents your consensus on the issues discussed at the last two meetings. Please focus your review on the correctness of the text, instead of introducing new arguments that the group did not discuss.

Please return your comments by close of business Wednesday May 26, 2010. Signing of the final report will be on Wednesday, June 2, 2010.

Please see attachment
From: Michael Hamman [mhamman@igc.org]
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2010 4:03 PM
To: Murray, Sam
Cc: Alex Lantsberg; Fathina Holmes; Mike McGowan; Mark Klaiman; Karen Pierce; Espanola Jackson; Chiu, Carolyn; Jones, Bonnie; Moehle, Melissa; Loiacono, Jon; Jue, Tyrone; Kubick, Karen; Ho, Humphrey
Subject: Re: Lantsberg Comments on Task Force Report Consensus Document

Sam:

I am surprised that you are entertaining substantive changes to the document at this time. You told us that no substantive changes would be considered after the close of the last meeting. That meeting we to be the "last" Task Force meeting. If in fact you are considering the changes requested by Alex i insist that they be debated at the next meeting.

Michael Hamman
mhamman@igc.org

On 5/24/2010 11:09 AM, Alex Lantsberg wrote:

Hi Sam,

Thanks for sending the draft report. I reviewed the document and identified the following points that I need addressed before I sign off on a consensus document:

1. **Project cost (throughout the report):** The number should be expressed in current dollars whenever it is mentioned. Its great that the present value is noted in the spreadsheet (p.15) but I believe the use of future values throughout the document biases decision-making.

2. **Mention of potential housing at the former power plant site (pp 11 & 17) should be stricken.** The concept is speculative at best, certainly more speculative than the Port’s ideas about an eco-industrial park. The land is zoned for heavy industry and there are no applications pending that would change that zoning. The Task Force decided avoid discussion of hypothetical land use changes and thus should treat PG&E’s speculative ambitions no more favorably than we do the Port’s.

3. **Reference to PAC Concept plan should be stricken (pp 12 & 14) -** I didn't have a chance to comment on this at the meeting before I left, but this statement doesn’t comport to what the PAC’s Concept Plan actually says regarding its vision for the Backlands and the digester rebuild. With the exception of conceptual discussions of a park that the Port has ruled out, the PAC’s Concept Plan November 12, 2000 FINAL DRAFT envisions the Backlands as a mixed-industry area that emphasizes the use of...
cargo facilities along the waterfront and clustering of eco-industrial facilities. (p. 153) and states a resource/waste-sharing eco-industrial park could potentially be developed in the upland area or backlands of the Port Property on Cargo Way. Where the Concept Plan mentions the digesters, it states the following: major capital improvements being investigated by the PUC include demolishing the existing digesters and moving the solids handling facilities to a location north of Jerrold Street away from residential properties. None of these statements conflict with moving the digesters to the Backlands. Moreover, there is no denying that building anything in the Port's Backlands, whether an eco-industrial park and/or a solids handling facility will create jobs in that specific area and in the Bayview Hunters Point community overall. This is true regardless of whether the site of the current digesters is redeveloped for job producing uses in the event that the Backlands are chosen. In light of the Concept Plan's official statements it is best that our Report avoid any mention of it.

4. **Mandatory Local Hiring in Community Benefits, p. 18**: As much as I'd like to, I can't support these first two bullets. Targets, training, and strong first source requirements are absolutely critical. But a duty to hire a minimum number irrespective of availability or capability is simply not a good practice for critical infrastructure that requires specialized skills, whether in construction or operation.

5. **Food Waste, p.18** I think it's more accurate to say that the Task Force could not reach consensus on this item rather than state that it does not support it. I certainly support further investigation of the concept.
sam,

i will not be at the next meeting (out of town).

i consider these points indispensable for consensus. i gave up a lot of my points and will not sign the document without them.

aml

On Mon, May 24, 2010 at 4:02 PM, Michael Hamman <mhamman@igc.org> wrote:

Sam:

I am surprised that you are entertaining substantive changes to the document at this time. You told us that no substantive changes would be considered after the close of the last meeting. That meeting we to be the "last" Task Force meeting. If in fact you are considering the changes requested by Alex i insist that they be debated at the next meeting.

Michael Hamman
mhamman@igc.org

On 5/24/2010 11:09 AM, Alex Lantsberg wrote:

Hi Sam,

Thanks for sending the draft report. I reviewed the document and identified the following points that I need addressed before I sign off on a consensus document:

1. **Project cost (throughout the report):** The number should be expressed in current dollars whenever it is mentioned. Its great that the present value is noted in the spreadsheet (p.15) but I believe the use of future values throughout the document biases decision-making.

