



**Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC)  
 MINUTES**

**The Regular Meeting on Tuesday, March 27 was CANCELLED and  
 RESCHEDULED TO Wednesday, March 28, 2012**

5:30 – 7:00 p.m.

1155 Market Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor

**Members:**

Stephen Bjorgan (M)(P)	Jessica Buendia (D6)(P)	<b>Doug Cain (D3)(P)</b>
Donald Carmignani (D2)(W)	<b>Jennifer Clary (D11)(W)</b>	Walt Farrell (D 7)(P)
Richard T. Hansen (D1)(W)	Art Jensen (M)(W)	<b>Terrence Jones – Ch (D10)(W)</b>
<b>Alex Lantsberg (BOS P)(WW)</b>	Mike Marshall (D5)(W)	David Pilpel (D4)(WW)
Javieree Pruitt-Hill (D8)(WW)	Dairo Romero (D9)(WW)	Vacant (M – Large Water)
Vacant (M – Environmental)	Vacant (BOS Pres – S Busi.)	

(P) Power Sub-committee, (W) Water Subcommittee, (WW) Wastewater Subcommittee  
 (Bold = Subcommittee Chair )

**Staff Liaisons:** Jean Walsh and Teresa Young

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call** - Chair Jones called the meeting to order at 05:33 p.m. when the panel achieved quorum.  
**Present:** D.Carmignani; W.Farrell; J.Pruitt-Hill; T.Jones; J.Clary; S.Bjorgan; A.Lantsberg; A.Jensen; D.Pilpel; D.Cain; J.Buendia;  
**Absent:** M.Marshall; R.Hansen; D.Romero;
  
2. **Approval of the February 28 meeting minutes**  
 A.Lantsberg moved; J.Clary seconded. Minutes approved by acclamation. Include A.Lantsberg's year end and T.Jones' Memo in February Minutes.  
 Committee Comments/Suggestions: Summarize discussions.
  
3. **Public Comment:** None. In attendance:
  - a. Office of Economic and Workforce Development
    - i. Rhonda Simmons
    - ii. Ken Nim
  - b. Nicolas - Glen Park Association Board of Directors and working with SFPUC on the Central Bayside project doing public outreach
  - c. Chris Iglesias – SFPUC staff
  - d. Two students from Golden Gate School of Law – Part of Environmental Justice program and heard about the CAC meeting online
  
4. **Report from the Chair:** Supervisors email dated 02.07.12, Updated Committee Assignments, Document Request Log
  - a. Supervisors email - Included email to board of supervisors about environmental justice discussion, but got no response from them.

**Edwin M. Lee**  
 Mayor

**Anson Moran**  
 President

**Art Torres**  
 Vice President

**Ann Moller Caen**  
 Commissioner

**Francesca Vietor**  
 Commissioner

**Vince Courtney**  
 Commissioner

**Ed Harrington**  
 General Manager



- b. Updated Committee Assignments - T.Jones moved from Wastewater subcommittee to Water subcommittee.
- c. Document Request Log - J.Clary received no notification from committee chairs on requests that haven't been met. She will send out a notice to committee chairs to let them know that J.Clary is managing the request log.

Comments:

D.Pilpel: The email sent to Supervisors was not something the full committee had decided to do. The email to the full Board of Supervisors appeared to come from the full CAC. We need to decide as a group to send something to the Board.

T.Jones agreed to run communications by entire CAC body at full CAC meetings before sending out to appropriate parties going forward.

Public Comment: none

**5. Staff Report: Review of SFPUC Commission's Advanced Calendar (J.Walsh)**

Advanced calendar for Commission: All CAC members should already receive the calendars and agendas. If CAC member has not received these items, sign up to join the mailing list.

- April 10 – Annual wholesale presentation from Crispin Hollings on rates policy. Approved – taking action on it.
- April 24 – Lake Merced MOU with Rec & Park (R&P) dictating roles and responsibilities between SFPUC and R&P on management of Lake Merced. The MOU has gone before the water subcommittee.

