



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

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Tuesday, July 19, 2022  
 5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.**

**PARTICIPATE VIA ZOOM VIRTUAL CONFERENCE SOFTWARE**

**Meeting URL**

<https://sfwater.zoom.us/j/82084780464?pwd=cDFkYkVIRTdtVHIBRThoYk1WVGZ2dz09>

**Phone Dial-in**

669.219.2599

Find your local number: <https://sfwater.zoom.us/j/keHz3hLoQk>

**Meeting ID/Passcode**

820 8478 0464 / 596860

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 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)**

- VACANT (D1)
- Suki Kott (D2)
- Steven Kight (D3)
- Douglas Jacuzzi (D4)
- Emily Algire (D5)
- Barklee Sanders (D6)
- Joshua Ochoa (D7)
- Amy Nagengast (D8)

- VACANT (D10)
- Jennifer Clary (D11)
- Maika Pinkston (M-Environmental Org.)
- Nicole Sandkulla (M-Regional Water Customers)
- Marisa Williams (M-Engineering/Financial)
- Eliahu Perszyk (M-Large Water User)
- VACANT (B-Small Business)
- Michelle Pierce (B-Environ. Justice)

**London N. Breed**  
 Mayor

**Anson Moran**  
 President

**Newsha Ajami**  
 Vice President

**Sophie Maxwell**  
 Commissioner

**Tim Paulson**  
 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.



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

Staff Liaisons: Mayara Ruski Augusto Sa, Lexus Moncrease and Jotti Aulakh  
Staff Email for Public Comment: [cac@sfgwater.org](mailto:cac@sfgwater.org)

## **ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **1. Call to order and roll call at 5:41 pm**

Members present at roll call: (9) García, Kott, Jacuzzi, Algire, Sanders, Ochoa, Clary, Pinkston\*\*, and Perszyk

Members Absent: (5) Kight, Nagengast\*, Sandkulla, Williams, and Pierce

Staff presenters: Bessie Tam, Chris Colwick, Mike Perlstein, and Kayla Rau

Members of the Public: Alex Lantsberg, Leslie Austin, Melissa Yu, Batoul Al-Sadi, Tracey Brieger, and Sam Appel

\*Member Nagengast joined at 5:54 pm. Quorum maintained.

\*\*Member Pinkston left at 5:50 pm. Quorum maintained.

### **2. Approve [May 17, 2022](#) Minutes**

Motion was made (Kott) and seconded (Clary) to approve the May 17, 2022 Minutes.

AYES: (9) García, Kott, Jacuzzi, Algire, Sanders, Ochoa, Clary, Pinkston, and Perszyk

NOES: (0)

ABSENT: (5) Kight, Nagengast, Sandkulla, Williams, and Pierce

Public Comment: None

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

- Welcome members, staff, and the public
- Ohlone Tribal Land Acknowledgement
- Appreciation for Member Marisa Williams
- SFPUC Communications
  - [Drought Condition Report – July 5, 2022](#)
  - [CPUC Ruling on PG&E Electric Grid Valuation](#)
  - [OneWaterSF 2022 Brochure](#)
  - [Recycled Water and Purified Water Opportunities](#)
  - [Wildfire Mitigation Plan](#)
  - [Water Enterprise Physical Security Plan](#)
  - [Public Health Goal and Contaminants of Emerging Concern](#)
  - Quarterly Reports
    - [Budget Status](#)
    - [PG&E Interconnections](#)
    - [CleanPowerSF](#)
    - [Hetch Hetchy Capital Improvement Program](#)
    - [Wastewater Capital Improvement Program](#)

- [Water Capital Improvement Program](#)
- [Water System Improvement Program](#)
- [Alternative Water Supply Program](#)

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. **Discussion and Possible Action:** [Resolution Making Findings to Allow Teleconferenced Meetings Under California Government Code Section 54953\(e\)](#)

Motion was made (Clary) and seconded (Perszyk) to adopt the resolution.

