

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

Staff Liaisons: Mayara Ruski Augusto Sa and Jobanjot Aulakh
Staff Email for Public Comment: cac@sfwater.org

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. **Call to order and roll call at 6:19 pm**

Members present at roll call: (3) Nagengast, Pinkston*, Pierce

Members Absent: (2) Evbuoma and Ekanem

Staff presenters: Sarah Minick

Public Comment: None

*Member Pinkston arrived at 6:05 pm. Quorum was reached at that time.

2. **Approve [September 14, 2021](#) Minutes**

Motion was made (Pierce) and seconded (Nagengast) to approve the September 14, 2021 Minutes.

AYES: (3) Nagengast, Pinkston, Pierce

NOES: (0)

ABSENT: (2) Evbuoma and Ekanem

Public Comment: None

3. **Report from the Chair**

- No report from the Chair

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

Public Comment: None

5. **Presentation and Discussion: Upper Islais Creek Watershed Update,** Sarah Minick, Utility Planning Division Manager, Wastewater Enterprise

Presentation:

Staff Minick explained that the overall purpose of the program is to spread out flood resilience benefits. The pipe project around Alemany includes

a pipe for the five-year three-hour storm. The challenge is being able to take that \$289 million dollars and spread it across the watershed.

For the upper watershed, the method to be used is soak it up, which means figuring out the how much green infrastructure can be implemented up, as well as finding synergies with partners. This can be with MTA (Municipal Transportation Agency) and the streetscape, SFUSD (San Francisco Unified School District) on school properties, Rec Park (Recreation and Parks), and hearing from community members about their priorities to amplify synergies. The slow it down method consists of capturing and reusing rainwater. The protect method relies on urban design for flood resilience. To advance these methods, they need to focus on the co-benefits that would be most meaningful to people.

The SFPUC is a utility and their core business is storm water management, which means that PUC will be able to measure how much flood reduction can be achieved from these various interventions. The SFPUC plans on conducting surveys to understand people's concerns. There will be paper surveys, electronic surveys, and verbal interactions with people to gather data in the field. The idea is to learn about concerns that might exist, such as noise, safety, air quality issues. There are also concerns regarding toilet overflow and access to the Farmers' Market. Overall, the SFPUC wants to learn more about these concerns to match the delivered benefits to hopefully minimize those concerns. Staff Minick also acknowledged that the core issue of flooding remains important.

The next part of the presentation discussed flood claims, specifically understanding what the risks and vulnerabilities are. The SFPUC is measuring how much water they need to capture and how much space is in the community to deal with that water. The team is going through the area and identifying different options for detention and soaking it up and then looking at the public right of way to understand how much opportunity there is on land that is more easily accessible by the City. The team is also recognizing while parcels are going to play a role and CalTrans is going to play a large role.

As they look at those areas, they are also thinking about hard and soft solutions and how they can come together in an urban design setting. Staff Minick discussed how their base case has to offer flood protection but also build multiple benefits, which will be better understood after the surveys are concluded. Green infrastructure allows checking off all these things at once. Even something that may be less important will still be delivered to community. It is important to know the benefits as they can change design strategies.

There are linkages that require the team's attention from the lower watershed and to characterize the land area to understand what their opportunities are. the SFPUC is using their understanding of what the linkages are to try and change the public realm.

Staff Minick commented that one of the big concerns communicated to the PUC is to not prioritize the needs of commuters and instead prioritize the needs of those living around the corridor. They are excited to model different flood resilience measures that could bifurcate Alemany Blvd. in the same way a more traditional boulevard like Octavia Blvd. or Sunset Blvd. would be bifurcated. There would be a local street for those who live right there and then a protective buffer, which would deliver multiple benefits. It would be an urban design feature, but it would also be a flood protection and a green infrastructure feature that could separate the slow local lane from the faster cars that are heading to the freeway. The Commission instructed the team to think big. Staff Minick continued that she thinks the public realm is key to this project and is introducing many problems that people are experiencing. She is excited for the team to get in and iterate on how they can do both green infrastructure solutions across the watershed but also address those who are most vulnerable in the flood zone with a solution that could be more transformative for them.

