San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Citizens’ Advisory Committee

MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, July 20, 2021
5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.

PARTICIPATE VIA BLUEJEANS VIRTUAL CONFERENCE SOFTWARE

Meeting URL
https://bluejeans.com/752704622/9248

Phone Dial-in
408.317.9253

Meeting ID/Passcode
752 704 622# / 1787

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. 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:
Anietie Ekanem, Chair (D10)
Marria Evbuoma (D1)
Suki Kott (D2)
Steven Kight (D3)
VACANT (D4)
Emily Algire (D5)
Amy Zock (D6)
VACANT (D7)
Amy Nagengast (D8)
Moisés García (D9)
Jennifer Clary (D11)
VACANT (M-Environmental Org.)
Nicole Sandkulla (M-Regional Water Customers)
Mark Tang (M-Engineering/Financial)
Eliahu Perszyk (M-Large Water User)
VACANT (B-Small Business)
Michelle Pierce (B-Environmental Justice)

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.
ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Call to order and roll call

Members present at roll call: (10) Ekanem, Evbuoma, Kott, Algire, Nagengast, García, Clary, Tang, Perszyk, Pierce

Members absent: (3) Kight, Zock, Sandkulla

Staff/Presenters/Consultants: David Beaupre, Nadia Rahman

2. Approve May 18, 2021 Minutes

Motion was made (Kott) and seconded (García) to approve the April 20, 2021 Minutes

AYES: (10) Ekanem, Evbuoma, Kott, Algire, Nagengast, García, Clary, Tang, Perszyk, Pierce

NOES: (0)

ABSENT: (3) Kight, Zock, Sandkulla

Public Comment: None

3. Report from the Acting Chair

- Welcome members, staff, and the public
- Appreciation for Engineering/Financial representative Mark Tang

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: Waterfront Resilience Program Update,
David Beaupre, Senior Development Project Manager, Port of San Francisco

Presentation
- Agenda - Overview
- Waterfront Resilience Program (earthquake, hazards, and sea level rise)
Waterfront Resilience Program Efforts: Area and Subareas Covered by the Project and Related Port Projects

Embarcadero Seawall Program – planning stages and funding from bonds. First projects are critical life safety projects

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Flood Resiliency Study

Learnings To Date

Hazards and Consequences: MHRA Key Findings

Other Earthquake Hazards and Consequences: MHRA Key Findings

USACE Flood Resiliency Study Assessment: Waterfront Wide Assets at Risk – Flooding

Measures Development

What is a Measure? Concept and Port Goals

Sample Seismic Measures

Sample Flood Measures: riprap on Panama Bay and South Beach Wave

Adapt Plan: will include a resilience roadmap; guidance; transparency; engagement opportunities

Adapt Plan Adaptation Strategies Development Overview

Funding and Finance Recommendation: Secured Funding (Prop A Funding, USACE Study, and State of California Funding) and Potential Funding

Waterfront Resilience Program Steps: construction should start sometime in 2023

Community and Stakeholder Feedback

Learnings from the Engagements (2017-Present)

Assets Communities Want to Protect

How We Use Valuable Community Feedback

Upcoming in the Waterfront Resilience Program (WRP)

Question & Answer

Discussion

Member Clary mentioned that there are infrastructure issues such as CSO discharge points and combined overflows. The CSO discharge points in the northern waterfront are more susceptible to sea level rise and backups and flooding will happen during high tides and high rain events. Member Clary then asked if the Port is prepared for that and if the Port is working with SFPUC.

Port Staff Beaupre responded that SFPUC and Port are working together and coordinating where the overland flows occurs and where the other outfalls are. They are trying to understand where the locations are as there are points in Northern waterfront, Southern waterfront, and Mission Bay. Close coordination is needed, some baffles will work for some period of time and other solutions may need to be considered down the road.

Member Clary commented that the difficulty with baffles is that it prevents seawater from getting into the wastewater system but almost guarantees that there will be backups on the shore.

Member Clary commented that riprap affects shore birds and their habitats asked if that being taken into consideration as having soft shorelines.

Port Staff Beaupre answered that the Port should show different examples that are softer shorelines. But the northern waterfront is armored and difficult but looking at potential locations to introduce a soft shoreline. There are more opportunities in the southern waterfront and the Port is working on a project for
a living shoreline in a park. There are other opportunities within the creeks and certain areas. All approaches are being considered and there should be a good balance depending on typology and wave conditions.

- **Member Clary** commented that the main CSO discharge points are in Islais Creek which accounts for two thirds of the volume of combined sewage overflows that occur in the city. This creates issues for the Port and options are limited because of the SFPUC infrastructure. Member Clary then asked what the strategy for resilience in that area is.

**Port Staff Beaupre** answered that there is a study specific to Islais Creek and this document from various departments has longer-term vision for the Islais Creek.