2. **Mention of potential housing at the former power plant site (pp 11 & 17) should be stricken.** The concept is speculative at best, certainly more speculative than the Port's ideas about an eco-industrial park. The land is zoned for heavy industry and there are no applications pending that would change that zoning. The Task Force decided avoid discussion of hypothetical land use changes and thus should treat PG&E’s speculative ambitions no more favorably than we do the Port’s.
3. **Reference to PAC Concept plan should be stricken (pp 12 & 14)** - I didn’t have a chance to comment on this at the meeting before I left, but this statement doesn’t comport to what the PAC’s Concept Plan actually says regarding its vision for the Backlands and the digester rebuild. With the exception of conceptual discussions of a park that the Port has ruled out, the *PAC’s Concept Plan November 12, 2000 FINAL DRAFT* envisions the Backlands as “a mixed-industry area that emphasizes the use of cargo facilities along the waterfront and clustering of eco-industrial facilities.” (p. 153) and states “a resource/waste-sharing eco-industrial park could potentially be developed in the upland area or “backlands” of the Port Property on Cargo Way.” Where the Concept Plan mentions the digesters, it states the following: “**major capital improvements being investigated by the PUC include demolishing the existing digesters and moving the “solids handling” facilities to a location north of Jerrold Street away from residential properties.**” None of these statements conflict with moving the digesters to the Backlands. Moreover, there is no denying that building anything in the Port’s Backlands, whether an eco-industrial park and/or a solids handling facility will create jobs in that specific area and in the Bayview Hunters Point community overall. This is true regardless of whether the site of the current digesters is redeveloped for job producing uses in the event that the Backlands are chosen. In light of the Concept Plan’s official statements it is best that our Report avoid any mention of it.

4. **Mandatory Local Hiring in Community Benefits, p. 18** - As much as I’d like to, I can’t support these first two bullets. Targets, training, and strong first source requirements are absolutely critical. But a duty to hire a minimum number irrespective of availability or capability is simply not a good practice for critical infrastructure that requires specialized skills, whether in construction or operation.

5. **Food Waste, p.18** I think its more accurate to say that the Task Force “could not reach consensus” on this item rather than state that it “does not support” it. I certainly support further investigation of the concept.
From: Mark Klaiman [mailto:Mark@petcamp.com]
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2010 4:08 PM
To: Michael Hamman; Murray, Sam
Cc: Alex Lantsberg; Fathina Holmes; Mike McGowan; Karen Pierce; Espanola Jackson; Chiu, Carolyn; Jones, Bonnie; Moehle, Melissa; Loiacono, Jon; Jue, Tyrone; Kubick, Karen; Ho, Humphrey
Subject: RE: Lantsberg Comments on Task Force Report Consensus Document

Sam:

At the last meeting you specifically stated that you wanted us to review for the document for typographical and grammatical errors not with an eye to changing content. As such, I agree with Michael that we should not be taking in more substantive comments or changes at this time. If you are considering accepting the changes proposed by Alex I suggest that we need to have the opportunity to discuss them fully – as all the changes were vetted last month. It seems that taking this course of action, will, of necessity, prolong the task force and preclude finalization of a report in time for the PUC meeting in June.

Respectfully,

Mark

Mark Klaiman
Senior Counselor
Pet Camp

Main Campground
525 Phelps Street
San Francisco, CA 94124
(415) 282-0700

Cat Safari
3233 Sacramento Street
San Francisco, CA 94115
(415) 567-0700

From: Michael Hamman [mailto:mhamman@igc.org]
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2010 4:03 PM
To: Samuel Murray
Cc: Alex Lantsberg; Fathina Holmes; Mike McGowan; Mark Klaiman; Karen Pierce; Espanola Jackson; Carolyn Chiu; Bonnie Jones; Melissa Moehle; Jon Loiacono; Tyrone Jue; Karen Kubick; Humphrey Ho
Subject: Re: Lantsberg Comments on Task Force Report Consensus Document
Sam:

I am surprised that you are entertaining substantive changes to the document at this time. You told us that no substantive changes would be considered after the close of the last meeting. That meeting we to be the "last" Task Force meeting. If in fact you are considering the changes requested by Alex i insist that they be debated at the next meeting.

Michael Hamman
mhamman@igc.org

On 5/24/2010 11:09 AM, Alex Lantsberg wrote:

Hi Sam,

Thanks for sending the draft report. I reviewed the document and identified the following points that I need addressed before I sign off on a consensus document:

1. **Project cost (throughout the report):** The number should be expressed in current dollars whenever it is mentioned. Its great that the present value is noted in the spreadsheet (p.15) but I believe the use of future values throughout the document biases decision-making.

