



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

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Tuesday, July 12, 2022  
 5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.**

**PARTICIPATE VIA ZOOM VIRTUAL CONFERENCE SOFTWARE**

**Meeting URL**

<https://sfwater.zoom.us/j/84925458098?pwd=Uk1EYVRUQ00rckp3RTRieXdRYm5MUT09>

**Phone Dial-in**

669.219.2599

Find your local number: <https://sfwater.zoom.us/j/84925458098?pwd=Uk1EYVRUQ00rckp3RTRieXdRYm5MUT09>

**Meeting ID / Passcode**

849 2545 8098 / 941132

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

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

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

**Members**

**Amy Nagengast, Chair (D8)**  
 Douglas Jacuzzi (D4)

Maika Pinkston (M-Enviro. Org)  
 Moisés García (D9)

Michelle Pierce (B-Enviro. Justice)

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

**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

**Anson Moran**  
 President

**Newsha Ajami**  
 Vice President

**Sophie Maxwell**  
 Commissioner

**Tim Paulson**  
 Commissioner

**Dennis J. Herrera**  
 General Manager



## **ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **1. Call to order and roll call at 5:31 pm**

Members present at roll call: (4) Nagengast, Jacuzzi, Pinkston, and García

Members Absent: (1) Pierce

Staff/presenters: Catherine Curtis, Erika Uribe, Meryl B Klein, and Sarah Minick

Members of the Public: None

### **2. Approve [May 10, 2022 Minutes](#)**

Motion was made (García) and seconded (Jacuzzi) to approve the May 10, 2022 Minutes.

AYES: (4) Nagengast, Jacuzzi, Pinkston, and García

NOES: (0)

ABSENT: (1) Pierce

Public Comment: None

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

- Welcome members, staff, and the public
- The Biosolids Digester Facilities Project sent out their April through June construction air quality monitoring report. There was one item of dust that exceeded the threshold, which occurred on April 26.
- Chair Nagengast sent to CAC asking the members to stay focused on fixing and upgrading the sewer infrastructure in the Alemany Cayuga area, which is in District 11. The Chair asked that communication to be added as a correspondence log.
- [Correspondence Log](#)

Public Comment: None

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

Public Comment: None

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

Motion was made (García) and seconded (Jacuzzi) to adopt the resolution.

The motion PASSED with the following votes:

AYES: (4) Nagengast, Jacuzzi, Pinkston, and García

NOES: (0)

ABSENT: (4) Pierce

Public Comment: None

**6. Presentation and Discussion: Wastewater Enterprise Competency Based Training System (CBTS), Catherine Curtis, CBTS Project Manager, Wastewater Enterprise**

*Presentation*

- WWE Competency Based Training System (CBTS)
- What is Competency Based Training System (CBTS)?
- CBTS Team
- Project Timeline
- Training Defined
- Contents of a Training Module
- CBTS – What are we doing?
- Why are we doing this?
- Questions/Comments
- CBTS Process
- Treatment Plant Operator Chart
- Where Are We?
- Next Steps
- CBTS Administrative Components
- CBTS OSP Implementation Committee
- Task Force
- CBTS Process
- Communication
- SOP Report Sample
- Assessment Report for Safety
- Monthly Report
- SharePoint Site
- Train-the-Trainer Workshop

*Discussion*

- **Member Jacuzzi** asked whether there were trainings specific to job/task levels or if trainings were meant for everyone.

**Staff Curtis** responded that safety modules are for everyone. Staff Curtis explained that everyone includes seniors, junior employees, and apprentices. However, the Wastewater Enterprise no longer has apprentices. Other trainings include operations, mechanical maintenance, instrumentation, and control. The focus is on the trades. There are about 150 technical SOPs (Standard Operating Procedures) that the Wastewater Enterprise has developed. If an individual passes, they are deemed qualified for that job. Individuals that pass all the assessments can be certified.

- **Member Jacuzzi** asked if there would also be ongoing training for each module the certification had been issued.