J.Clary suggested keeping a running calendar on issues that have gone before the CAC Committee.

T.Jones met with Commissioner Moran last month and was informed that the calendar is not perfect and changes before the actual meeting itself. T.Jones suggested to look further out in the Commission calendar and try to avoid what happened with the "land use" item (the discussion had already taken place before the Commission, but CAC was not notified).

J.Walsh: 4/24 includes upcoming Commission items include the Lake Merced MOU, quarterly updates on SSIP, interim wastewater capital improvements. On 5/8, there will be a discussion on wholesale contract rates and the Commission is taking an action on that. It's important for CAC to be flexible and responsive because CAC meets only once a month and the Commission calendar is moved around and changed before the meeting occurs.

J.Walsh met with AGMs of each enterprise and came up with a draft calendar (she will work with T.Jones and subcommittee heads) to include issues that CAC is interested in as well as E.Harrington's list from January CAC meeting.

Public Comment: none.

**6. Subcommittee Chair Reports:**

- a. Power Subcommittee (Doug Cain)
  - i. The issue of land use came up at the last Power subcommittee meeting. The major trigger point was the Francisco Reservoir – issue also spilled over to the Water committee. It was general discussion and no resolution came out from meeting around the stewardship of SF's natural areas being treated equally to areas outside of SF.
  - ii. Comment from D.Pilpel: There was an article from the SF Chronicle on Business Section today about reselling PG&E power and the Ferry Building, which is not occupied by City tenants.
- b. Water Subcommittee (Jennifer Clary)

- i. There was a presentation of the climate change report. SFPUC and Turlock had been doing modeling of the Tuolumne Watershed for several years and withheld reports because they weren't ready yet.
    1. J.Clary shared two items from presentation: The presentation took 6 different hydrology options in temperature and precipitation and modeled on what would happen in the watershed. We get run off earlier in the year, less in June and can have implications for water supply beyond reduction in flow into the reservoir. We'll learn how the model will be on system yields and different scenarios.
    - ii. As a result of Power subcommittee meeting in early march water subcommittee added Francisco Reservoir Neighbors into agenda for this month. Don and Karen agreed to work on a resolution to discuss further at April/May subcommittee meetings and bring to full CAC to vote on. J.Clary passed out draft to get feedback and invited CAC members to attend water subcommittee meeting.
      1. Francisco reservoir is no longer used for SFPUC purposes and zoned as open space. The Community wants to keep it as open space, but SFPUC feels it has a mandate to sell surplus property at market rates. Water subcommittee trying to figure out how that would work and shared first draft of resolution to full CAC.
    - iii. Tomorrow at 6pm at 1155 Market, 4<sup>th</sup> floor –there is a meeting on Eastside Recycled Water Plan. This is an ongoing series of workshops on what recycled water would look like in this part of the City.
  - c. Wastewater Subcommittee (Alex Lantsberg)
    - i. Last meeting included a presentation from the Capital staff on current project updates. The staff gave capital program updates on construction scheduling and local hire issues.
    - ii. Future meetings: invited urban watershed framework team to talk about the process they are going through and that the survey results can yield something that can impact/determine the capital program.
7. **Presentation / Discussion:** An overview of the local hire legislation and how local hire and the regional work lead by the Infrastructure Resources Management Bureau is doing, impact jobs at the SFPUC as it relates to Community Benefits – Chris Iglesias – local hire ordinance.
- Rhonda Simmons and Ken Nim distributed first annual local hiring progress report for 2011 – 2012 and presented information from report. Rhonda also shared about City Build, a pre-apprentice training program that has placed over 2,000 people in City jobs.
- Questions & Answers:
- A.Jensen: Within the 4.6 billion WSIP work, there was \$1billion work on SF projects. Prior to the Local Hire Ordinance, was there much involvement in local hiring?
    - Rhonda: We haven't done a lot of prior comparison yet. That will be the next obvious data bunch to look at. Currently small data set with 22 projects and not a high dollar value. The next task is to compare and contrast data.
    - Ken: The work done in SF has about 25% SF residents that are showing up on the work being done in the City. Regionally, that number drops tremendously, especially in Moccasin and Hetch Hetchy. There are still some SF residents, but much lower.

