

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Citizens' Advisory Committee

MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, March 19, 2024 5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m. 525 Golden Gate Ave., 3rd Floor Tuolumne Conference Room

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY OBSERVE AND PARTICIPATE VIA ZOOM VIRTUAL CONFERENCE SOFTWARE

Meeting URL

https://sfwater.zoom.us/j/84836605971?pwd=UXNJdlcwSzgzN3hGRUIOMzliM2NGdz09

Phone Dial-in 669.219.2599

Find your local number: https://sfwater.zoom.us/u/kbwFEr2FCG

Meeting ID/Passcode

848 3660 5971 / 816506

Mission: The purpose of the SFPUC CAC is to provide recommendations to the SFPUC General Manager, the SFPUC Commission, and the Board of Supervisors regarding the agency's long-term strategic, financial, and capital improvement plans (Admin. Code Article XV, Sections 5.140 - 5.142)

Members:

Moisés García, Chair (D9) Caroline Law (D1) Suki Kott (D2) Sally Chen (D3) Douglas Jacuzzi (D4) Emily Algire (D5) Barklee Sanders (D6) Elizabeth Steele Teshara (D7) Amy Nagengast (D8) Steven Lee (D10) Jennifer Clary (D11) Maika Pinkston (M-Environmental Org.) Nicole Sandkulla (M-Regional Water Customers) Jodi Soboll (M-Engineering/Financial) Eliahu Perszyk (M-Large Water User) Andrea Baker (B-Small Business) Michelle Pierce (B-Environ. Justice)

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

Staff Liaisons: Lexus Moncrease and Sharon Liu-Bettencourt **Staff Email for Public Comment:** <u>cac@sfwater.org</u>

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Members present at roll call: Law, Kott, Chen, Jacuzzi, Algire, Steele Teshara, Clary, Soboll, Perszyk, and Baker

London N. Breed Mayor

> Tim Paulson President

Anthony Rivera Vice President

Newsha K. Ajami Commissioner

Sophie Maxwell Commissioner

> Kate H. Stacy Commissioner

Dennis J. Herrera General Manager



Members absent: Garcia, Sanders, Nagengast, Lee, Clary, Pinkston, Sandkulla, and Pierce

2. Approve February 20, 2024 Minutes

Motion was made (Perszyk) and seconded (Algire) to approve the February 20, 2024, minutes.

Approved without objection.

Public Comment: None

3. Report from the Chair

- Welcome members, staff, and the public
- Ohlone Tribal Land Acknowledgement

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.
 - Peter Drekmeier (Policy Director for the Tuolumne River Trust): The SFPUC (and the irrigation districts in San Joaquin) lost the lawsuit over phase 1 of the Bay Delta plan. The SFPUC can appeal but they hope they do not. The alternative water supply plan was included in the agenda packet for the commissions as communications and they are hoping for discussion regarding the need for alternative water supply and the direction that would make the most sense. He states that he hopes the CAC would consider learning more about the appeal process on the lawsuit as they believe it should be a public process and that the CAC would encourage the SFPUC to have a workshop around alternative water supplies.
 - **Gary** (WLW Consultants): When is an audit going to be completed for the Bayview Hunters Point Bio Solids Project that shows that the community benefits policy is being enforced and taken into account. He states the neighborhood has not been updated on community benefits and cost of the project.
- 5. Presentation and Discussion: <u>Wastewater Capital Projects</u>, Bessie Tam, Wastewater Capital Programs Director

Presentation: Update on Program Planning RECAP from July 2020 meeting Capital Planning Strategy An integral part of the never-ending asset lifecycle Move towards Adaptive Management Approach Overview from Q1 Report (Q1 FY23/24) The Wastewater Enterprise (WWE) Capital Programs are comprised of three programs. SSIP Phase 1 Status Other SSIP Status Facilities and Infrastructure (F&I) Renewal and Replacement (R&R) - Collection System Renewal and Replacement – Treatment Facilities Upcoming Challenges Move towards Adaptive Management Approach Southeast Plant Mainstream Nutrient Reduction Southeast Bay Outfall & SEP Booster Station Replacement WWE LOS WWE Levels of Service (LOS) and Key Metrics Q1 FY23-24 WWE Capital Program Quarterly Report Approved Program based on Feb 2023 CIP Anticipated Construction Completion in 2024 SSIP Phase 1 Status SSIP Status - Cost Summary Facilities and Infrastructure Status- Cost Summary **Capital Programs Milestones** SEP Biosolids Digester Facilities Project Southeast Plant New Headworks Facility Project

