



**San Francisco Public Utilities Commission  
 Citizens' Advisory Committee  
 Wastewater Subcommittee**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Tuesday, January 11, 2022  
 5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.**

**PARTICIPATE VIA ZOOM VIRTUAL CONFERENCE SOFTWARE**

**Meeting URL**

<https://sfwater.zoom.us/j/88998175960?pwd=eVVlc2RTTmFadlIPK0RxUnJKcExVZz09>

**Phone Dial-in**

669.900.6833

Find your local number: <https://sfwater.zoom.us/j/88998175960>

**Meeting ID / Passcode**

889 9817 5960 / 084314

This meeting is being held by Teleconference Pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order N-29-20 and the Sixteenth Supplement to Mayoral Proclamation Declaring the Existence of a Local Emergency Dated February 25,2020

During the Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) emergency, the San Francisco Public Utilities Citizens' Advisory Committee's (SFPUC CAC) regular meeting room, 525 Golden Gate Ave., 3rd Floor Tuolumne Conference Room, is closed. CAC Members and SFPUC staff will convene CAC meetings remotely by teleconference. Members of the public are encouraged to submit their public comment on agenda items in advance of the teleconference meeting by emailing comments to [cac@sfwater.org](mailto:cac@sfwater.org). Comments submitted no later than 12 PM Tuesday the day of the meeting will be read into the record by SFPUC CAC Staffing Team members during the teleconference meeting and will be treated as a substitute to providing public comment during the meeting. Persons who submit written public comment in advance on an agenda item or items will not be permitted to also provide public comment on the same agenda item(s) during the meeting.

**Mission:** The Wastewater Subcommittee shall review sewage and stormwater collection, treatment, and disposal system replacement, recycling, and other relevant plans, programs, and policies ([Admin. Code Article XV, Sections 5.140 - 5.142](#)).

**Members**

**Amy Nagengast, Chair (D8)** Anietie Ekanem (D10) Michelle Pierce (B-Enviro.  
 Marria Evbuoma (D1) Maika Pinkston (M- Justice)  
 Enviro. Org)

**D = District Supervisor appointed, M = Mayoral appointed, B = Board President appointed**

**London N. Breed**  
 Mayor

**Anson Moran**  
 President

**Newsha Ajami**  
 Vice President

**Sophie Maxwell**  
 Commissioner

**Tim Paulson**  
 Commissioner

**Ed Harrington**  
 Commissioner

**Dennis J. Herrera**  
 General Manager

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



## **ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **1. Call to order and roll call at 5:34 pm**

Members present at roll call: (3) Nagengast, Evbuoma, and Pierce

Members Absent: (2) Ekanem and Pinkston

Staff: Greg Norby, Anna Roche, Chris Colwick, and Sarah Minick

### **2. Approve [November 9, 2021](#) Minutes**

Motion was made (Pierce) and seconded (Evbuoma) to approve the November 9, 2021 Minutes.

AYES: (3) Nagengast, Evbuoma, and Pierce

NOES: (0)

ABSENT: (2) Ekanem and Pinkston

Public Comment: None

### **3. Report from the Chair**

- Chair welcomes committee members, staff, and the public
- The Mayor has announced that in-person committee meetings will resume February 28, 2022

Public Comment: None

### **4. Public Comment:** Members of the public may address the Committee on matters that are within the Committee's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda (*2 minutes per speaker*)

Public Comment: None

### **5. Discussion and Possible Action:** [Resolution Making Findings to Allow Teleconferenced Meetings Under California Government Code Section 54953\(e\)](#), Amy Nagengast, Wastewater CAC Chair

Motion was made (Pierce) and seconded (Evbuoma) to adopt the resolution.

The motion PASSED with the following votes:

AYES: (3) Nagengast, Evbuoma, and Pierce

NOES: (0)

ABSENT: (2) Ekanem and Pinkston

Public Comment: None

**6. Discussion: Stipulated Cleanup and Abatement Order R2-2021-0021, adopted by the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board on November 10, 2021, Greg Norby, Assistant General Manager, Wastewater Enterprise**

*Presentation:*

**AGM Norby** began his presentation by stating that the settlement documents are public record, and the settlement has been approved by both parties. AGM Norby introduced Estie Kus from the San Francisco City Attorney's Office and stated she and her team were instrumental in the development of the agreement

The settlement agreement has a couple of different technical terms. It is sometimes referred to as a Clean-up and Abatement Order, which is formal term used by the State of California and the Regional Water Board in these matters. AGM Norby explained that he might refer to it as the settlement agreement or the order during the discussion.