**Staff Curtis** responded that people need to be re-certified every three years, and new employees are required to be certified within six months. The trainings might change as the work evolves.

- **Member García** asked what size Wastewater's labor force is.

**Staff Curtis** responded that the Wastewater enterprise has about 470 people, mainly focused on operations and mechanical maintenance. Oceanside has around 20-25 people for operations and around 16 people for mechanical maintenance. The Southeast has a much bigger population.

**Staff Klein** commented that the pilot started at Oceanside, which has a much smaller staff. The plan is to implement this program at Oceanside and expand it later. They are starting with the safety trainings, which will impact more people.

- **Member García** asked if the trainings were primarily related to safety or if they would prepare staff for promotions.

**Staff Curtis** responded that these were mandatory safety trainings, and OSHA (Occupational Safety and Health Administration) oversees the rules and regulations around them.

- **Chair Nagengast** asked if there were additional SOPs that were not safety related and were specifically for electricians or I&C (Instrumentation and Control technicians).

**Staff Curtis** responded that they have about 75 SOPs for mechanical maintenance, they have about 12 for I&C, and they have about 120 to 125 for operations.

- **Chair Nagengast** asked who owns the SOP and who ensures they are following the latest OSHA regulations.

**Staff Curtis** responded that a subject matter expert develops the SOP, and the expert passes the SOP to the superintendent of the facility. The superintendent reviews it, and the SOP might return to the expert if edits are needed. The expert then makes the edits and sends it back to the superintendent for approval. This must be done every three years and changes are implemented to comply with OSHA.

- **Chair Nagengast** asked whether the safety officer will be the only one responsible for the SOP when this project is rolled out enterprise wide.

**Staff Curtis** responded that multiple people will be responsible for the SOPs, including the safety officer.

**Staff Klein** commented that the Wastewater Enterprise is looking at how they evaluate the training program on an annual basis. The division managers are also aware of everything that has been developed and what the update priorities are. They are looking to develop a process to look at all the training systems that the SFPUC has, which should be rolled out in the next year or two.

**Chair Nagengast** asked staff to return to the Wastewater CAC to discuss training for the enterprise.

- **Member Pinkston** asked if the community is benefiting from the pilot.

**Staff Curtis** responded that the Wastewater Enterprise has hired people from the community, but the competency-based training is internal, and its goal is to ensure that SFPUC employees are competent to do their jobs. The SFPUC used to have an apprenticeship program but is no longer available.

**Staff Klein** responded that the pilot is focused on their staff or newly hired staff and less looking outward.

- **Member Pinkston** asked if the SFPUC is considering people coming out of apprenticeship programs from organizations like APRI (A. Philip Randolph Institute), City Build for this project.

**Staff Curtis** responded that she was not able to answer that because she does not work on those projects, but the SFPUC is strongly aligned with racial equity and it wants to get back to figuring out how to pull people in from the community. Curtis added that there was a job announcement that went out for a training program for I&C, and anybody could have applied to that.

**Member Pinkston** asked how the outreach for that was.

**Staff Klein** responded that Human Resource Services runs most of the SFPUC's recruitment and they are responsible for the outreach as well. Klein added that jobs are posted on many job boards.

- **Member Pinkston** commented that she knew several people in her community who would be overqualified for many of these positions. If there are people in her neighborhood who are qualified and have been through apprenticeships or have experience, they should be utilized. Due to the rebuilding and restructuring that has taken place within the Bayview community, there should be outreach so that people in the community are given an option.

**Staff Curtis** responded that Emily, who runs the facility, cares deeply about the community, and she is always doing outreach.

**Staff Klein** responded that she works with HRS directly when doing job postings and would like to connect offline to discuss outreach strategies. The training being discussed is for current SFPUC staff, but anyone would be eligible to take it if hired.

**Member Pinkston** responded that she would be happy to help with the outreach if necessary.

- **Chair Nagengast** commented that maybe they can have the HR folks back to the Full CAC to discuss what they have been doing to increase the reach of job postings.