- Rhonda: Good faith wasn't by trade, but by overall project. This law is by trade. The real question here is how you build pipelines and trades where you don't have enough pull of local folks.
- J.Clary: Because it only covers trade, it's overwhelmingly SF male hires. Do you have any ideas on how to move forward to cover female employees?
  - Rhonda: The construction trade is male dominant. The question is how do we figure out trades that we can gauge more female participants? This is just one trade that our office works on. We also run a healthcare academy and a contract administration program to diversify the pool.
- J.Clary: If we're pushing SF hires in these categories, how are we also pushing SF hires in areas where we have a different gender balance? Are you tracking data that's reportable?
  - Rhonda: Yes, we are tracking everything. Some sectors definitely have gender and demographics attached to it. When this was first launched, City Build was the only program out there. We aimed to diversify the types of offerings we have to deal with that.
- J.Clary: How do you track disadvantaged communities so that you can target assistance in the right areas?
- A.Lantsberg: Taking a look at the list of projects, there are a bunch of 200-250 day projects. Are you able to see where these folks are going after they complete the projects? Is this opening up other opportunities for them to work for contractors in the Bay Area?
  - Ken: A lot of the local contractors are the ones employing SF residents, taking them from one job to another job and they may be recycled into these numbers based on project schedule. The alternative is when contractors don't have enough bodies to make up the percentage, they hire from the program or union to bring in SF residents.
- A.Lantsberg: Since this is a competitive bid environment, many of these smaller contractor agencies don't have the capacity to take on more than maybe two projects. What's happening with the union reps? Are they finding work for other employers? Is this the first step to get them familiarize with the public works sector?
  - Rhonda: We don't know just yet. City Build is 6 years old and we're in the process of building a major reunion. One of the goals for the reunion is to gauge where the students/graduates are now. We haven't been able to get data just yet, but as we get more sophisticated with this and gathering more data, we can track and see where the 2,000 folks are placed, about half of them came from academy.
- A.Lantsberg: How many of these folks who have gotten an opportunity through this program are actually moving into the private side?
- W.Farrell: How do you ensure compliance?
  - Ken: On projects, we check certified payroll and complaints that residents may see. We have a hotline and email that people can report anonymously. We will investigate from there and review the contractors' certified payroll for discrepancies.
- D.Pilpel: On page 7 focusing on the SFPUC, for the \$16M construction project, it might be helpful to list the project cost breakdown. Why that forest hill project is so low?
  - Ken: The project is still wrapping up.

- D.Pilpel: A year from now, if there is an update that's relevant, please let us know how the CAC can help.
- J.Buendia: We're beginning to move from being just district representatives to engaging the districts and SFPUC. It would be great to see where the workers are coming from and being placed. In the advisory committee, is there a place for us to help them?
  - Rhonda: We're in process of making recommendations to the Mayor now and are not planning to make this a big group. We are not sure about size and formal process for this, but will involve community stakeholders, community reps, union, contractors, and City staff.
- J.Buendia: Suggestion to include a school district representative to discuss pipeline issues.
  - Rhonda: In SFUSD, their role is more on the youth counsel.
- J. Pruitt-Hill: As far as branding and marketing for these programs, what type of organizations do you target? How to people find out about this?
  - Rhonda: City Build is training partner and it is a collaboration of community partners. There are community partners that help us do outreach and recruit for program.
  - Ken: We run orientations twice a month, every second and fourth Thursdays. Employed and unemployed people can find info.
- Public comment: none.

8. **Presentation / Discussion:** SFPUC spending on Programs as they relate to Community benefits by district – T.Jones.