2. **Mention of potential housing at the former power plant site (pp 11 & 17) should be stricken.** The concept is speculative at best, certainly more speculative than the Port’s ideas about an eco-industrial park. The land is zoned for heavy industry and there are no applications pending that would change that zoning. The Task Force decided avoid discussion of hypothetical land use changes and thus should treat PG&E’s speculative ambitions no more favorably than we do the Port’s.

3. **Reference to PAC Concept plan should be stricken (pp 12 & 14)** - I didn't have a chance to comment on this at the meeting before I left, but this statement doesn’t comport to what the PAC’s Concept Plan actually says regarding its vision for the Backlands and the digester rebuild. With the exception of conceptual discussions of a park that the Port has ruled out, the *PAC’s Concept Plan November 12, 2000 FINAL DRAFT* envisions the Backlands as “a mixed-industry area that emphasizes the use of cargo facilities along the waterfront and clustering of eco-industrial facilities.” (p. 153) and states “a resource/waste-sharing eco-industrial park could potentially be developed in the upland area or “backlands” of the Port Property on Cargo Way.” Where the Concept Plan mentions the digesters, it states the following: “major capital improvements being investigated by the PUC include demolishing the existing digesters and moving the “solids handling” facilities to a location north of Jerrold Street away from residential properties.” None of these statements conflict with moving the digesters to the Backlands. Moreover, there is no denying that building *anything* in the Port's Backlands, whether an eco-industrial park and/or a solids handling facility will create
jobs in that specific area and in the Bayview Hunters Point community overall. This is true regardless of whether the site of the current digesters is redeveloped for job producing uses in the event that the Backlands are chosen. In light of the Concept Plan’s official statements it is best that our Report avoid any mention of it.

4. **Mandatory Local Hiring in Community Benefits, p. 18**: As much as I'd like to, I can't support these first two bullets. Targets, training, and strong first source requirements are absolutely critical. But a duty to hire a minimum number irrespective of availability or capability is simply not a good practice for critical infrastructure that requires specialized skills, whether in construction or operation.

5. **Food Waste, p.18** I think it's more accurate to say that the Task Force “could not reach consensus” on this item rather than state that it “does not support” it. I certainly support further investigation of the concept.

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
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From: Karen Pierce [gagajean@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2010 10:35 AM
To: Alex Lantsberg; Murray, Sam
Cc: Michael Hamman; Fathina Holmes; Mike McGowan; Mark Klaiman; Espanola Jackson; Chiu, Carolyn; Jones, Bonnie; Moehle, Melissa; Loiacono, Jon; Jue, Tyrone; Kubick, Karen; Ho, Humphrey
Subject: Re: Lantsberg Comments on Task Force Report Consensus Document

All: I could not attend the last meeting of the Task Force because I was in Virginia at a CDC meeting. Since I was not part of the final discussion and consensus agreement, I am limiting my comments to the things that are in the draft report that I specifically commented on previous to that last meeting.

1. In the Site Options sections for both 1a and 1b, the distance from residential uses should be noted as it is for option 2. While the move would put more distance from Phelps Street homes, it would put the Digesters less than 500 feet from residences on Oakdale Avenue. I pointed this out on numerous occasions during our discussions and it should be included in this document to make it balanced and transparent.

2. In the Cons section for Site 2, number 7 (page 11) should be stricken. At the last meeting I attended I brought this up and pointed out that there was no indication that housing would in fact be build on that site. This statement confuses the issue related to actual impact on existing residential properties. Additionally, number 11 (page 12) should also be stricken as I do not believe that is a correct statement.

3. Likewise, on page 17, reference to any future housing on PG&E property should be stricken.

I understand that this is a "final draft" but I feel that it does not present the understandings that I felt we had agreed upon at my last meeting. If this agreement changed at the final meeting, I am interested in seeing the discussion to understand the reasoning for the change.

Sorry I missed the last meeting and I appreciate everyone's hard work and dedication to the process. I am still hoping for a final consensus document without need for a "minority report". kp
Hi Sam,

Thanks for sending the draft report. I reviewed the document and identified the following points that I need addressed before I sign off on a consensus document:

1. **Project cost (throughout the report):** The number should be expressed in current dollars whenever it is mentioned. Its great that the present value is noted in the spreadsheet (p.15) but I believe the use of future values throughout the document biases decision-making.