**Member García** commented that the Full CAC plans on scheduling a presentation on human resources and hiring efforts.

- **Member Jacuzzi** asked if there were roughly 470 personnel within the Wastewater Enterprise.

**Staff Klein** responded that she thinks they have over 500 now because the new budget was recently approved. However, Klein explained that the number of authorized and filled positions is different.

- **Member Jacuzzi** commented that it was important for committee members to know how many people were being trained. Jacuzzi then asked about training requirements for contractors.

**Staff Curtis** responded that the training was developed by Competency Training System and that they also developed the UTAC software. The person that developed the system has experience with utilities and got the model from the Navy. The Wastewater Enterprise had implementation meetings, their leadership made the decisions, and all the SOPs were reviewed by the SFPUC's staff.

**Member Jacuzzi** asked how they know if the hired private contractor is working at the same level of competency that the SFPUC training demands.

**Staff Klein** responded that they are at a loss because they are trying to think where they have had private contractors doing work that would be included in the technical competencies they have been looking at. Klein added that the program started at Oceanside and they have not come across this issue this far.

- **Member Jacuzzi** commented that the SFPUC is working with private contractors in the concrete placement at the Oceanside project.

**Staff Curtis** asked if that was related to SSIP work because the concrete work is not related to this training.

**Member Jacuzzi** commented that he was not sure what that concrete work is related to. Jacuzzi commented that this work should require safety training to ensure contractors are at the same competency level as SFPUC staff.

**Staff Klein** commented that workers from the capital programs are Infrastructure staff and not Wastewater staff. Klein explained that infrastructure staff is not included in the pilot because the pilot is focused on operations.

**Chair Nagengast** commented that the Wastewater Enterprise is separate from other divisions that might execute projects for the Wastewater Enterprise.

- **Member Jacuzzi** commented that the separation does not mean no accidents. Jacuzzi added that even though this is a pilot program, it can lead to a larger policy and that he was curious to know what the pilot program would mean to subcontractors since he is a contractor.

**Staff Curtis** commented that the pilot program does not reach the contractors now and she cannot answer the questions about the impacts on contractors as that is beyond her scope of work.

- **Member Jacuzzi** asked if there are basically no interfaces within this pilot program with outside contractors.

**Staff Curtis** responded that this was a training program only.

**Staff Klein** commented that they have a regular meeting with their health and safety team and there might be SFPUC-wide health and safety trainings.

- **Chair Nagengast** asked staff to give an update in 2023.

Public Comment: None

7. **Presentation and Discussion:** [Upper Islais Creek Watershed Approach](#), Sarah Minick, Urban Watershed Planning Division Manager, Wastewater Enterprise

*Presentation*

- Upper Islais Creek Watershed Approach
- Agenda
- Alemany Flooding Challenges
- SFPUC Commission Feedback
- Upper Islais Creek Watershed and Lower Alemany
- Why a Watershed Approach?
- 5-Year Storm Flood Extent – Land Use Analysis
- Environmental Justice Communities
- Collaborators and partners (ongoing)
- Community Engagement Overview
- Community Survey Highlights (prelim.)
- Community Conversations (ongoing)
- Future Outreach
- Flood Resilient Neighborhoods
- Soak It Up Preliminary Findings
- Soak It Up Preliminary Findings – City Agency Synergies
- Slow It Down Preliminary Findings
- Protect Preliminary Findings
- San Francisco Boulevard Examples
- Protect It Draft Concept Plan: Integrated Stormwater and Urban Design Improvements
- Watershed approach
- Quality of Life Multiple Benefits
- Next Steps

*Discussion*

- **Chair Nagengast** commented that this was beautiful and asked if a joint benefit authority (JBA) could support a project like this.
- **Member García** asked what the potential timetable for this project was.