The motion PASSED with the following votes:

AYES: (9) García, Kott, Jacuzzi, Algire, Sanders, Ochoa, Nagengast, Clary, and Perszyk

NOES: (0)

ABSENT: (5) Kight, Pinkston, Sandkulla, Williams, and Pierce

Public Comment: None

6. **Presentation, Discussion and Possible Action:** [Resolution in Support of Electric Grid Reliability on Treasure Island](#), Barklee Sanders, Power CAC Member

*Introduction*

**Member Sanders** commented that civilians were moved to Treasure Island in 1997 as part of a rehousing program for people who were based out of the Tenderloin and other underserved areas. Since 1997, there have been no investments to update the infrastructure. There have been 455 power outages in the last 25 years, which averages to a power outage every other week. Sanders commented that he wants Treasure Island to receive the same treatment as other parts of San Francisco served by PG&E. The granular data they have since 2016 shows that there had been about 128 unplanned outages.

Treasure Island is serviced by an interconnection agreement with the Port of Oakland, for which they pay a direct flat annual fee. The residences and business are built by TIDA (Treasure Island Development Authority), so TIDA act as PG&E on the billing part. PG&E does not own any of the infrastructure on the island, and they are not responsible for it in any way. The power is supplied through the Hetch Hetchy Power Program, and the SFPUC sets the electricity rates for the island. For the residents, the cost of power is billed directly into their rent, and businesses are billed directly by TIDA.

For approvals and recommendations for upgrades, the SFPUC can only recommend upgrades to TIDA. They cannot direct TIDA to do any upgrades. The City's approach to upgrading infrastructure on Treasure Island is to fix it once it breaks. Upgrades such as a new power station or new power

lines are approved by TIDA and paid for by the developer. There have been 8 power outages in 2022, 19 power outages in 2021, 14 power outages in 2020, 18 power outages in 2019, and 26 power outages in 2018. Reliability standards are not met without the upgrades that the community needs.

Sanders commented that he is hoping the SFPUC could support their recommendations to TIDA to improve the reliability of the electrical grid in the next five years. He also would like the CAC to support the study in advance of the redevelopment project to determine the necessary upgrades and replacement of power infrastructure on Treasure Island to improve the reliability of the service to all customers. There are also equity issues. Sanders hopes the recommendations of this resolution will bring Treasure Island to current state standards of reliability and infrastructure that are applied to new projects (CPUC GO 165). Sanders expressed his hope that the CAC supports upgraded infrastructure overall on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena to achieve a reasonable level of safety and reliability.

#### *Discussion*

- **Member Nagengast** asked what the origin of TIDA's funding for electrical infrastructure is.

**Chair García** responded that to his knowledge they use special bonds.

**Member Sanders** responded that there does not seem to be political will to initiate special bonds on the island. Sanders noted that Treasure Island was its own city at one point, and it was structured in a way where there was no federal oversight and no oversight from the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). Sanders commented that the redevelopment does not allow federal oversight, nor State oversight and makes Treasure Island ineligible for funding. Sanders continued that a special bond would be the SGIP (Self-Generation Incentive Program), which could provide \$300 million of state funding that would provide access to back up batteries and solar funding for every other community except Treasure Island. Sanders expressed that Treasure Island should be treated like the rest of San Francisco and have similar oversight and access to funding.

- **Chair García** commented that there was some work being done by the City Attorney's Office to respond to emergencies more quickly. He noted that the SFPUC was limited to how they could upgrade the infrastructure and that the SFPUC has shown a great deal of care and attention towards this issue and are trying to do the best they can within all the constraints.
- **Member Clary** asked whether the last Resolved clause was not already the current contract which discusses how the CAC supports upgrading the distribution system alongside completion of redevelopment projects.

**Member Sanders** responded that it was not. Sanders commented that there was a new substation on the island that was not built for the current residents and was built and paid by the developers. Sanders explained that the SFPUC needs approval from TIDA to replace failing equipment. Sanders commented that infrastructure updates were being done because of the redevelopment and not the outages.

- **Member Clary** asked if Sanders was asking the CAC to recommend a different process. Clary noted that maybe they needed some more aggressive than what is already in the agreement to update the infrastructure as redevelopment occurs.

**Member Sanders** commented that it might sound better to state that updates should occur before the completion of the redevelopment.

**Member Clary** suggested reframing it as for current residents.

**Member Sanders** commented that it would probably have to say post DDA (Disposition and Development Agreement) and pre DDA, which is a term used to determine the legacy residents. Sanders noted that the term “current residents” could include residents on Yerba Buena in the new condos.