2. **Mention of potential housing at the former power plant site (pp 11 & 17) should be stricken.** The concept is speculative at best, certainly more speculative than the Port’s ideas about an eco-industrial park. The land is zoned for heavy industry and there are no applications pending that would change that zoning. The Task Force decided avoid discussion of hypothetical land use changes and thus should treat PG&E’s speculative ambitions no more favorably than we do the Port’s.

3. **Reference to PAC Concept plan should be stricken (pp 12 & 14) -** I didn't have a chance to comment on this at the meeting before I left, but this statement doesn’t comport to what the PAC’s Concept Plan actually says regarding its vision for the Backlands and the digester rebuild. With the exception of conceptual discussions of a park that the Port has ruled out, the **PAC’s Concept Plan November 12, 2000 FINAL DRAFT** envisions the Backlands as “a mixed-industry area that emphasizes the use of cargo facilities along the waterfront and clustering of eco-industrial facilities.” (p. 153) and states “a resource/waste-sharing eco-industrial park could potentially be developed in the upland area or “backlands” of the Port Property on Cargo Way.” Where the Concept Plan mentions the digesters, it states the following: “major capital improvements being investigated by the PUC include demolishing the existing digesters and moving the “solids
"handling” facilities to a location north of Jerrold Street away from residential properties.” None of these statements conflict with moving the digesters to the Backlands. Moreover, there is no denying that building anything in the Port's Backlands, whether an eco-industrial park and/or a solids handling facility will create jobs in that specific area and in the Bayview Hunters Point community overall. This is true regardless of whether the site of the current digesters is redeveloped for job producing uses in the event that the Backlands are chosen. In light of the Concept Plan’s official statements it is best that our Report avoid any mention of it.

4. Mandatory Local Hiring in Community Benefits, p. 18: As much as I'd like to, I can't support these first two bullets. Targets, training, and strong first source requirements are absolutely critical. But a duty to hire a minimum number irrespective of availability or capability is simply not a good practice for critical infrastructure that requires specialized skills, whether in construction or operation.

5. Food Waste, p.18 I think its more accurate to say that the Task Force “could not reach consensus” on this item rather than state that it “does not support” it. I certainly support further investigation of the concept.
From: Fathina Holmes [fholmes@ycdjobs.org]  
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 3:05 PM  
To: Alex Lantsberg  
Cc: Murray, Sam; Michael Hamman; Mike McGowan; Mark Klaiman; Karen Pierce; Espanola Jackson; Chiu, Carolyn; Jones, Bonnie; Moehle, Melissa; Loiacono, Jon; Jue, Tyrone; Kubick, Karen; Ho, Humphrey  
Subject: Re: Lantsberg Comments on Task Force Report Consensus Document

Dear Mr. Murray (and Mr. Lantsberg):

As I recall, and no doubt as the minutes reflect, Mr. Lantsberg registered no complaint against the mandatory 50% local hiring requirement that is found on page 18 of the report when this matter was discussed at the Task Force. References to "specialized skills" have long ago been rejected by the community as excuses not to train or hire San Francisco residents. Therefore no changes to the "mandatory local hiring" paragraph of page 18 are required or should be contemplated.

However, we did agree at the Task Force, based on Ms. Espanola Jackson's suggestion that the "job readiness, training and preparation" should be funded out of the actual project cost of replacing the digesters, to include language in the third bullet point of "Community Benefits" on page 18 that "The necessary resources of this training equals 5% of the total project cost.

Therefore, the third bullet point should begin "The necessary resources, equal to 5% of the total project cost, should be allocated to job readiness, training and preparation..."

Thank you again everyone,

Fathina Holmes

On Mon, May 24, 2010 at 11:09 AM, Alex Lantsberg <lantsberg@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Sam,

Thanks for sending the draft report. I reviewed the document and identified the following points that I need addressed before I sign off on a consensus document:

1. **Project cost (throughout the report):** The number should be expressed in current dollars whenever it is mentioned. Its great that the present value is noted in the spreadsheet (p.15) but I believe the use of future values throughout the document biases decision-making.

2. **Mention of potential housing at the former power plant site (pp 11 & 17) should be stricken.** The concept is speculative at best, certainly more speculative than the Port's ideas about an eco-industrial park. The land is zoned for heavy industry and there are no applications pending that would change that zoning. The Task Force decided
3. **Reference to PAC Concept plan should be stricken (pp 12 & 14)** - I didn’t have a chance to comment on this at the meeting before I left, but this statement doesn’t comport to what the PAC’s Concept Plan actually says regarding its vision for the Backlands and the digester rebuild. With the exception of conceptual discussions of a park that the Port has ruled out, the *PAC’s Concept Plan November 12, 2000 FINAL DRAFT* envisions the Backlands as “a mixed-industry area that emphasizes the use of cargo facilities along the waterfront and clustering of eco-industrial facilities.” (p. 153) and states “a resource/waste-sharing eco-industrial park could potentially be developed in the upland area or “backlands” of the Port Property on Cargo Way.” Where the Concept Plan mentions the digesters, it states the following: “major capital improvements being investigated by the PUC include demolishing the existing digesters and moving the “solids handling” facilities to a location north of Jerrold Street away from residential properties.”