The San Francisco Regional Water Board contacted the City regarding their concerns of an alleged violation of the California Water Code as it relates to overflows from the City's combined sewer and stormwater system. One of the unique aspects of the system is that it is designed and intended to convey both regular dry weather municipal wastewater and stormwater during wet weather storms. The remaining amounts are discharged with partial treatment through permitted outflows located around the perimeter of the City. This unique aspect of the urban system is shared with some cities in the Midwest and back East, but it is unique for California.

Under the settlement, the City has agreed to implement three overflow minimization projects. These projects are in the Wawona neighborhood, the Folsom and 17<sup>th</sup> area, and the lower Alemany neighborhood. The approximate cost for all three projects is about \$622 million. Each project was already in the SFPUC's long-term capital plan. Each of these projects is intended to increase the conveyance capacity in those locations. When there are storms, it reduces/eliminates any combined stormwater sewer overflows from those parts of the system. They are designed to provide that level of service for the five-year storm. The term five-year storm is a level of service storm, and the five years refers to the average statistical return frequency of the storm. It may also be described as a three-hour five-year storm, which refers to the duration and relative intensity of the storm.

This is a standard that has been in place in San Francisco for about 50-60 years, so it is not a new standard that they are striving to meet in the three locations. The agreement allows the City, specifically for the lower Alemany area and the Folsom area, to have a one-year window to develop alternative designs for those areas. If there are better or more desirable solutions, then they can be brought to the Regional Water Board for their consideration. The alternatives would involve more integrated approaches with surface improvements such as green infrastructure and limited land-use transition. There is an allowance for consideration of those alternatives within the plan.

The land-use transition pertains to areas that are at higher risk of flooding. At some point, there is an appropriate public debate or policy level discussion about whether to maintain those current land uses with the risk of more frequent flooding or transition that land use over time to a use that is more resilient and less impacted by the periodic flooding. San Francisco's high density in an urban setting make specific options very specialized. The land

use transition is not unique to San Francisco and is a common policy item across the urban areas of the United States in terms of flood resiliency.

The intent is that by undertaking these improvements, the City, its residents, and businesses in these areas will benefit from reduced overflows during heavy storms. The discussion with the State was very collaborative to reach the agreement.

The other element of the commitment is that these three projects need to be completed by early 2028. That schedule can also potentially shift if there is approval from the Regional Board to modify the alternatives for the lower Alemany and the Folsom area. March 2028 may sound like a long time, but these are large, complicated projects. These timelines will require the SFPUC and the City to be diligent and committed to moving these projects forward because it is not that much time considering the scale of these projects.

The other key commitment made by the SFPUC is to develop and submit to the State a Sewer Overflow Response Plan. This plan is intended to document to the State how the SFPUC monitors, responds, and cleans-up after any wet weather overflow events in these three areas. The first version of that plan will be submitted in the next month or so. The plan largely documents what the SFPUC is already doing. The SFPUC has an extensive wet weather response plan which has been developed over many years that involves coordination with public works crews, the Department of Emergency Management, the MTA (San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, and others. For example, during the October and December storms, there were several well-attended coordination meetings ahead of those storms where logistics and crew deployments were worked out.

The plan that will be submitted by the SFPUC is not a new plan. It is documenting and committing the City to what they already do in these areas. This plan is about how the SFPUC prepares, trains staff, and has appropriate resources for the events. It documents what is done during the events to respond and assess any flooding incidents. It also documents what is done after a flooding event in terms of clean-up and outreach to damaged properties. The plan also commits the SFPUC to install water level monitoring devices in these areas so that there is a good indication of conditions where they can see when flooding might be occurring. This data can then be used appropriately during the events. This is something the SFPUC has already been doing. They have about 20-30 monitoring stations that are already deployed around the system to help monitor performance during wet weather events. The SFPUC will be modifying that network to make sure it has specific monitoring stations that bracket each of the three high-risk areas.