**Staff Minick** responded that the pipe project is still being negotiated in the current cleanup and abatement order. The pipe project was scheduled to be completed in 2028. The SFPUC did reach out to the Regional Board and had a great meeting with their staff to explain the direction the SFPUC was heading. It was a conversation about the feasibility of this option. Staff Minick explained to the Regional Board that her vision would mean looking at what the green infrastructure in the upper watershed would look like in the 10-year CIP (Capital Improvement Plan) because that is about how long it would take to do all the green infrastructure. The second part addressed what the storage project looked like in the middle of the watershed in terms of costing and scheduling. The third part addressed what the Public Realm Project would look like. The SFPUC was straightforward that this would not be completed by 2028, which the Regional Board

understood, but asked for a series of milestones. Staff Minick commented that she could not provide the dates currently because the next exercise is related to costing and scheduling.

- **Member García** commented that he lives in District 9, so he wanted to know how engaged Supervisor Ronen's office is.

**Staff Minick** responded that Supervisor Ronen has been the most enthusiastic supervisor and thought this should be San Francisco's Green New Deal Infrastructure Project. This project has transit, ecological services, and stormwater management. Supervisor Ronen and her office helped with some of the outreach and newsletters and encouraged the SFPUC to keep her in the loop as they move forward. She also advised the SFPUC to reach to the state level for funding.

- **Member García** commented that much of the run-off is created by the 280 and asked what potential funds were available to this project.

**Staff Minick** responded that this package will be more than the \$289 million that was on the table for the pipe. The SFPUC will need funding partners. They do know from their land use analysis that 16% of the flood extent area that they would have taken care of with that money is Caltrans (California Department of Transportation) land. The SFPUC does want to coordinate with Caltrans and the SFMTA (Municipal Transportation Agency) to see if there are any potential funding partnerships available. The SFPUC also needs to see what the Water Board might decide to do.

- **Member Jacuzzi** commented that he was the Director for Westside Water Resources, which also helps the SFPUC with stormwater management. He noted that this area was a flood area long before modern development just by nature of the geology of the area and the soil types. Mimicking nature, which Staff Minick has been supportive of in the presentation, is the direction they should go. One more pipe is not the answer. Jacuzzi then asked whether the analysis had focused on residential properties and if there had been a cost benefit analysis per water unit.

**Staff Minick** responded that there are many metrics in terms of the cost benefit, and there is a separate effort to amend the building code to require flood resilient construction of the 100-year storm.

- **Member Jacuzzi** commented that roughly 10 years ago he worked with the plumbing division within the building department to create the rainwater liter disconnect permit. Jacuzzi added that it was great to hear about required construction configurations.

**Staff Minick** responded that they are big fans of the downspout disconnect where it makes sense. For the flood resilient construction, they did do a planning level cost benefit analysis and found that for the cost of doing flood resilient construction versus the benefit, it was about a 1 to 17 with the benefit being the 17 part of the ratio. It is cost beneficial to build flood resilient buildings even if there is an analysis done for only one one-hundred-year storm. In this case, the SFPUC wants people to apply to their grant program where they could become more flood resilient building by building, but the SFPUC would like to protect the whole corridor with a more holistic solution. Until they do the costing, they will not be able to give good data on the cost benefit. Another metric they are looking at is days in service for their

ratepayers. The plan that was presented would impact people in their daily lives from a transit and public realm perspective that would be in service 365 days a year, whereas a pipe for the five-year three-hour storm will only be in service one day because the other pipe would have served all the other days except that one day. They are also looking at rate payers served because this is 1/10<sup>th</sup> of 1% of their combined sewer area if they only do the pipe solution so then people will not see that benefit. The SFPUC has not done this yet, but they will try to do a GIS (Geographic Information System) analysis. Staff Minick added that a lot of work is still needed to have the numbers and metrics.

- **Member Jacuzzi** reminded Staff Minick that his second question was about the involvement with private property as there are many rooftops and private impervious surfaces in the area.

**Staff Minick** responded that only 3% of the structures that have been impacted are residential. The contributing area has many residential structures. The SFPUC GIS team did run those numbers. The trick with this whole project is getting the water from the contributing area to go where they want it to go. In the past, the SFPUC looked at how many acres they would have to disconnect to influence the flooding. There would be about 500 acres that they would have to disconnect. The trick has been getting the water down to the nature-based solution. If they disconnect the downspout from one house, ultimately in a big enough storm it would just go back into the sewer. They cannot do a sewer disconnection all the way down the street because that would end up being a billion dollars. The issue that is happening is that they are trying to take advantage of where the pinch point is and gather the stormwater when it overflows.