None of these statements conflict with moving the digesters to the Backlands. Moreover, there is no denying that building anything in the Port’s Backlands, whether an eco-industrial park and/or a solids handling facility will create jobs in that specific area and in the Bayview Hunters Point community overall. This is true regardless of whether the site of the current digesters is redeveloped for job producing uses in the event that the Backlands are chosen. In light of the Concept Plan’s official statements it is best that our Report avoid any mention of it.

4. **Mandatory Local Hiring in Community Benefits, p. 18**: As much as I’d like to, I can’t support these first two bullets. Targets, training, and strong first source requirements are absolutely critical. But a duty to hire a minimum number irrespective of availability or capability is simply not a good practice for critical infrastructure that requires specialized skills, whether in construction or operation.

5. **Food Waste, p.18** I think its more accurate to say that the Task Force “could not reach consensus” on this item rather than state that it “does not support” it. I certainly support further investigation of the concept.
From: Alex Lantsberg [mailto:lantsberg@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 01, 2010 7:50 PM
To: Fathina Holmes; Murray, Sam
Subject: Re: Lantsberg Comments on Task Force Report Consensus Document

Sam and Fathina,

Two things

First, as you no doubt recall, I had to leave the meeting before having the opportunity to register my objections. I did however submit written comments and am quite certain that I did note my problems with the explicit "must hire" language.

Second, I want to zero in Fathina's response to my point. You say that references to "specialized skills" have been rejected as "excuses to not train or hire." As you know, the main premise for the PUC's 9910 program has been to impart Bayview residents with those very same specialized skills that are critical to getting people employed in high wage high skill jobs in the wastewater infrastructure industry. The same goes for construction. To reject the need for specialized skills for employment is to reject the need for development of specialized skills through training.

This gets to the heart of my objection. We absolutely have to build skills. We absolutely have to get people with the necessary skills in front of employers and into jobs. But we cannot put a hard number on hiring without making sure that the people we put in those jobs are qualified to do the work. Doing so will set people up for failure and discredit our efforts for the long-term workforce development that's needed to improve lives and strengthen communities.

All the best,

Alex

On Fri, May 28, 2010 at 3:04 PM, Fathina Holmes <fholmes@ycdjobs.org> wrote:

Dear Mr. Murray (and Mr. Lantsberg):

As I recall, and no doubt as the minutes reflect, Mr. Lantsberg registered no complaint against the mandatory 50% local hiring requirement that is found on page 18 of the report when this matter was discussed at the Task Force. References to "specialized skills" have long ago been rejected by the community as excuses not to train or hire San Francisco residents. Therefore no changes to the "mandatory local hiring" paragraph of page 18 are required or should be contemplated.

However, we did agree at the Task Force, based on Ms. Espanola Jackson's suggestion that the "job readiness, training and preparation" should be funded out of the actual project cost of replacing the digesters, to include language in the third bullet point of
"Community Benefits" on page 18 that "The necessary resources" of this training equals 5% of the total project cost.

Therefore, the third bullet point should begin "The necessary resources, equal to 5% of the total project cost, should be allocated to job readiness, training and preparation..."

Thank you again everyone,

Fathina Holmes

On Mon, May 24, 2010 at 11:09 AM, Alex Lantsberg <lantsberg@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Sam,

Thanks for sending the draft report. I reviewed the document and identified the following points that I need addressed before I sign off on a consensus document:

1. **Project cost (throughout the report):** The number should be expressed in current dollars whenever it is mentioned. Its great that the present value is noted in the spreadsheet (p.15) but I believe the use of future values throughout the document biases decision-making.

2. **Mention of potential housing at the former power plant site (pp 11 & 17) should be stricken.** The concept is speculative at best, certainly more speculative than the Port’s ideas about an eco-industrial park. The land is zoned for heavy industry and there are no applications pending that would change that zoning. The Task Force decided avoid discussion of hypothetical land use changes and thus should treat PG&E’s speculative ambitions no more favorably than we do the Port’s.