The last item is about the flood resiliency grant program, which makes grants of up to \$100,000 available to properties that are at risk of flooding. Property owners can implement property improvements and make them more resilient during flood events. This can be a whole different range of features, such as modifying drains, developing specific landscape features, installing sewer lateral back-flow prevention devices. The SFPUC tries to bring attention to the back-flow retention devices. Under the agreement, the SFPUC is committed to making a minimum of \$1.5 million per year budgeted and available for that grant program. This new level of funding has been included in the SFPUC's draft budget, which is going through approval for the new fiscal year.

These are the key elements of the settlement. It has only been a few months since both the City and the Regional Board approved the settlement.

*Discussion:*

- **Chair Nagengast** asked if they were ever under an EPA consent decree and whether that was part of any negotiations. She understands that they are separate but wanted to know if that is something they have been working with as well. She would like to understand the overlap between the two of them and if there are

synergies between them. There might be sensitivities there that cannot be shared but she would like more background before she asks any additional questions.

**AGM Norby** responded that they are not under a consent decree. Related conversations are going on, but they still have a sensitive nature in terms of other regulatory conversations.

**City Attorney Kus** added that from a Brown Act perspective, they should stay on the narrower topic of the settlement agreement because the consent decree is not an agenda item. She offered to respond to these questions in a privileged memorandum.

- **Chair Nagengast** commented that it is important to have some synergies when working with the San Francisco Water Board and the EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) so that interests are aligned. Chair Nagengast wanted to know if there was a consolidation of what might be mandated from different organizations to reduce oversight. The Chair then stated that she would be interested in having a memorandum about this.
- **Member Pierce** commented that she plans on sending the SFPUC written questions for follow-up.
- **Member Evbuoma** commented that the three-hour five-year metric has been in place for 56 years, but it is probably inadequate due to the impacts of climate change. Evbuoma added that she does not understand why the SFPUC is working off such an old framework. Evbuoma then asked why the framework is not more in line with predictions that are currently taking place and expected to happen in San Francisco.

**AGM Norby** responded that Evbuoma hit a key item with her questions, which are the cornerstone of the flood resiliency conversation. Climate change and climate variability have come more to the forefront of these discussions around the country and the world, but there used to be a standard practice when designing flood control systems and related facilities. The industry in both the private and government sector across the country since the early parts of the 20<sup>th</sup> century had the standard practice to look at the available historic record of rainfall and storms. In some cases, that record might have been decades-long or shorter. The record of storm events might have had some events that dump a tremendous amount of water in a short time, while other storms had a slow and steady rainfall that lasted longer. The technical approach over the years was to develop a standard statistical characterization of those storms and then have local government or stakeholders decide what type of storm they could handle. It was a judgment call, which has been the standard approach in many cities across the US. The data was not made up. NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) or its predecessor have published intensity duration frequency curve atlases for many decades. For example, in the 1990s if a storm-water channel had to be designed anywhere, the information would be found published on NOAA atlases for any specific area. The curves from the atlas would help design a system that could handle, for example, a storm that comes along every two years. If they wanted a system that could handle a one in 50 years storm, those same NOAA atlases would provide the storm characterizations for the 50-year storm. The storm characterizations then translate into a flow. AGM Norby used the

example of a control channel to show how the atlas data would translate a 50-year storm, which would have a flow rate of 50,000 gallons per minute. That would then dictate how large the channel needed to be. This approach underpins virtually all the existing stormwater and flood infrastructure seen across the country. Currently, the hydrology of North America and different regions is now shifting. Much of the infrastructure that has been built to respond to a particular intensity of a storm is likely to change patterns in the future because of climate change. It is a big issue facing urban areas across the country. That is where the roots of the five-year three-hour storm come from. By the late 1940s, San Francisco was already a mature urban center. The technical decisions at the time were to select that type of storm to guide the City's stormwater systems. The same system is in place today. It is an important dialogue to consider whether the City wants to continue to use that standard for flood resiliency. There is some interesting work underway looking at how the global climate models can help to understand what the climate change picture might look like 10, 20, or 50 years from now. There is work underway to use those global models to downscale and arrive at what the statistical characterizations of storms in the future might look like. It is a big issue whether you are running an airport or a city stormwater system. It is a key item that the City needs to be thinking about moving forward.