**Consultant Rahman** added that there is a consultant team dedicated to the southern team and they have a presentation that is specifically devoted to Islais Creek and Mission Creek. The current presentation is Citywide. The organizations that the Port has been engaging with are in the southern waterfront area

**Port Staff Beaupre** offered to come back and have Port staff present on the Islais Creek.

**Member Clary** clarified that the CAC has members from all over the City. Member Clary then commented that all the funding goes to the richer part of the City while the southern part of the City needs to wait for more funding.

**Port Staff Beaupre** answered that the reason the bond money is going to the northern waterfront initially is because the seismic issue with the seawall can happen any time now and the sea level rise is happening slowly. The City will ask for additional funding, but the seawall is critical now.

- **Member Pierce** understands Staff Beaupre remarks but stated that this is still a racial inequity issue. Member Pierce then asked what the timeline for the southern sea wall is. Member Pierce added that the plant that handles about 70% of wastewater sits on Islais Creek and anything that disrupts that is a problem. Member Pierce asked who oversees planning for the southern sea wall.

**Port Staff Beaupre** answered that the bond money is not going to the Marina Green. It is for the original seawall from Pier 45 or 47 to Pier 38 or the Giants Ballpark. There is no seawall in the southern waterfront and that is the reason why the funding is not being used in the southern waterfront. The southern waterfront seismic vulnerability assessment will be made public towards the end of the summer. It shows what the risks are and then decisions on how to address those risks will be made. The resilience work done with Army Corps of Engineers looks at the entire waterfront from Aquatic Park to India Basin. The program with the Army Corps was paused for six to nine months because they needed to figure out how to resource it. However, the program got reinitiated this week and alternatives on how to deal with flood should be available next year.

- **Member Pierce** commented that we are already experiencing sea level rise and flooding issues. This winter, the candlestick expressway was flooded for three weeks. It is a huge concern for people that live closer to the shoreline.
Port Staff Beaupre answered that he has seen flooding in the Mission as well. That program is being managed by the Port's Resiliency Team. Regarding the Southeast Treatment Plant, SFPUC is better equipped to answers questions related to that.

- **Member Pierce** commented that seismic and sea level rise need interdepartmental cooperation and would like to intervene if the Port needs more cooperation from SFPUC.

Port Staff Beaupre answered that there is a lot of collaboration and that it is going well.

- **Member Ekanem** asked if the Blue Greenway is part of the Port property and if it is impacted by the project.

Port Staff Beaupre answered that the Blue Greenway is part of the Port’s property. The Port has joint jurisdictions with SFMTA and SFDPW in certain areas. The measures to address sea level rise and seismic risk will be designed to have multi beneficial uses. As future Blue Greenway projects come onboard, they will be looking into how to enhance the Blue Greenway.

- **Member Algire** asked what determined the borders of this project? Why does the study stop in the middle of BVHP (and West of Fisherman's Wharf?) The group is prioritizing the northern edge/Embarcadero.

Port Staff Beaupre answered that the borders were defined by the Port of San Francisco’s jurisdiction. That is why it ends at India Basin. However, the Port has been doing work and risk assessment outside of the boundaries of Port’s jurisdiction, such as Mission Creek and Islais Creek.

- **Member Evbuoma** asked if funding for a sea wall went to the Northside first because the sea wall is there already?

Port Staff Beaupre answered that the seismic risk of the seawall is huge. If a Loma Prieta level earthquake happens, the lateral spreading would have major implications to the Embarcadero Roadway, utilities, and infrastructure on top of it.

Public Comment: None.

6. **Presentation, Discussion and Possible Action:** Resolution in Support of SB 612, Moisés García, Power CAC Chair

Discussion:
- Brief Introduction of SB 612 by Power CAC Chair García. The bill has become a two-year bill and it is now with an assembly and this should slow things down. The bill would require Investor Owned Utilities to allow CCA’s access to the resources that they paid for. The bill was supported by the Board of the Supervisors, Mayor’s Office, and the SFPUC.
- **Member Clary** asked if the bill might change since it has been converted into a two-year bill.
- **Chair García** answered that it is unclear if there will be any changes since it became a two-year bill yesterday.
• **Member Clary** added she is happy to support the bill.
• **Member Ekanem** commented that the resolution language makes it clear what the SFPUC CAC is supporting.
• **Acting Chair Nagengast** added that the resolution will probably note the date of adoption.

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

The motion PASSED with the following votes:

**AYES:** (10) Ekanem, Evbuoma, Kott, Algire, Nagengast, García, Clary, Tang, Perszyk, Pierce

**NOES:** (0)

**ABSENT:** (3) Kight, Zock, Sandkulla

Public Comment: None

7. **Presentation, Discussion and Possible Action:** Resolution in support of transition of CleanPowerSF residential customers to time-of-use rates, Moisés García, Power CAC Chair

Discussion:

• **Power CAC Chair García** explained that the SFPUC has adopted Time-of-Use rates starting July 2021. The SFPUC enacted bill security measures to ensure that customers will not be paying more money. Power CAC Chair also noted that the Power Subcommittee is committed to ensure that the debt overhang does not hamper the customer’s ability to pay their bills.