3. **Reference to PAC Concept plan should be stricken (pp 12 & 14) -** I didn’t have a chance to comment on this at the meeting before I left, but this statement doesn’t comport to what the PAC’s Concept Plan actually says regarding its vision for the Backlands and the digester rebuild. With the exception of conceptual discussions of a park that the Port has ruled out, the PAC’s Concept Plan November 12, 2000 FINAL DRAFT envisions the Backlands as “a mixed-industry area that emphasizes the use of cargo facilities along the waterfront and clustering of eco-industrial facilities.” (p. 153) and states “a resource/waste-sharing eco-industrial park could potentially be developed in the upland area or “backlands” of the Port Property on Cargo Way.” Where the Concept Plan mentions the digesters, it states the following: “major capital improvements being investigated by the PUC include demolishing the existing digesters and moving the “solids handling” facilities to a location north of Jerrold Street away from residential properties.” None of these statements conflict with moving the digesters to the Backlands. Moreover, there is no denying that building anything in the Port’s Backlands, whether
an eco-industrial park and/or a solids handling facility will create jobs in that specific area and in the Bayview Hunters Point community overall. This is true regardless of whether the site of the current digesters is redeveloped for job producing uses in the event that the Backlands are chosen. In light of the Concept Plan’s official statements it is best that our Report avoid any mention of it.

4. **Mandatory Local Hiring in Community Benefits, p. 18**: As much as I’d like to, I can’t support these first two bullets. Targets, training, and strong first source requirements are absolutely critical. But a duty to hire a minimum number irrespective of availability or capability is simply not a good practice for critical infrastructure that requires specialized skills, whether in construction or operation.

5. **Food Waste, p.18** I think it’s more accurate to say that the Task Force “could not reach consensus” on this item rather than state that it “does not support” it. I certainly support further investigation of the concept.
Review of Potential Biosolids Center Sites for 8/5/09 Digester Task Force Meeting

Seventeen sites were evaluated for locating a new biosolids center that would replace the aging sludge handling facility now located at the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant (SEP). All the potential sites reviewed for the new biosolids center are illustrated in Figure 1. A description of the site screening considerations and the reasoning involved in selecting the recommended biosolids center site alternatives are detailed in this handout.

A new biosolids center requires 12 to 15 acres and would consist of:

- A new sludge handling facility (7 to 10 acres) that should be built as soon as possible. This facility would upgrade treatment to a Class A level from our current Class B level to accommodate reuse/disposal area requirements.

- A 5 acre advanced biosolids drying facility to be constructed in the future. The facility would produce dried biosolids pellets that can be marketed as fertilizer and used in local parks.

Figure 1. Potential SSMP Sites
Site Selection Summary

Site criteria were developed and utilized for comparing and analyzing all the sites for the possible placement of a new biosolids center. Site acquisition of parcels that are not owned by the SFPUC would need to be obtained through eminent domain proceedings which is a two year process. This section summarizes the reasoning and criteria involved with comparing the seventeen potential sites.

Sites Not Meeting Minimum Size Requirements

The follow sites were screened from future consideration as they did not meet the minimum area requirements for a new biosolids center nor did they have an available adjacent site to combine with to form the required 12 to 15 acres.

• **Circosta:** (3.0 acres available) The site is bordered on the west by an active elevated rail track and on the southeast by an active, at-grade Port railroad spur make safety a major concern. The spur separates this lot from the SEP making it a less desirable adjacent location for operations and worker safety, and a difficult site for construction. This small, flat privately owned lot is considered heavily polluted, located on fill, and would likely require a long-term hazardous waste cleanup effort and a future monitoring expense. The site is about 0.4 of a mile from residences and the wind tends to blow toward Islais Creek. There could be future flooding issues and gateway plan conflicts.

• **Griffith Pump Station Lot:** (7.9 acres of available area) Griffith Pump Station property occupies ~1.1 acres of an 8.8 acre lot and additional perimeter property may be required for future stormwater control projects. Most of the parcels are zoned for public use and are owned by the City, but 5 of the parcels will need to be obtained through eminent domain. The site is over a mile from the SEP, has a flat terrain, and the wind direction is toward residences. Established truck routes are through residential zones to reach the freeway that is approximately a mile away. Future stadium traffic plans have proposed use of part of the lot for a roadway.

• **Mirant:** (4.5 acres of available area) This property is owned by Mirant LLC and is an active power plant that is located on contaminated fill. The wind tends to blow towards the bay, is about 0.8 of a mile from the SEP, has a flat terrain, and the eastern portion could be subject to future flooding. There are two historic structures on the available parcel and PG&E has easements and cleanup responsibilities. The site is ~700 feet from a residential zone.