- **Member Evbuoma** commented that she wants the City to be prepared and advocate for change in the framework itself and how the City rebuilds so that these types of projects are not obsolete in five years.

**Staff Minick** commented that when they do the modeling runs for their alternative designs in Alemany and looking at both water that will be flowing beneath the surface in the existing pipes and water also flowing on the surface, they will be utilizing the 100-year storm to test the design ideas. This is to see if the urban design strategies, in particular green infrastructure, and highly flooded areas, can help convey much larger storms. Staff Minick will be excited to show CAC members as those scenarios merge for storms larger than the five-year.

**Member Evbuoma** commented that she is looking forward to the 100-year model being implemented.

- **Chair Nagengast** asked what level of flood was settled on for the three overflow minimization projects.

**AGM Norby** responded that the intent with the projects in place is to not have water exiting the combined system in a five-year three-hour storm. It could be right up to just below the crest of the system, but it cannot be coming into the street or out of the manholes. It will certainly not be flowing through people's laterals. It should reflect no significant surface flow during the five-year three-hour storm.

- **Chair Nagengast** commented that Staff Minick has provided them with a deep dive into lower Alemany alternatives and asked if there are parallel alternatives being looked at for Folsom and Wawona.

**AGM Norby** responded that the Wawona project has a distinct bowl at the intersection of 15th and Wawona that has been an area of historic flooding. That project is already under construction, which is why the agreement does not discuss alternatives for the Wawona project. The lower Alemany and the Folsom and 17<sup>th</sup> area still have allowance for alternatives that achieve the same service level.

- **Chair Nagengast** asked if there is another one-year study going on for the Folsom project.

**AGM Norby** responded that they are just starting on that effort. The primary focus has been in the lower Alemany area. Folsom will be referred to as the Folsom and 17<sup>th</sup> project. It is a large, deep tunnel that originates in the Folsom and 17<sup>th</sup> area and then conveys flows to the east under 280 to Mission. AGM Norby is not sure where it ties into the main system, but that tunnel is at roughly 30% design currently. There is an allowance for alternatives.

- **Chair Nagengast** commented that she would love to hear more about the sewer overflow response plan in a subsequent meeting. She would also like to have more level of service discussions. Chair Nagengast then asked about the \$1.5 million that was allocated to the flood resistance grant program and asked what happens with the \$1.5 million funding if it is not used this year.

**AGM Norby** responded that the SFPUC acknowledges that the current grant process is challenging and cumbersome, and they are working to improve that. The \$1.5 million is for each fiscal year, and it does not roll over. If only \$1 million is used in a particular fiscal year, that remaining \$500,000 would not be available to use the next fiscal year. From Wastewater's perspective, success means that every dollar of that \$1.5 million is used in a grant. The benefits are created when the money is spent. For a host of reasons, they are not getting the level of demand and utilization of the grant program that they would like to see.

- **Chair Nagengast** asked whether that \$1.5 million starts July 1<sup>st</sup>.

**AGM Norby** responded affirmatively.

**Chair Nagengast** commented that the program needs to be revamped in five/six months so that they can get more people to enroll. She then asked if there was a \$100,000 maximum still.

**AGM Norby** responded affirmatively.

- **Staff Minick** commented that they are targeting going to the Commission with improvements in the fourth quarter, and they want the Commission to approve it for the next fiscal year. They know the broad categories where they want to make improvements and streamline the administrative process. They have a good sense of what needs to happen. The other big lift is completing the guidebook that is accessible to the layperson so that folks can understand what the options are for their property. The guidebook should not be a lengthy document. She is happy to agendaize that for a future meeting as well.