- **Member Jacuzzi** commented that he did a quick calculation and came up with roughly 7,200 1,200 square foot residential homes that would be the full 200 acres that the SFPUC is targeting. The idea there would be not just to disconnect but also to store and saturate on site in a distributed model.
- **Chair Nagengast** asked if they would be engaging next in early 2023.

**Staff Minick** responded that the first step would be to see if upper management wants to submit this to the Water Board, which is Staff Minick's hope and should happen in October. When a decision is made, Minick will reach out to kick off a more robust engagement and planning process. Staff Minick also wanted to address David Hooper's concerns. She explained that the proposed approach does not do the same thing for the Cayuga neighborhood as the pipe does. The proposed approach would help more people, but there are trade-offs. Hooper brings up the point that the way the pipe project conveys water hydraulically reduces flooding in the 25-year event in Cayuga, which has been shown through modeling. The project that the SFPUC is proposing would encourage Cayuga residents to apply for the floodwater grant programs. Solutions Not Sandbags has encouraged the SFPUC to look at land acquisition programs, which they are looking at. If this approach was modeled, though, they would not get the same exact reduction in the 25-year storm for the green infrastructure watershed approach. On the other hand, it does help in the 100-year storm. There is a great deal of complexity in the modeling, but the SFPUC hears David's point. Staff Minick also pointed out that Cayuga already meets the level of service and is in

that environmental justice area, whereas Alemany does not meet the level of service. She would argue that they need to stay focused on the corridor where folks are more vulnerable. They want to help as many people as they can.

- **Chair Nagengast** asked if a resolution in support would be helpful.

**Staff Minick** responded affirmatively. Her hope is that this becomes a model for the SFPUC.

Public Comment: None

## 8. Staff report

Introduction of new SFPUC staff member Lexus Moncrease

Public Comment: None

## 9. Future Agenda Items and Resolutions

- Level of Service Goals Update and Annual Report – *tentatively Nov*
- Upper Islais Creed Watershed Approach Update – *tentatively 2023*
- Wastewater Enterprise Competency Based Training System Update – *tentatively 2023*
- Regulation and Legislation for PFAS, Microplastics, and BPA
- Westside Water Resources Presentation
- Floodwater Grant Program
- Treasure Island and Wastewater
- Southeast Treatment Plant Update
- 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 CAC staff
- Asset Management Integration – policy and capital projects
- Green Infrastructure Program and Resolution Update
- Wastewater Communications Update
- Stormwater Management Ordinance and Southeast Treatment Plant
- Upcoming Construction
- Workforce Programs and Qualifications
- Treasure Island Field Trip
- Environmental Justice Analysis briefing
- Environmental Justice in Capital Projects

Adopted Resolutions for Follow Up

- Resolution in Support of SFPUC Class A Biosolids Local Distribution Program [adopted August 21, 2018](#)
- Resolution in Support of Cityworks Interns Recommendations [adopted on November 21, 2017](#)
- Resolution in Support of Equitable Green Infrastructure Implementation throughout the Southeast Sector of San Francisco and throughout the City [adopted on June 20, 2017](#)
- Resolution Urging SFPUC Commission to Initiate Planning and Environmental Review for Building a New Community Center at Third and Evans and to Direct Staff to Develop an Interim Greenhouse Environmental and Workforce Development Program [adopted on October 18, 2016](#)

- Resolution Supporting the SFPUC to Conduct Robust Community Engagement to Determine the Community's Preference for Remodeling Southeast Community Facility at 1800 Oakdale or Building a New Community Center at 1550 Evans [adopted on January 19, 2016](#)

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

Public comment: None

**11. Adjournment**

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

Meeting was adjourned at 7:31 pm.