



San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Citizens' Advisory Committee

MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, May 21, 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/89322442848?pwd=UGdOS1JFOFRjbJyVjJJSWITL3NHZz09>

Phone Dial-in

669.219.2599

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

Meeting ID/Passcode

893 2244 2848 / 344464

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: cac@sfwater.org

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Members present at roll call: García, Law, Chen, Jacuzzi, Algire, Sanders, Steele Teshara, Clary, Sandkulla, Perszyk and Pierce

Members absent: Kott, Nagengast, Lee, Pinkston*, Soboll and Baker

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.

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



*Member Pinkston joined the meeting at 5:42pm.

2. Approve [April 16, 2024, Minutes](#)

Motion was made (Clary) and seconded (Perszyk) to approve the April 16, 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.

Public Comment: None

5. Presentation and Discussion: [Stormwater Project Management & Flood Resilience in the Folsom Area](#), Adam S. Derek, SFPUC PMB Project Manager & Sarah Minick, SFPUC PMB Project Manager

Presentation:

Stormwater Management & Flood Resilience in the Folsom Area

Agenda

Folsom Area Stormwater | Improvement Project

Project Background

Project Purpose

Channel Watershed

Folsom Project Study Area

Folsom Project Scope

Tunnel Launch Shaft (Example)

Sewer Box Cross-Section (Preliminary)

Channel Watershed Parcel GI Opportunities

Constrained Watershed for Green Infrastructure

Green Infrastructure City-wide Strategy

San Francisco Stormwater Management Ordinance

Green Infrastructure Grant Program

\$100M for green infrastructure in the 10-year Capital Plan

SFUSD Properties

City-Wide Green Infrastructure Strategy

Outreach | And Next Steps

Program Outreach

Community Outreach - Folsom

Discussion:

- **Staff Derek** showed the members a map of the Channel Watershed. He explained that the Channel Watershed is one of the largest and densest watersheds in the city and that there is very little permeable surface in that watershed to slow the water. He continued that as a result of this, a large amount of surface flows that go onto the streets and into the sewer system

all come down to the area around 17th and Folsom Streets in the Mission District.

Member Perszyk asked if the entire Channel Watershed drains into that one project area.

Staff Derek responded that the whole Channel Watershed does not drain exactly into that one project area but rather into the system, but that the system is downstream of the channel area so any backup in the system is built up and causes flooding at the 17th and Folsom Streets area.

- **Member Chen** commented that she was at Treat Plaza the past weekend and that they were having presentations on their project and getting input from the neighborhood on how the sidewalks should be put back after the project. She asked how the work at Treat Plaza intersects with the stormwater project management department at the SFPUC as well as how the good input they are getting will get to the SFPUC.

Staff Minick responded that their department looked at Treat Plaza as a potential space for green infrastructure projects and found that the space is not good for green infrastructure projects as it is at the bottom of the watershed with very bad soil. She commented that their office met with the point of contacts for the project at Treat Plaza to see if there is room for future collaboration.

Member Clary asked if someone could explain what the project is.

Staff Derek responded that the main scope of the project is a new park plaza on Treat Street between 16th and 15th Streets, and that the area is currently only parking and has no frontages.

Staff Minick noted that the people working on the Treat Street project are still looking for community feedback.

Staff Derek further explained that the Treat Plaza project is directly above a SFPUC project. He clarified that the SFPUC project involves excavating the entire street and is designed to then put the street back as is. He commented that the public works paving code requires this. He also noted that the SFPUC would be supportive of putting in a park there instead, however the project does not have the funds to do so and would not want to use rate payer funds. He commented that SFPUC could work with any funding sources the Treat Plaza project could get. He explained that they are working closely with those working on the project and that his department in the SFPUC is planning on staffing future Treat Plaza project events so there will be SFPUC representation there.

Member Chen commented that the people who are running the Treat Plaza project just had a kickoff block party and plan on having block parties every weekend where they feature the past, present, and future and they have a public historian.

Member Clary asked when these block parties occur.