Public Comment: None

7. **Presentation and Discussion:** [Ocean Beach Climate Change Adaptation Project Update](#), Anna Roche, Project Manager, Climate Change

*Presentation:*

- Agenda

- Project History
- Project History Clean Water Act – Oceanside
- Project History: Chronic Erosion
- Historic Approaches to Erosion
- Project Drivers and Primary Objectives
- Project Drivers: Infrastructure at Risk
- Project Drivers – Policy and Litigation
- Primary Project Objectives
- Short-term and Army Corps of Engineers
- Erosion South of Sloat Boulevard
- Short-term Improvements
- ACOE Beneficial Use of Dredged Material as Sand Nourishment
- Long-term Improvements – 35% Design Brief Recap
- PUC and Non-PUC Elements
- PUC Elements – Structural Protection Design Considerations
- Wastewater Infrastructure at Risk
- Structural Protection Secant Pile Wall Design
- Low Profile Wall – Cross Section
- Swoo Area – DSM Treatment
- Non-PUC Elements – Design and Design Considerations
- Trail Design
- Restroom Facility
- Beach Access
- Intersection Improvements
- Long-term Improvements 65% Design
- 65% Design
- 65% Design Overview
- PUC and Non-PUC 65% Design Elements
- PUC Elements – Changes from 35% to 65%
- Planning Level Design – Ocean Beach Master Plan
- 35% Design Level Design
- Low-Profile Secant Pile Wall
- Low Profile Wall Design
- Low Profile Secant Pile Wall Sloat Plaza-Northern Terminus
- Low Profile Secant Pile Wall Swoo DSM
- Low Profile Secant Pile Wall Southern Terminus
- Low Profile Secant Pile Wall Cross Section
- Low Profile Secant Pile Wall Cross Section at SWOO
- Southern Terminus – DSM Treatment
- DSM Treatment at Stairs
- Removal of Shoreline Armoring
- Sand Management Program
- Non-PUC Elements – Design
- Beach Access
- Stairs at Southern Access
- Skyline Parking Lot, RPD Trail and SFPUC Access Road
- Multi-Use Trail Design
- Parking Lot at Skyline
- Trail Design
- Trail Design and SFPUC Access
- Sloat Plaza, Restroom and Northern Trail
- Sloat Plaza – Trail, Road and Restroom
- Sloat Plaza – Restroom, Mechanical, and Electrical
- Trail Design – Sloat Plaza
- Intersection Improvements
- Intersection Improvements and Zoo Access



- Intersection Improvements at Sloat and Zoo Access
- Intersection Modifications at Skyline
- Project Schedule
- Design and Construction Schedule
- Environmental Schedule
- Ongoing Challenges
- Challenges
- Q & A

#### *Discussion*

- **Member Evbuoma** commented that is nice to see that a great deal of work has been done since the last presentation. Evbuoma commented that she is still concerned about the use of plastics in the sandbags and whether they are monitoring micro-plastics in this project for both the water and the sand. Evbuoma also pointed out that when the Great Highway is closed, the intersection of Sloat and Skyline that has a small stop sign, gets bottlenecked. Evbuoma asked that this intersection be kept in mind as improvements are being made. She is thinking about how access to the neighborhoods have been cut off due to the closure of the northern side of the Great Highway. She also brought up the topic of designing for the future and the need to expand the number of restrooms since Ocean Beach has become a major destination for residents and tourists, and the need serve unhoused neighbors.

**Staff Roche** responded that the sandbags are monitored as required by the Coastal Commission. The bags that break or are in bad condition are removed. The bags are temporary and will be removed once the low-profile wall can be built. To her knowledge, the material used on the sandbags is as good as it can be for that use. The bags of sand must withstand sunlight and waves. If something breaks down, they are removed as part of the monitoring program. The Skyline and Great Highway intersection starts construction sometime this year. Caltrans is doing a stoplight installation and some lane painting to make this a safer intersection. This will no longer be a public road for thoroughfare, but there will still be traffic turning to access the parking lot. There are also the SFPUC needs to access that road to get to their facilities, which is why the SFPUC is working with Caltrans to make sure the intersection changes work for the situation. The other intersection discussed was Sloat and Skyline and this project is gaining momentum again. The SFPUC understands that these intersections will need to operate better in the future given that that section of the Great Highway will be closed. Staff Roche that her understanding is that it is going to either be a round-about or they will signalize that intersection to improve it. The other intersection is the Sloat intersection that is part of the SFPUC project. This intersection is being designed for those changes. The SFPUC is currently working with the SFMTA to encourage folks driving along the Great Highway who intend to end up at the Skyline to exit sooner at Sunset to avoid traffic issues. At the same time, they are encouraging folks to think about how there are going to be sacrifices made for the City to address climate change. The SFPUC is doing a managed retreat, which is a term used by the Coastal Commission, where they are removing that highway out of this section and instead adding much improved coastal access for people to enjoy. They are trying to protect the critical assets that are still at the young end of their asset life because this is all being paid for by the ratepayers of San Francisco. Therefore, they are trying to think through all the cost-effective pragmatic approaches to this project. There were