The big difference from when Staff Minick spoke to the CAC last is that they are starting to iterate concepts that they will try to formalize enough by the end of the year. The goal is to be able to state what is the measurable difference in flooding because of a specific intervention. There will be tradeoffs. If what the team is suggesting is done, it would force more flood waters into the commuter lanes, and it would allow for more protection for the vulnerable communities along the corridor. Nothing will fix everything. The plan is to include everyone in the conversation to see what people think. Staff Minick explained that the countdown for the project starts tomorrow when the settlement with the Regional Board is signed. The plan is to have multiple feasible alternatives rather than just one to share with the regulators. This puts them in a better position to field their concerns and be nimbler. That is why they are doing a scenario planning method.

It would be helpful to present again to the CAC once they finish the scenarios.

Discussion:

- **Chair Nagengast** commented that scenarios and modeling are a great approach. Chair Nagengast asked what those impacts would be beyond flooding. Chair also asked if the modeling is intended to get quantitative for co-benefits as well as the flooding. Chair Nagengast Asked if here is data behind the benefits and said she is looking for more evaluation on the co-benefits than just statements that they are being increased.

Staff Minick responded that the team has been discussing that. There are so many different tools across the City. Internally to the SFPUC, they have the TBL (triple bottom line) tool. Their charge is to be the alternative to the pipe project. There are also the public health rubrics that the Department of Public Health has all kinds of metrics for. The San Francisco Estuary Institute is working on a co-benefit measuring tool. Given their credibility, rigor, and their relationship to the Regional Board, it seems it would be great to engage them as teammates. They can also provide an external lens so that the SFPUC does not get too parochial, which Staff Minick thinks is very important. They could potentially measure the co-benefits in the scenarios that the SFPUC comes up with their tool. It will be based on data and the use of that tool. If the SFPUC's solution has so many square feet of a certain kind of green infrastructure and it has a certain ecological conductivity and habitat, the San Francisco Estuary can then put it in and measure it. That could help the SFPUC credibly measure the co-benefits. Some of them are easier to measure than others. There are ones that can be quantitatively measured versus policy ideals that they are striving for. Staff Minick asked the CAC to share their ideas. Staff Minick believes that they should identify the top things that people care about and be as rigorous as they can.

- **Chair Nagengast** recommended a tool (<https://autocase.com/software/>) used by the airport that might be useful.
- **Member Pinkston** mentioned that she has an off-topic water situation as the water in her house looks unsafe to drink and she is not sure who to reach out to.

Member Pierce commented that the water usually changes when it rains hard. Pierce then suggested reaching out to the City.

Member Pinkston asked if that is something that is just happening in her house.

Member Pierce responded negatively.

Member Pinkston added that the water from the faucet bubbles and looks like a water spritzer.

Member Pierce commented that it might be bacterial overflow. Pinkston is close to a storm overflow outlet and a little bit of storm overflow for processing to the plant backs up right around Pinkston's house. This problem should be reported every time. That water is not dangerous to normal, healthy people but it is dangerous to people who are immunocompromised. People who are undergoing cancer treatment, people with kidney issues, organ transplants, HIV, and some autoimmune disorders should be careful about that water. Pierce asked Staff Sa to provide Pinkston with information on someone to monitor the system around the edges of Bayview Hunters Point.

- **Staff Minick** thanked Pinkston for bringing that up and mentioned that the Water Enterprise can check what can be done in terms of monitoring or site visits.

Member Pinkston commented that they have a great deal of elders who probably have compromised immune systems and she hoped they were not drinking that water.

Member Pierce commented that showering in the water could also lead to exposure because the water can still go into the individual's system.

Public Comment: None

6. Presentation and Discussion: Flood Water Grant Program, Sarah Minick, Utility Planning Division Manager, Wastewater Enterprise

This agenda item was postponed to a future meeting.

Public Comment: None

7. Staff Report

Reminder about empty seats.

Public Comment: None

8. Future Agenda Items and Resolutions

- San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board Settlement and Overflow Actions and Projects
- Flood Water Grant Program

- Treasure Island and Wastewater
- Southeast Treatment Plant Update
- Nano plastics in the Bay – Monitoring
- Environmental Justice Analysis briefing
- Environmental Justice in Capital Projects
- Watershed Stewardship Grants
- 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 in 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](#)

Public Comment: None

- 9. Announcements/Comments** The next scheduled meeting of the Wastewater Subcommittee will take place on January 11, 2022. Visit www.sfpuc.org/cac for final confirmation of the next meeting date.

10. Adjournment

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

Meeting was adjourned at 6:50 pm.