**Member Clary** suggested changing the last phrase starting with the next to last line “and Yerba Buena Island to achieve a reasonable level of safety and reliability for pre DDA residents alongside completion of the redevelopment projects.” In the last Resolved after the word reliability the phrase “for pre and post DDA residents” was added.

- **Member Nagengast** suggested removing the phrase “alongside completion of redevelopment projects” from the last Resolved clause. The sentence “alongside completion of redevelopment projects” was removed from the last Resolved.
- **Member Jacuzzi** asked what the unbundled energy credits were and why they should be avoided.

**Member Sanders** responded that it is not that they should be avoided, but that Treasure Island is not eligible. Sanders explained that Treasure Island is not eligible for the self-generation grants and the SOMAH (Solar On Multifamily Affordable Housing) grants.

- **Member Jacuzzi** asked for clarification on the phrase “shall avoid unbundled versus bundled.”

**Member Sanders** responded that they are just not eligible for those things, and there is no political will to make Treasure Island eligible. Sanders commented that they want the developers to pay for the infrastructure upgrades and if Treasure Island were to become eligible for the grants, the developer would no longer have to pay for them.

- **Member Kott** commented that the CAC makes recommendations to the SFPUC and no other bodies. Kott continued that in the second Further Resolved clause, it says “that TIDA performs or causes to be performed.” Kott commented that it seemed off to her to make a recommendation to another agency.

**Chair García** commented that the SFPUC makes recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, the General Manager, and the Commission.

- **Member Kott** asked whether this resolution was a policy statement in support of some actions and not a resolution.

**Chair García** responded that they were limited.

**Member Sanders** responded that these were only recommendations.

**Chair García** responded that the CAC can ask the SFPUC, the General Manager, and the Board of Supervisors to do certain things.

He noted that the issue is whether TIDA performs any of those actions, which is the larger issue on Treasure Island.

- **Member Sanders** asked if they would have to change “recommends TIDA” in the second to last Further Resolved clause to “recommends the SFPUC General Manager.”

**Member Clary** responded the best thing for the CAC to do is urge their appointing authority, which is the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor’s Office. Clary noted that in the second to last Further Resolved clause, they could replace “recommends that TIDA performs or causes to be performed” with “urges the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to ensure that.” Clary also recommended that in the second to last Further Resolved clause, the phrase “is conducted and” is added after Yerba Buena Island. In the same clause Clary then recommended that “establish” is removed before “a plan” and “is established” is added after “a plan.” The above changes were made.

- **Member Sanders** commented that he would worry if the CAC did not call out that TIDA should not have the ability to do the inspection themselves.

**Chair García** responded that the SFPUC is TIDA’s contractor on these issues.

- **Member Clary** asked if they should change the resolution to request for “a full independent inspection.”

**Member Sanders** responded that it would be more equitable if a third party conducted an inspection.

- **Member Clary** suggested adding “by the SFPUC or an independent third party” To the second to last Resolved.

**Member Sanders** responded that he would want it to be both an independent party outside of the SFPUC and the SFPUC. The second to last Further Resolved clause was changed to add “by the SFPUC and an independent third party; and” after “is conducted.”

- **Member Sanders** commented that a previous inspection was limited to above ground infrastructure.

Motion was made (Sanders) and seconded (Clary) to adopt the resolution.

The motion PASSED with the following votes:

AYES: (9) García, Kott, Jacuzzi, Algire, Sanders, Ochoa, Nagengast, Clary, and Perszyk

NOES: (0)

ABSENT: (5) Kight, Pinkston, Sandkulla, Williams, and Pierce

Public Comment: None

7. **Presentation and Discussion:** [Collection System Upgrades](#), Bessie Tam, Project Manager, Infrastructure; Chris Colwick, Wastewater Capital Communications Manager, Wastewater Enterprise

*Presentation*

- San Francisco Public Utilities Commission: Collection System Upgrades
- Purpose & Agenda
- Collection System Overview
- A Look Inside 100-yr-old Sewers
- Issues with 100-yr-old Sewers
- Collection System Capital Upgrades
- Construction Methods
- Sewer Upgrades – Open Cut
- Sewer Upgrades – CIPP (Cured-In-Place-Pipe)
- Benefits of CIPP
- Limitations of CIPP
- Other Trenchless Repair Methods
- Upcoming CIPP Work
- Current & Completed CIPP Projects
- Outreach Process

*Discussion*

- **Member Kott** commented that she did not understand if the pipes had to be replaced because they were old and crumbling. Kott then asked how putting a plastic sleeve inside of the pipes would remediate the situation and if the sleeve would support the crumbling existing pipe.