Member Chen responded the first one was on May 18th 10am-2pm and there will be follow up ones. She commented that she does not know when the next one is but that it should be easy to find on their website.

- **Member Perszyk** complimented the presentation and the work the team is doing with green infrastructure. He then discussed the green infrastructure grant program for large properties and its 20-year deed restriction. He commented that it was restrictive and that only schools and churches have been able to use it. He suggested that if there was a different mechanism, such as pro-rata, and not a 20-year deed restriction it would be available for more property owners and business owners. He explained that UCSF tried to use the grant program and was unable to due to the 20-year deed restriction.

Staff Minick responded that in order to use rate payer funds, the grant program has to run in accordance with the requirements provided by the city attorney and the deed restriction was one of them. She conceded, that it is important to get feedback such as Member Perszyk's, and if her department receives enough of the same feedback and they see that the deed restriction is a barrier, her team can ask if a program amendment is possible.

Member Perszyk commented that it would be good to have a legal mechanism that would guarantee a return on investments.

- **Member Perszyk** asked Staff Minick if the team has it modeled where they could look at a parcel and understand that if green infrastructure was done in that area, how much storm water could be managed.

Staff Minick responded that they have a very high level of modeling. She explained that while the team could technically do as Member Perszyk suggests, from a staff time perspective, the team is unable to model every parcel, instead they would have to do so in chunks. She further explained that the team does full opportunity analyses, doing all they can before modelling to avoid modeling too much, and then they only model specific opportunities to manage the workflow.

- **Member Jacuzzi** commented that in his experience as a property owner and with large property owners, commercial properties need to refinance every 5 to 10 years and banks do not like deed restrictions. He explained that the more deed restrictions a property has, the banks will impede refinancing raising the risk for commercial property owners causing higher rates or loans getting turned down. He commented that his organization, West Side Water Resources had many commercial properties signed up for the green infrastructure grants and that the deed restriction prohibited any of them from happening. He commented that his organization also has between 50-60 residential households signed up for the aggregated grant group despite doing zero outreach, every sign-up was from a property owner who contacted their organization wanting to put part of an aggregated grant group. He commented that with outreach, they could probably bring in hundreds of properties.

Staff Minick commented that they now have a residential grant program.

Member Jacuzzi responded that there are still some issues and that the deed restriction is redundant. He commented that in reference to the storm water management ordinance, it is not possible to reconnect after disconnecting.

Staff Minick asked for clarification on what reconnection meant.

Member Jacuzzi explained that reconnection is in reference to the combined systems. He commented that if someone disconnects or redirects from the combined system, it is extremely difficult to become reconnected back to the combined system. This makes the deed restriction a redundant impediment, a hurdle that does not mean or do anything.

Staff Minick commented she is not sure if that is a convincing legal argument.

Member Jacuzzi responded that his organization has attorneys working on it.

Staff Minick responded that the team wants to make their green infrastructure grants more accessible. She explained that for the residential grant program, they currently have 300 unfunded properties in their queue. She further explained that their pilot program for residential grants was to see if there is demand and if so, how much demand. She commented that she would like to connect with Member Jacuzzi to see if the 60 residential properties Member Jacuzzi talked about are within the 300 residential properties their program accounted for or if they are an additional 60 residential properties.

- **Member Law** asked if all the projects in the presentation are green infrastructure projects.

Staff Minick responded that they are all green infrastructure projects, but they are not capital projects and are the result of the regulatory arm of the stormwater management ordinance. She further commented that not all the projects have been built yet.

- **Member Perszyk** asked if staff could explain the stormwater management ordinance.

Staff Minick explained that the stormwater management ordinance was passed in 2010 and is a requirement through the Clean Water Act that imposes a regulatory mechanism and gives authority to enforce storm water regulations in specific separate sewer areas. She continued that because San Francisco is only 10% municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) and at the time the ordinance was proposed, the city was also in the middle of implementing the green building ordinance, the city decided that having stormwater used in the green building ordinance should be a citywide policy. She continued that the SFPUC was successful in this proposal and as a result, the city came out of the recession with the stormwater ordinance in place. She explained that this requires that any new project or redevelopment that is disturbing 5,000 square feet or more in combined sewer area, or 2,500 square feet or more in separate sewer area managed in the combined flow and volume in the separate focuses

on treatment for its parcel. She further explained that her team then reviews to ensure the green infrastructure is designed to meet regulations.