- T.Jones looked at Appendix B, took projects over \$10m and categorized them by districts. Four categories: communities benefit from water, power and sewer, but other benefits are jobs, gardens on SFPUC land, community center, etc.
- D.Cain: If they're spending \$150M, are they required to take 2% for art?
  - T.Jones: Yes, only for above-ground art.
- J. Pruitt-Hill: Visited Southeast Community Center in District 10. Last night's meeting focused on restructuring inside facility, good things within facility, strong support of City College students, training program that transitions community members into career jobs at Southeast Facility. There are 10 members that are taking place in the 9910 program. There is a bit of resistance from community members with restructuring of the square footage at Southeast Community Center. They want to divide sq. ft. in ways that might not benefit community as a whole.
- A.Lantsberg: Currently, CCSF takes up about 16,000 sq. ft. and there are discussions to expand that footage. There are trying to reconfigure space to have more of an efficient use and leverage multiple uses of facilities.
- D.Pilpel: There are different ways to look at spending by district. Spending money in a district may not have a direct benefit to the district, it has a benefit to the city as a whole. When we build projects in a neighborhood, how do we do that in a way that works with residents to plan in advance coordinate and engage on investments and have jobs that are more intentional about the choices.
- J.Clary: SFPUC hired consultants to prepare reports on Community Benefits and that should have been made available to CAC. The SFPUC is in negotiation with Art Commission on how 2% is spent and CAC should understand on how to interact with the Art Commission. If we want that 2% to be spread throughout the City, we could take an action on that.

When we talk about community benefits, we need to talk about community impacts.

- D.Carmignani: On the art side, there could be programs that could benefit kids and the community.
- J.Buendia: There could be a fifth category around education. The SFPUC is trying to be more deliberate to provide students with internships that are not just in the trades. Hope the community benefits report should include environmental justice and community benefits. To see the cause and effect that compares the two.
- A.Jensen: Take a look at other community benefits like museums, they aren't spread around equally throughout the City. Where are the benefits located, like universities? CAC could think of some metrics that could be used to see if SFPUC is doing a good job in relating to the neighborhoods and if it's uniform across neighborhoods.
- A.Lantsberg: The scope of this discussion brings back to setting up a community benefits subcommittee. Looking at community benefits and art, we need to look at arts beyond visual items and consider at all sorts of artistic pursuits. The jobs are more than just construction and we need to look at a workforce development pipeline. In terms of environmental justice policy and community benefits come from impacted communities that were getting it all, except the good stuff. The benefits of a functioning infrastructure that's City wide and targeting areas where the impact happens. It's important to figure out most appropriate metrics without shortchanging other communities.
- D.Pilpel: Some of these items are project mitigation or project based, others are more operational impacts, and yet others are reflecting community concerns/policies to do things differently. This is not an exclusive list. I disagree about setting up separate committee, but we need to discuss these issues as a full body because it impacts all enterprises. If we do anything meaningful on this, meeting once a month for 1.5 hours is not enough.
- Public comment: There was agreement with the CAC discussion. Why is there more spent in one area than another? Take out required spending (CEQA) and see where the discretionary spending is at. Money is spent in best areas and following needs to the city to help people where they need it best.

#### **9. Future Agenda for next meeting and balance of year advanced calendar**

- J.Walsh: Urban agriculture – April. Update on SSIP in May. June – SSIP to go before Commission to get approved and validated – get CAC update in May.
  - J.Clary: SSIP discussion should start at subcommittee level and then they will make a recommendation before the full body.
- T.Jones: In looking at January 2012 minutes, would like to get an update on SSIP.
- A.Lantsberg: Update on SSIP. Urban agriculture program.
- Have community benefits as a standing item.

April: Urban agriculture, Community Benefits (arts, report) on how construction projects occur and relates to neighborhood.

May: SSIP Update, Francisco Reservoir Resolution.

Next regularly scheduled Full CAC meeting will take place on April 24.

#### **10. Adjournment – Meeting adjourned at 07:09 p.m.** T.Jones moved to adjourn. D.Carmignani seconded.