• **Norcal:** (6.8 acres of available area) The site is not owned by the City, has a flat terrain making visual mitigation difficult, and does not meet the minimum size requirements. New development and future development (including residential) near and on the site is expected and the site could have problems with future flooding from Mission Creek. It is located more than 1.5 miles from the SEP which will result in higher long-term pumping and tunnel construction costs. The wind blows toward nearby residences and the site is located near two freeways.

• **North Point Wet-Weather Facility:** (2.3 acres of available area on the south side) The North Point Wet-Weather Facility (NPF) even with the possible inclusion of the adjacent Port of San Francisco Seawall Lot 314 (0.7 acres) is not large enough to locate a new biosolids center. The NPF is located near The Embarcadero, owned by the City and rela-
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...tively distant from Highway 101 and the Bayshore Freeway as well as the SEP (~4 miles). Residential neighborhoods look down on the flat facility site.

- **Selby Wedge:** (6.6 acres of available area) The site is bordered on the eastern edge by an active elevated rail track and on the northwestern edge by the I-280 Freeway making construction, operation, facility and worker safety, and joining safely with an adjacent property a major concern. Six private property owners hold title to the site, making eminent domain acquisition more cumbersome. The site is about a third of a mile from residences, on fill, and there could be future problems with flooding. The wind direction is toward Islais Creek, but the lot is not adjacent to the creek.

- **Tuntex:** (8.9 acres of available area in San Francisco) The majority of the Tuntex site (146 acres) is located in the city of Brisbane and eminent domain proceedings outside of the City and County of San Francisco could be complicated and unpredictable, as it would involve negotiations with both the city of Brisbane and San Mateo County. This site is heavily contaminated and there could be future cleanup, worker safety, and concerns associated with sending substantial quantities of waste to another county for treatment. The site is over 2 miles from the SEP, has a flat terrain, and the wind direction is toward nearby residences. There is freeway access and other local industry could partner with a new biosolids center to conserve energy or resources.

### Other Preliminary Sites Considered

- **Candlestick Point State Recreation Area:** (over 20 acres available) This public park area is owned by the State making acquisition difficult and public acceptance may be a major issue, as San Francisco has less park area per capita than the national average. It is zoned for public use, on fill (that could be contaminated), and large enough to place the entire biosolids center. Adjacent facilities could partner with the biosolids center to conserve energy and water. Most of the property is located over a mile from the SEP resulting in increased future tunnel construction and long-term pumping costs. The terrain is flat making the site more difficult to visually mitigate and could have problems with future flooding. Truck routes to the freeway would partially go through residential zones, and would depend on which parcels were utilized.

- **Hunters Point Shipyard Parcel E:** (40 to 60 acres) This property is heavily contaminated (including radiation) as much of the site was used by the Navy as a disposal site and there could be future cleanup and worker safety concerns. The San Francisco Redevelopment Agency is considering this site for a new stadium. The site is about 1.5 miles from the SEP and would require extensive pipeline tunnels to be built. Nearby residences would look down on the new biosolids center. The site is flat, on fill, and could have future flooding problems. The wind direction is toward the bay. New truck routes would need to be established, part of which would be through residential zones to reach the freeway that is approximately 1.5 miles away. The site could be large enough to site a new biosolids center or entire plant that could partner with adjacent projects/industries for multi-use opportunities.

- **Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant Lot:** (30.7 acres available at OSP lot) The Oceanside Water Pollution Control Plant (OSP) is not considered a feasible site for the placement of a new biosolids center as pumping sludge almost 7 miles across the city will affect its treatability. The existing OSP occupies 12 acres of a 42.7 acre lot and the remaining 30.7 acres is under the purview of the Recreation and Parks Department. Most of the new biosolids center would be constructed and operated underground, but during construction the existing Zoological Gardens and National Guard Armory (that still has 44 years on its...
lease) buildings would need to be temporarily or permanently relocated. Site preparation costs would be substantially lower when compared with the other potential sites as this site has the best soil and least amount of contamination. The salty, wet environment is highly corrosive to metal structures. The site is conducive to visual mitigation, over a third of a mile from a residential zone, and in close proximity to Highway 35 with winds typically blowing in a northeast direction.

Remaining Sites Considered

These remaining sites are considered to be viable alternatives for locating either all or part of the new biosolids center. Although the Southside SEP, Central Shops, Caltrans, Parcels A&B, and Bruce Flynn Pump Station (BFS) sites alone do not meet the minimum 12 to 15 acres requirement, they are adjacent to each other and can be combined to meet the minimum size requirement. Four site alternatives have been developed based on the six sites listed in this section.