**Member Algire** responded that she believes it gets cured and hardens with the steam and that it would functionally replace the old pipe while being placed inside it.

**Staff Tam** responded that the plastic sleeve is embedded with a resin. Tam explained that the resin pipe serves as a replacement pipe that has as much strength as a new pipe in the ground. She noted that the sleeve is engineered to take on the forces from the ground and support itself to continue to provide flow. She also commented that it does not rely on the strength of the host pipe and that if they have a chance to slip it in and cure, it will function like a new pipe. Tam noted that it was good in terms of hydraulics because there is a smoother flow inside the pipe.

- **Member Sanders** asked why Treasure Island and other redevelopment areas were not included on the maps for the presentation.

**Staff Tam** responded that the collection system is not responsible for the sewer pipes because they are TIDA's responsibility.

- **Member Sanders** commented that he was on the TIDA Advisory Board and that the TIDA meetings had to be attended to receive updates on the utilities. Sanders then asked if the SFPUC would direct staff to go to TIDA meetings to receive updates on infrastructure.

**Staff Tam** responded that she would find out and get back to Sanders. She then clarified whether Sanders was inquiring about the status of wastewater infrastructure on Treasure Island, and how he can find out more information on that.

- **Member Jacuzzi** commented that in the preamble to the description of the piping was a description of the overview of the collection system. Jacuzzi noted the overflow of the system was released directly into the bay and into the ocean and that the water was extremely polluted.
- **Member Ochoa** expressed his support in including Treasure Island on maps used in presentations from the SFPUC even if the SFPUC does not have oversight.

**Member Clary** responded that she agreed with Sanders and Joshua, and that maybe staff could remind presenters of this concern when they are preparing for the meetings with the CAC.

**Member Algire** responded that this could be an interesting resolution to bring to the SFPUC and potentially the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.

**Member Sanders** agreed that Treasure Island should be included on maps even when TIDA has oversight and the SFPUC does not because it helps to show that the island is a part of San Francisco.

Public Comment: None

8. **Presentation and Discussion: [Affordability and Accessibility Overview](#)**, Mike Perlstein, Special Projects Manager, External Affairs

*Resources:*

- [Customer Assistance Program Flyer](#)
- [Bill Relief Webpage](#)
- LIHWAP: one-time bill assistance for past-due water/wastewater bills:
  - Potential applicants must complete the LIHWAP Customer Information form at [www.EnergyServices.org/LIHWAP](http://www.EnergyServices.org/LIHWAP) or call (831) 726-8817 and leave a voicemail.
- Season of Sharing: one-time bill assistance for overdue bills and other essential costs: [Chronicle Season of Sharing Fund](#)

Due to time constraints, this presentation was postponed.

9. **Presentation and Discussion: [Resolution in Support of Transparency, Environmental Accountability, and Labor Standards for California Community Power](#)**, Alex Lantsberg, Director of Research & Advocacy San Francisco Electrical Construction Industry; Moisés García, Power CAC Chair

*Introduction*

**Alex Lantsberg** introduced himself as the Research and Advocacy Director for the San Francisco Electrical Construction Industry. He spoke to the CAC back in April of this year to discuss some of what was happening with CleanPowerSF, the SFPUC, and the California Community Power Joint Powers Authority.

Lantsberg came to raise awareness about a missed opportunity to put San Francisco values in action and leverage their ability and participation in the large statewide organization to achieve labor environmental justice and transparency goals. Since then, they have been working with their partners around the state and with other CCAs (Community Choice Aggregators).



Lantsberg also spoke with Power AGM Hale about how to work through the CAC and through the constituent Community Choice Aggregators to adopt these policies and get them in place at CC (California Community) Power. The proposed resolution contains an excellent timeline of the activities that have brought them to this point.