Discussion

• **Staff Tam** showed in her presentation how the FY23/24 annual budget, the sewer renewal and replacement portion of the budget is broken down by larger diameter sewers and small diameter sewers. She further shows how large diameter sewers are sewers in which the pipes are 36 inches or larger Staff Tam said the pipes are separated by diameters because the regulators wanted them to be separated however it is more catastrophic for bigger pipes to fail.

Member Clary asked if this is the reason why the budget allotted \$4.5 million per mile of pipe and commented how it's a lot more than she expected.

Staff Tam responded that there are a lot of challenges for large diameter pipes and that a lot of these pipes are made of turn of the century bricks from either the 1900s or even before the 1900s. She further said that brick sewers are also mainly in congested communities such as the Mission District and Chinatown and commented how the soil conditions are also not very good, and the streets are old. Staff Tam said that since it is so difficult to get work done in these old brick sewers, the PUC also collaborates with the MTA and Public Works, and everyone goes in and work at the same time, there are also often waterlines running through outbreak sources.

Member Clary responded that having waterlines through outbreak sources is inappropriate.

Staff Tam responded that it is but it's impossible to move some of these waterlines and when you peel back the asphalt on some of these streets, they are so full of utilities you could walk on it but waterlines are only in the sewers because there was no room anywhere else.

• Staff Tam presented on the renewal and replacement cost of treatment facilities and points out there are two and a half treatment plants; Southeast, Oceanside and North Point.

Member Soboll asked how the Southeast treatment plan is divided into phases and commented she thought the treatment plants would also include facility infrastructure and SSIP. Member Soboll asked if the Southeast treatment plant is in phase one, SSIP, or if it's sprinkled through all of them.

Staff Tam responded that Southeast treatment plan is sprinkled in SSIP Phase one and other SSIP.

• Staff Tam presented on the Southeast Outfall and Booster Station replacement project and said that the Southeast Outfall is a major pipeline that is downstream of the treatment plan but it is a very old facility that brings the flow from the Southeast treatment plant into the bay. She furthers presented on how there is a lot of requirements because it runs across a creek and underneath Pier 80, and Rate payer money cannot be used to fix Pier 80.

Member Soboll asked if this is the type of program that can receive funding from the federal infrastructure program especially due to climate change and algae blooms.

Staff Tam responded that they are talking with external parties for both projects to see if they can get federal funding.

• Member Clary asked if they received a \$1 billion grant last year.

Staff Tam responded that the WIFIA grant, and SRI Loan have been very successful in offsetting costs on the biosolids and headwork projects. She said that we need to be adaptive as extreme precision, climate change and sea level all impact us as a coastal city.

 Member Perszyk asked about mutual reduction projects and if the project addresses the daily discharges to the bay and if it addresses sewer discharges ton the bay.

Staff Tam responded that this is about nitrogen removal and one of the goals is to not have algae blooms in the future. She said the focus is on dry weather flow and the facility continues to operate during both wet and dry weather however, the focus is on reducing nitrogen during the dry weather. She further commented It's still early and the project hasn't even begun yet but said the focus is not on overflow reduction.

• **Member Baker** asked if staff could explain the difference between the budget in the 10-year plan being \$80 million and then becoming \$2.9 billion.

Staff Tam explained that conduction is off the 10-year plan and the budget is \$80 million in the 10-year plan but there is a big investment that they assume is on its way. She further commented they are also talking to the project manager to try and reduce cost because a lot of the money is in escalation cost..

• Member Baker asked if the \$80 million is signed yet.

Staff Tam responded that they plan on being in planning for another 3-5 years and then being in design stage after.

• **Member Clary** commented that she is trying to understand the revised schedule and what it's based off, and asked if that what's still being worked on?