- **Southside SEP:** (8.3 acres) The site is already owned by the City and utilization of the existing digester infrastructure would reduce costs. The possible future availability of the asphalt plant coupled with the potential closure of the Quint Street (2.12 acres) could potentially increase the buffer area for the southside of the SEP, but plans for those sites are uncertain at this time. Two major concerns with using the existing SEP site for new projects are the treatment plant’s proximity to residential neighborhoods and its history of odor and noise complaints throughout the year; the wind direction is directed toward nearby residences. Acquisition of an adjacent lot is necessary to locate a possible future 5-acre advanced biosolids drying facility. The adjacent sites considered were Central Shops, Caltrans, Islais Creek Parcels A and B, and the Bruce Flynn Pump Station lot. Easy freeway access is a plus. Some areas of the parcel could have future flooding problems.

- **Central Shops:** (5.3 acres) This flat site is owned by the City, adjacent to the SEP, and a viable option for the placement of a future advanced drying facility. Acquisition costs may need to include the relocation and/or replacement the existing city-owned central shops. It is not heavily polluted and would have lower cleanup and site preparation costs than most of the sites. Easy freeway access is a plus. There could be future flooding issues.

- **Caltrans:** (6.6 acres) The Caltrans site comprises eight parcel lots, three of which are privately owned and will require eminent domain proceedings to acquire and a Davidson Avenue Closure. The State of California has declared the five Caltrans parcels as surplus property, which is the first step required for selling the property; currently, the State has an environmental review of the property underway. The Caltrans site is on fill and the soil is considered of poor quality for construction and contaminated; the older buildings could contain asbestos and lead paint. In an abandoned historical building in ill repair is located on the Caltrans site. The site is adjacent to the SEP, could have future problems with flooding, and is located about a third of a mile from residences. This site borders Islais Creek and might conflict with future gateway plans. Easy freeway access is a plus.

- **Parcels A&B:** (5.8 acres) The Islais Creek Parcels A and B are developed with warehouses and each of the 6 privately owned properties would need to be obtained through eminent domain; it is not known if these parcels contain any hazardous wastes. Most of this flat area is prone to future flooding and would require extensive site preparation due to poor soil quality. It is located near the SEP and is over a third of a mile from residences. Easy freeway access is a plus and the wind direction is toward Islais Creek.

- **Bruce Flynn Pump Station Lot:** (1.4 acres available) The 2.7-acre Bruce Flynn Pump Station lot is already owned by the City, is adjacent to the SEP, and approximately 0.8 acres
is already occupied by the pump station. Approximately 0.4 acres to the east of the active railroad spur could be used for visual mitigation. The rest of the site is leased to a private business. The site has a flat terrain, is approximately a third of a mile from residences, has an easy access to the freeway, and the wind direction is toward Islais Creek. It is on fill, could have future problems with flooding, and the soil is considered of poor quality for construction.

• **Pier 94 Backlands:** (20 acres) The Pier 94 Backlands site is approximately 0.5 of a mile east of the SEP and located near the bay, providing a barging capability and rail access. The site is Port of San Francisco Public Trust property making it cumbersome to attain; obtaining this site for the biosolids facility will require approval by State Land Commission and the State of California legislature. The trust swap and property acquisition will add an additional 2-4 years before construction can begin. Plans by the Port for a eco-industrial park around Pier 94 means that the new biosolids center could partner with these facilities to share energy and water resources. This former landfill area is located on artificial fill and would require extensive site clean up, increasing the cost of developing this site. At this time the site is not flat and is not prone to flooding. It is located about 0.25 of a mile from a residential area. A new truck route along Army Street is being developed providing freeway access and the wind direction is toward the bay.
Four Site Alternatives

Site Alternative 1

Site Alternative 2
Four Site Alternatives, continued

Site Alternative 3

Site Alternative 4
APPENDIX G
Figure 8: Site Option 1a – Process Layout including Food Waste Digestion

Figure 9: Site Option 1b – Process Layout including Food Waste Digestion
Figure 10: Site Option 2 – Process Layout including Food Waste Digestion

Preliminary Layout of Biosolids Digester Facility with Food Waste Digestion

Site Option 2 (Pier 94 Site)

1. Thickening and Digestion Equipment
   2. Coard Thermal Hydrolysis Facility
   3. RCD and Food Waste Reactor
   4. Digesters
   5. Condensation Building
   6. Digested Sludge Storage Tanks
   7. Sludge Handling
   8. Sludge Storage
   9. Sludge Storage
   10. Pumps
   11. Dissolvers
   12. Biosolids Packed Landfill
   13. Advanced Biosolids Process (Drying)