no other solutions that they could come up with to address the sea level rise and chronic erosion in the area. The SFPUC does not have all the answers, but they are working with SFMTA to make sure they understand not only permanent changes to traffic but how they coordinate and collaborate on when projects are in construction. The SFPUC is trying to balance having coastal elements and protecting what they have out there, but at the same time, the Coastal Commission does not want facilities built out there that will have to be protected in perpetuity. The analysis showed that having all-gender five slots bathroom was equivalent to what is available now. They also tried to use materials that look appropriate for the area and can withstand the climate. It is a balancing between a group that wants a big bathroom with 20 stalls and a group that does not want anything out there because that means more infrastructure in the coastal zone. They will have to do sand placement and maintenance if there is a big storm, but Staff Roche is hoping that this can be safe from the elements through 2060 and 2070. This is a balancing exercise.

- **Member Evbuoma** commented that the area around Kelly's Cove no longer has bathrooms or garbage cans and it is a mess. It sounds like it is not up to SFPUC but seeing how people actually use the space should be taken into consideration.

**Staff Roche** responded that she completely agrees with Evbuoma. Roche added that San Francisco Recreation and Parks is struggling to maintain the assets from a staff and funds perspective.

**Member Pierce** commented that there used to be three different bathroom stations and one internal/external bathroom at the zoo. Now it is going down to a five-stall in the isolated corner of the zoo. Pierce thanked Evbuoma for bringing up the bathroom and garbage can situation.

**Staff Roche** commented that she understands what Pierce means about the number of bathroom stalls decreasing, but she did not understand the comment about the zoo bathroom.

**Member Pierce** responded that one of the zoo's entrance gates had a bathroom right at the front. This was an internal/external bathroom that people who were in that area could access. Locals knew that the zoo bathroom was an option if the bathrooms on the beach were occupied. There were also bathroom stations that were four blocks down and at the other end that had two to three stalls each for males and females. This all means that they are going down from 15-20 toilet seats/urinals to five, even though the population has not decreased. There is an explosion in numbers of unhoused neighbors in the Lake Merced and Ocean Beach area. They do everything they can to be good neighbors in how they dispose of their waste, but when they have no other option, a grassy beach with dunes is a good place to hide. This is a hygiene and public health safety issue. Stuff will go out into the ocean and get picked up even further in, especially on high tide days.

**Staff Roche** responded that she cannot speak to the zoo components of it because that is not a part of this project. From the designer's perspective, going from bathrooms that limit who can use which side to all-gender bathrooms is enough to replace existing capacity. This was a Rec and Park asset of the project and the decision is theirs.

- **Member Pierce** commented that the other bathrooms went away under the assumption that the City was planning improvements. It is

not just this bathroom, but over the course of 20 years, these things are going away under the assumption that they will come back. Then a new partner is brought in, such as Rec and Park, who decides that what is already there is all they have to account for.

**Staff Roche** responded that Rec and Park has always been a part of this project. It is a joint City project that the SFPUC is leading. This goes back to the Ocean Beach master planning process where SFMTA, Rec and Park, Public Works, and the SFPUC all sat at the table and came up with the concepts that are now being implemented as part of this project. The SFPUC is the lead decision-maker on elements that are protecting their facilities.

**Member Pierce** commented that SF Rec and Park implements many design factors that truly hamper equity, and the parks in Bayview Hunters Point reflect that.

**Staff Roche** responded that she encourages Pierce to put a comment in on the draft EIR (Environmental Impact Report) because that is a place she can comment. That is what CEQA (The California Environmental Quality Act) is. Pierce can ask if they are replacing the bathrooms with an adequate addition to what was already there. This is what the public comment period is for, and Staff Roche will take Pierce's comments back to the project team.

- **Member Pierce** asked Evbuoma to contact her and said she can put together a letter-writing campaign with her people for public comment on the plan.