Staff Tam responded that they are doing a rolling 10-year CIP and in 20210 2010there wasn't a live rate model but this past cycle, they ran the numbers through finance who looked at the numbers to see if we plug in these numbers, what would be the impact on the rate payers be. Staff Tam commented for example, we could we start construction earlier and reduce cost for Southeast Outfall project but they couldn't because it would have violated the rate payer policy, and with the current systems, they can do things in real time and not need a rate model.

• Member Clary asked where stormwater projects are in this model.

Staff Tam responded that stormwater projects are in both SSIP Phase 1 and other SSIP.

 Member Clary asked about green infrastructure and if that's more under repair and replacement.

Staff Tam responded it is not under repair and replacement but rather distribution.

• **Member Soboll** asked if the old model broke the cost down by phase, design, and construction or if the old model projected the entire project cost all together.

Staff Tam responded that she'd have to check in with finance, but she believes it's done year by year and would let the members know when the project is starting.

• **Member Soboll** asked if both the old and new model stretched it out by phase or if the old model refer more to the \$1 billion up front.

Staff Tam responded that she can't speak to the old model, but the new model breaks down and space out the money spent on construction.

• **Member Soboli** commented that when she worked at UCSF, they had to have the money allocated before they could start a new project, for example, if they had a \$200 million project planned over ten years, they had to had to have the \$200 ready. Member Soboli further commented she was wondered if any of the old models had that kind of requirement.

Staff Tam responded they typically do two plans, the spending plan and the encumbrance plan. She said that finance works their magic and figures out how they get the money, and She said there is timing that helps reduce the rate impacts and reduce interest. However, for more specifics, they would need to get finance in for a separate presentation.

• **Member Jacuzzi** asked if the revenue is primarily through rate payers or if there's borrowing as well and if there's borrowing, how is the debt paid off.

Staff Tam said she does not know the answer, but she knows it's a combination of both revenue and debt.

Member Algire asked if Staff Tam can speak to the details of the coverage of the filtration system and where San Francisco will be in relation to other cities and said that she saw on the news that San Francisco has one of the worst filtration systems for large cities. Member Algire asked how does this hold up to water treatment in other cities.

Staff Tam said she doesn't know the answer to this but her limited understanding, this would bring down the concentration a low level that other cities have not committed to yet

 Member Clary asked how denitrification is going to impact the cost of our alternative water supply plan.

Staff Tam responded that there's similar thinking on if there's collaboration opportunities. They need to start the project first and then they can brainstorm on the opportunities out there.

• **Member Algire** asked if the \$1.2 billion is budgeted for achieving the lowest concentration in the bay.

Staff Tam responded yes.

Member Pinkston asked who BAWSCA.

Staff Tam responded that it's Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency.

Public Comment:

- Gloria Berry: Over the decades she has seen so many projects with community benefits, and she has seen nothing but failure in terms of community benefits. She is concerned that the general manager of the SFPUC was just sentenced to prison for corruption. She wants to know how this body will push for community benefits even in the form of reparations which were already voted on by the Board of Supervisors, the San Francisco Democratic Party, Congressmen Pelosi and Senator Feinstein before she passed away. She also wants to know if the contractor's office at the executive port location of the SFPUC can stay open 5 days a week for community members to use it got training.
- Gary (WLW Consultants): When it comes to community benefits, the community sees very little benefit. Why did MHW receive another \$400 million, \$407 at Biosolids. Where is the oversite on this project and the community benefits? We need more local contractors and not huge

companies. We need to give local LBEs and MBEs a better opportunity to work on these projects.

6. Staff Report

No staff report.