• **Member Clary** added the change is a good idea given what the State says when the grid is overwhelmed.

• **Chair García** commented that the Legislature passed final language for the utility arrearages.

• **Member Clary** added that the funding was not enough though.

Motion was made (Tang) and seconded (Algire) to adopt the resolution.

The motion PASSED with the following votes:

**AYES:** (10) Ekanem, Evbuoma, Kott, Algire, Nagengast, García, Clary, Tang, Perszyk, Pierce

**NOES:** (0)

**ABSENT:** (3) Kight, Zock, Sandkulla

Public Comment: None

8. **Presentation and Discussion:** Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee (BRCAC) Update, Mark Tang, Full CAC Secretary

Discussion:
• **Brief Introduction by Member Tang** Balboa Reservoir is owned by SFPUC and it has never been used as a reservoir. In 2015/2016, the development of that property gained more interest. The SFPUC CAC passed a resolution in tentative support of the project if the development included 50% of affordable housing units, the land is declared surplus by the SFPUC and if there is robust community engagement. CAC’s requirements were checked. There are design guidelines regarding what the new development looks like and number of units. In 2018-2020 they went through the EIR process. The Board of Supervisors heard and approved the development last year. There are 1,100 units of housing, 50% of those units are permanently affordable units and there will be a mix of townhouses and apartments for sale at market rate. As approved, the Balboa Citizens’ Advisory Committee role is now concluded. The SFPUC has declared the property as surplus. The first residents are expected to move in 2024.

• **Member Clary** commented that City College advocates were unhappy with the plan and asked if they are getting any preference in allocating housing?

    **Member Tang** responded affirmatively. One of the affordable buildings is meant for educator housing for faculty and administrators and other affordable units can be rented out to students, but there is no priority.

• **Member Evbuoma** commented that it is disappointing to hear that there is no student housing set aside because the parking lot was set aside for unhoused students.

• **Member Pierce** commented that when the Student Body considered approving this, it was about unhoused immigrant students or students that were housing insecure and asked how it was determined that they would not get any of the slots.

    **Member Tang** answered that the project was contentious, and the single-family housing neighborhood considered the project inconsistent with the community. The community pushed back against the density that would support more housing units for low-income people. There was no consensus with that neighborhood.

• **Member Clary** added that there is a transportation issue there.

• **Member Tang** agreed that the transportation issues along Ocean Avenue are very real. There will be a task force to investigate what the MTA and CTA will be investing in to address those concerns. The SFPUC will still own a little piece of land there.

• **Member Anietie** thanked Member Tang for participating in the Balboa Reservoir and his work over the years.

   **Public Comment:** None

9. **Staff report**

   • Reminder for CAC seats seeking members
     - District 3
     - District 4
     - District 6
• District 7
• Small Business Seat appointed by Board of Supervisors’ President
• Environmental Justice appointed by the Mayor
• Engineering/Financial appointed by the Mayor

• Environmental Justice Positions Update
• Warning about resuming in person meetings soon

Public Comment: None

10. Future Agenda Items and Resolutions

• Annual Water Quality Report
• Lead Service Line Replacement Program
• Racial Equity – Composition of the Management Team
• SECFC/CAC Joint Meeting
• Power Rate Increases
• Education Update
• Pres Maxwell Visit
• Drought and Bay Delta Discussion
• CleanPowerSF and Hetch Hetchy Power Study Rates
• Agency-wide Planning & Policy on Climate Change & Adaptation
• Interagency Working Group on Sea Level Rise
• Contracting Process
• Education Resolution
• PUC Properties and City Department Partnerships
• Water Equity and Water Access for Homeless
• Workforce Programs
• Water Rights and Raker Act
• Water Use and Parks
• Flooding Protection
• Water Quality Report
• Green New Deal
• Micro Hydroelectric Power
• Prop A Bond Funding
• Commissioner Visits

Adopted Resolutions for Follow Up

• Resolution in Support of the Southern Skyline Boulevard Ridge Trail Extension project adopted April 20, 2021
• Resolution in Support of Interim Emergency Rate Assistance Program and Revised Community Assistance Program adopted July 21, 2020
• Resolution in Support of a Skilled and Diverse Utility Workforce adopted February 19, 2019
• Resolution Honoring the Life, Activism, and Contributions of Dr. Espanola Jackson to the Local Community adopted on April 19, 2016
• Resolution on Balboa Reservoir adopted March 15, 2016

11. Announcements/Comments The next FULL CAC meeting will be on August 17, 2021. Visit www.sfpuc.org/cac for confirmation of the next scheduled meeting, agenda and materials. The next Water CAC meeting will address drought. The meeting will take place on July 27, 2021.
12. Adjournment

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

Meeting was adjourned at 7:13 PM