Back in December 2020, Lantsberg learned that the SFPUC was proposing to join with several other Community Choice Aggregators around the state into a large JPA (Joint Powers Authority) that would pursue joint procurement to meet the California Public Utilities Commission's requirements for reliability. They started to connect with constituents and the SFPUC to emphasize that the SFPUC should make sure that its values were represented in the procurement decisions.

Lantsberg advocated the CAC should pass the resolution recommending that the SFPUC urge CC Power to adopt a permanent policy. The resolution was written incredibly well and provides a great timeline. Lantsberg is asking for the CAC's support to urge the SFPUC to be a leader in having a permanent policy at CC Power.

#### *Discussion*

- **Member Clary** asked whether this issue had been heard at the Power subcommittee.

**Chair García** responded that he thought it would be best to have Alex Lantsberg come to the Full CAC to understand the issue better. Chair García noted that the CAC would not take action for now and that SFPUC staff has asked to review the resolution as well.

- **Member Clary** asked whether the resolution was going to Power Staff and Racial Equity staff.

**Chair García** responded that they have only contacted Power Enterprise staff.

**Presenter Lantsberg** responded that Masood Ordikhani (External Affairs AGM) participated in the first round of approvals when the SFPUC was joining CC Power.

- **Member Clary** commented that the SFPUC Racial Equity group could use a little boosting from the CAC.

**Presenter Lantsberg** responded that he would love the opportunity to circle back with them.

- **Chair García** commented that it was important to support a standardized process to have policies in place with the new Joint Powers Authority that reflects the CAC's and the SFPUC's values in the way that they procure more power and long-term storage.

**Presenter Lantsberg** explained that a promise to procure power is required from many financiers and project developers to start building projects. He noted that there needs to be a revenue source, and the procurement process is what provides that. Lantsberg continued that unlike most public agency purchases that result in construction, the procurement process is completely free of regulatory encumbrances in many cases. He also noted that it still must go through CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) and various procedures, but there is no public contracting code for the construction side of it. Lantsberg commented that there is no capacity to control who does that work, and much of it is outsourced to an energy developer. He

noted that the absence of a policy creates an opportunity for incredibly low labor standards. Lantsberg concluded that they have managed to keep that at bay in California broadly with its three projects and with what CC Power has done in its year and a half.

- **Member Nagengast** asked whether other CCAs in California had such a policy or resolution.

**Presenter Lantsberg** responded that this would be the first. Lantsberg continued that CC Power has managed to create a template for how to start doing this work not just in California but across the country. He noted that it will strengthen the ability of the climate movement to make the case for broader transformations by keeping them together as a package and being able to move the environmental and work force standards forward.

**Chair García** responded that CleanPowerSF and their local CCA have policies in place, but now they are discussing the Joint Powers Authority. Chair García noted that it is made up of several CCAs, and as a new Joint Powers Authority, they do not have those policies. He commented that the CCAs have individual policies, which is where the disconnect happens. Chair García noted that the resolution is asking the California Community Power Joint Powers Authority to have one standard policy for all their other projects going forward.

Public Comment:

- **Leslie Austin** commented that she is a Climate Action Organizer with the Romero Institute, which is a non-profit law and public policy center. The institute is part of a growing coalition to create a clear and decisive voice for climate leadership on the central coast that ensures workforce and environmental justice standards at CCEs (Community Choice Energy formerly known as Community Choice Aggregation) throughout California. Today, more than 200 California cities and counties are powered by Community Choice Energy programs, and those programs serve more than 11 million customers. They now know that CCEs procure most of California's clean energy. If California has a chance of meeting its emissions reduction goals, the Community Choice programs must value a broad set of social, economic, and environmental goals. Those goals must include a worker focused approach that ensures high road careers and advances environmental justice standards to support the communities that host the renewable energy projects they build. They are all creating a green economy currently, and they want to do it right. This means developing CCE projects that reflect the values they hold for workers and their communities to both protect and support them throughout this energy transition. While PG&E and other investor-owned utilities have an impeccable track record of strong workforce standards for nearly all utility owned and contracted energy projects, CCEs have demonstrated a less than stellar performance, and as a result, Austin believe that CCEs are allowing investor-owned utilities to occupy the moral high ground. The CAC's leadership on workforce and environmental justice standards will have a cascading positive and lasting impact by setting the industry standard and best practices for other CCEs in California. Austin commented that the city works hard to create a culture of equity and inclusion to ensure a diverse and engaged workforce and to build a sustainable and equitable future for all. Austin then expressed her thanks for being a city whose policies represent their collective values and for standing up for workers in their communities by having this presentation tonight.