- **Member García** remarked that he was curious about the study Member Perszyk mentioned earlier regarding 15 minutes of rain.

Member Perszyk explained that the study was an early analysis of the Folsom project area and how long does it take the water flow to get from the top of the watershed down to the project area. He commented that the analysis stated it took only 15 minutes for water to get from the top of the hill to the area where the flooding is taking place.

Member García remarked that that area of the city is densely populated and there is not much land available. He commented that would be useful to know how difficult it would be to solve the problem, that it seems an entirely green infrastructure project is not feasible and that is why a gray water project is also necessary there. He explained that he lives in the Mission, and he often sees the sandbags there. He further explained that he feels the department should be helping the residents better understand why the area needs both projects in order to prevent further flooding and that even light to moderate rain can cause flooding in the area. He commented that until he saw the photos from Harrison and Division Streets from two years ago, he forgot how bad the flooding was in that area.

Staff Minick agreed that the department needs to find more relatable ways to explain how much water is causing the flooding and how much water can accumulate in a short amount of time. She commented that they tried to use various metrics such as using Olympic pools as a metric.

Member García remarked that Olympic pools might not be the most helpful metric.

Member Clary suggested a local pool as a measurement.

Member García suggested a local park as a measurement.

- **Member Clary** confirmed that this infrastructure project is to address a 5-year storm event. She asked if this is the level of service used everywhere in the city as it seemed low to her.

Staff Derek responded that is the level of service they use everywhere as it balances the cost spent here versus on other services in the city. He commented that this level of service addresses the bulk of the storms that hit the city.

Member Clary responded that this level of service does not address storms overtime as they become more intense. She asked if they had metrics on last year's monster winter storms and what impact that had on local flooding.

Staff Derek responded that in terms of storm events last year's storms were much higher than their anticipation for a 5-year storm event. He commented that they have had storms that are more intense than the theoretical storm event but for less time. He explained that a lot goes into sizing the storms and that most areas of the city can handle the theoretical

storm event but that there are pockets that cannot. He commented that to meet a larger storm event, the city would have to upsize the entire system.

- **Member Clary** responded that her issue here is that the theoretical storm the city can handle seems like a relatively small storm event, especially if we factor in climate change and more intense storms. She commented that she feels the city will end up spending a lot of money to maintain the status quo and she feels that the city is designing green infrastructure as a beauty contest rather than for the sake of designing the most viable green infrastructure projects. She commented that the city is not focused on areas that need green infrastructure the most.

Member García asked if \$100 million in capital projects would help address the issue.

Member Clary responded that it is the plan for green infrastructure that is failing, not the funding. She commented that \$57 million has already been spent on green infrastructure. She asked if there is information on the performance of current green infrastructure sites.

Staff Minick responded that they have full monitoring reports online and that her department is happy to come to the CAC and present on the performance of current green infrastructure sites as well.

Member Clary responded that she wants to identify what the tough spots in the city are for watershed and how the green infrastructure program can help mitigate those issues.

Staff Minick responded that as someone who is very data driven, she does not want her the projects she works on to be called a beauty contest. She commented that she would like to push back on Member Clary's categorization as it is not a critique she has previously heard. She conceded that Member Clary is correct that in the beginning EIPS were only one per watershed, but that part of the reason for this was to educate each city neighborhood on what green infrastructure projects are. She explained that EIPs were placed where they saw drainage problems and opportunities to collaborate with other agencies, to save money. She further explained that the plan is to continue doing more of this in the 10-year capital plan, and that there is opportunity for their projects to intersect with flood resilience.

Member Clary asked if there is a streetscape policy with DPW for green infrastructure.

Staff Minick commented that they finished the citywide public infrastructure plan and specs with Public Works (DPW) in 2016 and that they use the plan and specs for most of their projects with no pushback.