**Staff Roche** responded that she appreciates Pierce's comments.

- **Chair Nagengast** asked if there was a playground in the plaza.

**Staff Roche** responded that there is not. It is just a coastal access trail that is connecting the northern end of Ocean Beach to this end of the beach and further connects with Fort Funston. One of the elements of the project is that the SFPUC is partnering with Fort Funston to have a connection point somewhere in this area. Fort Funston can be more directly accessed from the parking lot, and there will be a connection with the Lake Merced area and the walking trails there. One of the parts of the project is to ensure that there is a safe and elevated crosswalk. Again, this is about connecting the area further up on Ocean Beach safely and making these connections.

- **Chair Nagengast** commented that she was at Pismo Beach recently and noticed they had a nice art installation that was also a playground for children. She thought it was a nice way to tie those two elements together. The Chair then asked what is the impact that people will have by submitting a comment on the draft EIR.

**Staff Roche** responded that the point of the public comment period is to allow the public to comment on the adequacy of the environmental analysis that was completed. When those comments are submitted, the CEQA team must respond to them. What makes up the final EIR is both a combination of the draft EIR that has been released and the responses to comments.

- **Chair Nagengast** asked if that would impact the design.

**Staff Roche** responded affirmatively. It could result in the City making a different decision. For example, if they received many comments on an element of the project, it would behoove them to make a change.

**Member Pierce** commented that the CEQA team can require them to reassess and make changes. Once it passes out of that phase, it goes before the Land Use Subcommittee of the Board of Supervisors. They will also have an opportunity to petition them, and they can reject what the CEQA team puts forward and require some changes to be made too. If they are persistent, they have two to three opportunities. It is a long and tedious process to fight something. It is one of those things that Environmental Justice people get down into. Occasionally it works effectively.

Public Comment: None

#### 8. Staff report

- In-person committee meetings will resume February 28, 2022

Public Comment: None

#### 9. Future Agenda Items and Resolutions

- Treasure Island and Wastewater – *tentatively March*
- Sewer Overflow Response Plans – *tentatively March*
- Level of Service and Needed Adjustments
- Analytics on Smart Manhole Covers – location, function
- Floodwater Grant Program – *tentatively May/June*
- Watershed Stewardship Grants – check on appropriate timing
- Wastewater Monitoring – BPA, Teflon, COVID, Micro cloths
- Nano plastics in the Bay – Monitoring
- Southeast Treatment Plant Update
- Environmental Justice Analysis briefing – Summer 2022
- Environmental Justice in Capital Projects – Summer 2022
- Next Generation Green Infrastructure
- Racial Equity Plan – Funding to Support the Plan
- Job Creation at the Plant – City Works and Apprenticeship Program
- Wastewater – Train and Training
- Wastewater CAC staff
- Asset Management Integration – Wastewater policy and capital projects
- Green Infrastructure Program and Resolution Update
- Wastewater Communications Update
- Stormwater Management Ordinance and the Southeast Treatment Plant
- Upcoming Construction
- Workforce Programs and Qualifications
- Treasure Island Field Trip

#### Adopted Resolutions for Follow Up

- Resolution in Support of SFPUC Class A Biosolids Local Distribution Program [adopted August 21, 2018](#)
- Resolution in Support of Cityworks Interns Recommendations [adopted on November 21, 2017](#)

- Resolution in Support of Equitable Green Infrastructure Implementation throughout the Southeast Sector of San Francisco and throughout the City [adopted June 20, 2017](#)
- Resolution Urging SFPUC Commission to Initiate Planning and Environmental Review for Building a New Community Center at Third and Evans and to Direct Staff to Develop an Interim Greenhouse Environmental and Workforce Development Program [adopted on October 18, 2016](#)
- Resolution Supporting the SFPUC to Conduct Robust Community Engagement to Determine the Community's Preference for Remodeling Southeast Community Facility at 1800 Oakdale or Building a New Community Center at 1550 Evans [adopted on January 19, 2016](#)

**10. Announcements/Comments** Visit [www.sfwater.org/cac](http://www.sfwater.org/cac) for final confirmation of the next meeting date.

#### **11. Adjournment**

Motion was made (Nagengast) and seconded (Pierce) to adjourn the meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 7:36 pm.