- **Melissa Yu** commented that she is with the Sierra Club and wants to echo the comments made by Lantsberg and Austin. The Sierra Club has advocated for years for a Community Choice Program that focuses not only on clean energy but also on generating equitable community benefits. They would love to have the full support of this Committee to urge the SFPUC to convince the California Community Power Board to adopt a stronger environmental justice labor policy for all projects moving forward and not piecemeal. It has been great to work with so many different labor, environmental justice, and environmental groups. There are not many places that they can come together and work so strongly. They hope this campaign will help push for a policy that can be uniformly adopted throughout the various CCAs as a standard for energy project procurements and ultimately have the California Community Power adopt a policy.
- **Batoul Al-Sadi** commented that she is the Environmental Justice Organizer for Let's Green California, and part of her work is to establish workforce and environmental justice standards at CCEs across the state. Her organization strongly supports the resolution. CCEs, as community energy agencies are obligated to ensure that workers and communities, especially those coming from historically disadvantaged backgrounds, are protected, and supported throughout this critical energy transition. At their core, Community Choice Programs are about creating ground up solutions to the climate crisis through community owned energy utilities. Centering community stakeholder voices and perspectives throughout the energy procurement process is fundamental to these programs. This resolution seeks to ensure diverse and meaningful community engagement. In doing so, this resolution seeks to remedy a long history of California CCEs failing to consider the disproportionate environmental burdens experienced by disadvantaged communities by both acknowledging and including those impacted by the legacy of environmental injustice into the decision-making process. By strengthening the workforce and environmental justice standards, they can better the community, energy, economy, and future. Furthermore, establishing these standards really means taking a proactive step in contributing to a future that favors renewable energy while also protecting the most burdened communities. Let's Green California believes that moving this resolution forward would be incredibly vital because it has the power to influence CCEs across the state of California.
- **Tracey Brieger** commented that she is Deputy Director of Jobs with Justice San Francisco, which is a coalition of half labor unions and half community groups working for racial, economic, and climate justice in San Francisco and beyond. There must be statewide standards for all these projects. This is a great example of a resolution that urges environmental justice labor standards and environmental standards to come together as one. There are sadly not enough examples across the state of when these are all incorporated into one resolution. Jobs with Justice wanted to lend their support and strongly encourage CAC members to adopt the resolution.
- **Sam Appel** commented that he is a California State Manager with BlueGreen Alliance. They are an alliance of state level affiliates of major unions and national environmental groups. They are strongly in favor of the resolution as proposed. Workforce standards are essential to delivering high quality jobs for disadvantaged workers and

dislocated workers. The environmental justice and environmental standards attached to the resolution are essential as well. From the state level perspective, labor environmental advocates and environmental justice advocates are united in pushing forward for standards across climate investments, which is what much of their statewide membership is focused on. The nature of this being a statewide effort is certainly not lost on them. The CAC's action is significant. Workforce standards generally do not increase project costs; they increase safety, and they deliver faster and more reliable projects. Environmental justice standards and environmental standards attached in concert with workforce standards are going to be essential to reaching the climate, economic and environmental justice goals. As they transition off gas and fossil fuels, it is also essential that they give their workers an opportunity to secure commensurate quality high road careers. Appel noted that the standards being discussed are a big part of that.

#### **10. Staff Report**

- Introduction of new SFPUC staff member Lexus Moncrease

Public Comment: None

#### **11. Future Agenda Items and Resolutions**

- [CAC Advance Calendar](#)

Public Comment: None

12. **Announcements/Comments** Please visit [www.sfpuc.org/cac](http://www.sfpuc.org/cac) for confirmation of the next scheduled meeting, agenda, and materials.

Public Comment: None

#### **13. Adjournment**

Motion was made (García) and seconded (Kott) to adjourn the meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 7:43 pm.