Member Clary asked if there are any sort of research plan regarding green infrastructure on steep slopes.

Staff Minick responded that the research was done in anticipation of their plan and specs. She explained that for permeable pavement and for some other facilities, they have a 5% slope limit and above that, the implementation would need to use underground check dams. She noted

that there is a difference between where green infrastructure can be implemented and where it should be implemented. She explained that green infrastructure can now be implemented on steeper slopes, but it is often not the best use of rate payer money. She commented that the city did a lot of research into other cities that are further along in their green infrastructure plan.

Member Clary asked what the impact is on combined sewage overflows into Mission Creek with this project.

Staff Derek responded there is no impact, it is the same amount of water, it just gets there faster. He commented that the CSO is also a different event from the 5-year storm.

Member Clary commented that she feels the freeway in that neighborhood has a big impact on CSO.

Staff Derek responded that freeways are not as big a problem for the Folsom neighborhood.

Member Clary stated that she would like to see what metrics are being used for the value of outreach efforts.

- **Member Sanders** asked what watershed Treasure Island is a part of and what the timeline looks like for Treasure Island to get its upgrades in flooding improvements.

Staff Minick asked if this question is about green infrastructure.

Member Sanders responded it is and that he reached out three years ago regarding flooding on Treasure Island and was told a lot of these flooding improvement projects do not include Treasure Island because Treasure Island is run by TIDA (Treasure Island Development Authority).

Member García commented that this might be a question for the presenter of the next presentation which is focused on Treasure Island.

Staff Minick responded that for green infrastructure Treasure Island is subject to stormwater management ordinances and has an approved stormwater control plan.

Public Comment: None

6. **Presentation, Discussion, and Possible Action:** [DB-132 Treasure Island Water Resource Facility Project Status Update](#), Jignesh Desai, P.E., BCEE, DBIA, SFPUC PMB Senior Project Manager

Presentation:

DB-132 Treasure Island Water Resource Recovery Facility (TIWRRF)

Agenda

Project Objective

Site Map

Site Layout

DB-132 Sustainability Approach - Envision Certification

The Envision rating system is...

Similar to LEED, the Envision rating system has four award levels
DB-132 TIWRRF Sustainability Analysis
Assessments shows TIWRRF Project qualifies for GOLD award!
DB-132 Construction ~33% complete
Project Schedule and Budget

Discussion:

- **Member Sanders** asked if the dollar amount that Staff Desai said was awarded came from TIDA's budget or SFPUC's budget.

Staff Desai responded it came from the SFPUC's.

- **Member Sanders** asked if they needed approval from TIDA for the project.

Staff Desai responded that they needed approval from the Board of Supervisors to build the wastewater treatment plan, which they received 5 years ago.

- **Member Sanders** asked if 2 million gallons of water was treated by the navy.

Staff Desai responded that the navy treated 200,000 to 250,000 gallons of water. He responded that they anticipate when they start the treatment plant in 2025, they will treat around 300,000 gallons of water.

- **Member Sanders** asked if once the treatment plant is operating, is it the SFPUC or TIDA's responsibility to keep the plant running and funded.

Staff Desai responded SFPUC will operate and maintain the treatment plant once it is completed.

- **Member Sanders** asked if infrastructure problems would come out of SFPUC's budget.

Staff Desai responded that once the new treatment plant is up and running, TIDA will decommission the old plant. He explained that in the existing arrangement TIDA uses SFPUC as a contractor to maintain and operate the navy treatment plant, but that the new plant will be entirely SFPUC maintained and operated.

- **Member Sanders** asked if this new plant will be first connected to the new community or the older community.

Staff Desai responded that the new treatment plant will be taking on the entire island's flow, whatever is connected to the current navy treatment plant.

- **Member Perszyk** asked how the recycled water will be used on Treasure Island. He also asked what it would take to make the new treatment plant into a facility that produces potable water.