Public Comment: None

7. SFPUC Communications

- California Extended Arrearage Payment Program
- Quarterly Audit and Performance Review Report, FY 2023-24 Q2
- Popular Financial Report, FY 2022-23
 - Comprehensive Financial Report, FY 2022-23
- Audited Financial Statements, FY 2022-23
- Waterfront Flood Study Draft Report
- Water Enterprise
 - o Water Supply Conditions Update (March 4, 2024)
 - Water System Improvement Program Quarterly Report, FY 2023-24 Q2
 - Water Enterprise Capital Improvement Program Quarterly Report, FY 2023-24 Q2
 - o Pacific Institute Evaluation of Water Efficiency Programs
 - o Alternative Water Supply Plan
- Wastewater Enterprise
 - o Rec & Park Department SF Zoo Recycled Water Project MOU
- Power Enterprise
 - o CleanPowerSF Annual Report FY 2022-23
 - o Treasure Island Development Authority MOU
 - o PG&E Interconnection Quarterly Report, FY 2023-24 Q2
 - o CleanPowerSF Quarterly Update, FY 2023-24 Q2
 - o Power Enterprise Customer Programs Update

Public Comment: None

8. Future Agenda Items and Resolutions

• CAC Advance Calendar

Public Comment: None

9. Announcements/Comments Please visit <u>www.sfpuc.org/cac</u> for confirmation of the next scheduled meeting, agenda, and materials.

Public Comment: None

10. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 6:56pm.

For more information concerning the agendas, minutes, and meeting information, please visit <u>www.sfwater.org/cac</u>. For more information concerning the CAC, please contact via email at <u>cac@sfwater.org</u> or by calling (415) 517-8465.

Disability Access

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 Lexus Moncrease at (415) 517-8465 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) 554-6789.

LANGUAGE ACCESS

Per the Language Access Ordinance (Chapter 91 of the San Francisco Administrative Code), Chinese, Spanish and or Filipino (Tagalog) interpreters will be available upon requests. Meeting Minutes may be translated, if requested, after they have been adopted by the Committee. Assistance in additional languages may be honored whenever possible. To request assistance with these services please contact Lexus Moncrease at (415) 517-8465, or <u>cac@sfwater.org</u> at least 48 hours in advance of the hearing. Late requests will be honored if possible.

語言服務

根據三藩市行政法第91章"語言服務條例",中文、西班牙語和/或菲律賓語口譯服務在有 人提出要求後會提供。翻譯版本的會議記錄可在委員會後要求提供。其他語言協助在可 能的情況下也可提供。請於會議前至少48小時致電 (415) 517-8465 或電郵至 [cac@sfwater.org] Lexus Moncrease 提出口譯要求。逾期要求,在可能狀況下會被考 慮。

ACCESO A IDIOMAS

De acuerdo con la Ordenanza de Acceso a Idiomas *"Language Access Ordinance"* (Capítulo 91 del Código Administrativo de San Francisco *"Chapter 91 of the San Francisco Administrative Code"*) intérpretes de chino, español y/o filipino (tagalo) estarán disponibles de ser requeridos. Los minutos podrán ser traducidos, de ser requeridos, luego de ser aprobados por la comité. La asistencia en idiomas adicionales se tomará en cuenta siempre que sea posible. Para solicitar asistencia con estos servicios favor comunicarse con Lexus Moncrease al (415) 517-8465, o cac@sfwater.org por lo menos 48 horas antes de la reunión. Las solicitudes tardías serán consideradas de ser posible.

PAG-ACCESS SA WIKA

Ayon sa Language Access Ordinance (Chapter 91 ng San Francisco Administrative Code), maaaring mag-request ng mga tagapagsalin sa wikang Tsino, Espanyol, at/o Filipino (Tagalog). Kapag hiniling, ang mga kaganapan ng miting ay maaring isalin sa ibang wika matapos ito ay aprobahan ng komite. Maari din magkaroon ng tulong sa ibang wika. Sa mga ganitong uri ng kahilingan, mangyaring tumawag sa Lexus Moncrease at (415) 517-8465, o <u>cac@sfwater.org</u> sa hindi bababa sa 48 oras bago mag miting. Kung maari, ang mga late na hiling ay posibleng pagbibigyan.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code §2.100] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220 San Francisco, CA 94102, Phone: (415) 252-3100/Fax: (415) 252-3112, Email: ethics.commission@sfgov.org.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, by mail to Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244 San Francisco, CA 94102-4683; by telephone 415-554-7724, by Fax 415-554-7854, or by email: sotf@sfgov.org

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.