Staff Desai responded that TIDA has a recycling water masterplan that includes parks, plumbing for new construction, and hotels. He further responded that this includes using recycled water for dust control, flushing

and sewers. He offered to provide the entire table of recycled water usage. In response to the second question, he explained that the SFPUC would eventually like to go the route of potable water but that there are currently few facilities that have potable water. He commented that to turn tertiary water into potable water will require additional process units such as fine filtration and other disinfection processes.

Member Perszyk asked if there is space for a facility to convert to potable water.

Staff Desai responded that they shrunk the footprint to leave the space for future requirements.

- **Member Clary** asked if recycled water usage includes wetlands and open space demands.

Staff Desai responded that the wetlands receive treated water before it is discharged into the outfall.

- **Member Clary** asked if TIDA is still responsible for the collection system.

Staff Desai responded the collection system is a TIDA and developer responsibility to build. He explained that once it is constructed, TIDA will likely turn it over to the SFPUC to maintain and operate.

- **Member Sanders** asked if power in the new treatment plant is backed up by generators or battery storage. He commented that the old treatment plant did not have good backup power and when power went out, sewage backed up as well.

Staff Desai responded that the existing navy plant has a backup diesel generator. He explained that the new treatment plant will have 2 generators, 1 duty and 1 standby. He further commented that the new treatment plant can be run for 8 hours on 1 fuel tank of 1 generator and power will be automatically transferred to the emergency backup generator in case of a power outage.

Member Sanders asked why the new treatment plants uses generators over batteries since batteries are coming down in price. He commented that they had a difficult time getting fuel trucks out to Treasure Island during outages.

Staff Desai responded that with 2 generators, they can run the treatment plant for 16 hours before needing more fuel. He commented that in terms of battery, it is still too early to run this large of a treatment plant on battery power and it would cost more.

Member Sanders asked how much power is in the backup generators.

Staff Desai responded 750 KW or .75 MW generator.

Member Sanders asked how many gallons the storage in the fuel tank is.

Staff Desai responded the tank is integrated with the generator and there is no separate fuel tank, so they do not know the volume.

Member Sanders responded that he might follow-up on that question.

Staff Desai responded that he could send the volume of the diesel tank to the committee liaison.

- **Member García** asked if the new treatment plant will be connected to the new power source on the island.

Staff Desai responded that the power enterprises switch yard is right next to the new treatment plant. He commented that they believe they can get the treatment plant power by March of 2025.

- **Member García** asked if the upgraded Southeast treatment plant is also eligible for LEED or Envision certifications.

Staff Desai responded that he is also the project manager for the Southeast treatment plan. He commented that the Southeast treatment plant went through the Envision framework and received a gold level award for their headworks project. He further commented that the biosolids project at the Southeast treatment plant received a platinum award through the Envision framework.

- **Member Clary** commented that the Southeast treatment plant is 25 years older than the navy treatment plant at Treasure Island that will be decommissioned in 2025.

Motion was made (Clary) and seconded (García) to approve empowering leadership to write a letter of support for the envision gold award. Approved without objection.

7. Staff Report

Public Comment: None

8. SFPUC Communications

- [Water and Wastewater Customer Assistance Program Commission Update](#)
- Water Enterprise
 - [Water Supply Conditions Update \(May 6, 2024\)](#)
- Wastewater Enterprise
 - [Green Infrastructure Grant Program Update, FY 2023-24 Q3](#)
- Power Enterprise
 - [CleanPowerSF Rates for FY 2024-25](#)
 - [Hetch Hetchy Power Rates for FY 2024-25](#)
 - [Annual Power Risk Management Update, 2023](#)
 - [Annual Electric Reliability Compliance Program Report, 2023](#)

Public Comment: None

9. Future Agenda Items and Resolutions

- [CAC Advance Calendar](#)

Public Comment: None

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

Public Comment: None

11. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 7:15pm.

For more information concerning the agendas, minutes, and meeting information, please visit www.sfwater.org/cac. For more information concerning the CAC, please contact via email at cac@sfwater.org 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 cac@sfwater.org 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 [\[cac@sfwater.org\]](mailto: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@sfgov.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 cac@sfgov.org 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: soft@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.