



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

Tuesday, February 28, 2012

5:30 – 7:00 p.m.

1155 Market Street, 4th Floor

Members:

Stephen Bjorgan (M)	Jessica Buendia (D6)	Doug Cain (D3)
Donald R. Carmignani (D2)	Jennifer Clary (D11)	Walt Farrell (D 7)
Richard T. Hansen (D1)	Art Jensen (M)	Terrence Jones – Chair (D10)
Alex Lantsberg (BOS Pres)	Mike Marshall (D5)	Dairo Romero (D9)
		Javieree Pruitthill (D8)

Staff Liaisons: Suzanne Gautier and Teresa Young

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call** - Chair Jones called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m. when the panel achieved quorum.
Present: R.Hansen; D.Carmignani; D.Cain; D.Pilpel; M.Marshall; W.Farrell; J.Pruithill; D.Romero; T.Jones; J.Clary; S.Bjorgan; A.Lantsberg; A.Jensen;
Absent: J.Buendia;

2. **Approval of the January 24 meeting minutes**
 J.Clary moved; A.Lantsberg seconded. Minutes approved by acclamation.

3. **Public Comment:** No public comment.

4. **Report from the Chair:** Transition Memo for the Mayor (see attached), Welcome New Members, Updated Subcommittee Assignments, Attendance Policy
 Welcomed new CAC member – Javieree Pruitthill (D8).
 Transition memo went out to Mayor and got feedback, talked about CAC vacancies. Member roster – list of everyone and subcommittees and districts – at the top of the agenda.
 Year-end CAC report included from A.Lantsberg.
 Document request log – track document requests at every meeting and send to subcommittee Chair and/or full CAC Chair.

5. **Report from the Former Chair (Alex Lantsberg):** 2011 Year End CAC Report (see attached)

6. **Staff Report:** Member bios needed, RSVP to J.Walsh via email or phone call to establish quorum.

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



7. Subcommittee Chair Reports:

- a. Power Subcommittee (Doug Cain)
 - i. Last month's subcommittee meeting: John Doyle from Power – funding from Transbay Cable and asking Power subcommittee for input. \$5M a year funding.
 - ii. Increase of power rates over 4 years. Still leaves GF Depts getting subsidized rates and leaves Power Enterprise underfunded. 2013 – 2014 a lot of power generation equipment upgrades needed at Moccasin. Management under Water, not Power. No funds to update what could be obsolete equipment. 2 cent bump – now Power enterprise has enough to borrow funds/bonds for O&M issues, can affect water rates down the road.
 - iii. Can we discuss if we want to assume future debt or want to have those rates revisited in regards to Prop E in 2004.
 - iv. Next meeting agenda – land use policy going to be reviewed on March 6 at 5:30pm. Been a burning issue for several years – not just real estate that SFPUC owns and may sell, but also regards to how public uses land.
- b. Water Subcommittee (Jennifer Clary)
 - i. Didn't have a quorum last meeting and weren't able to take into any action.
 - ii. Want to get comments and feedback from everyone. Can't take action, but compile into comments. Potable offset investigation presentation public material until March 13.
 - iii. Land use policy scheduled to be adopted by Commission two weeks ago. J.Clary asked for it to be sent back to CAC because she requested it earlier, but it wasn't available at the time. Commission sent it back to CAC for comment. Please review. Item that CAC took a position in 2008. Had considerable amount of public comment, so great interest to anyone on SFPUC land. Consider who might be impacted on SFPUC's decision.
 - iv. Land use policies – two pieces of properties in SF. Some properties are outside SF.
 - v. Circulate 2008 action to rest of CAC members. Submit formal request to S.Gautier. T.Jones will forward on.
- c. Wastewater Subcommittee (Alex Lantsberg)
 - i. Last meeting had informal dialog with staff about urban watershed framework. Staff figuring out how to evaluate green infrastructure and integrating that into gray infrastructure. CAC needs to give this a push. Will continue this discussion next meeting.
 - ii. Community group ACE contacted A.Lantsberg to know when discussion of Community Benefits will take place. Want to participate in discussion.
- d. No public comment.

8. Discussion: Non-potable water supply report/The Potable Offset Investigation (Steve Ritchie) SFPUC has prepared a draft report on potential yield of non-potable i.e. non-tap water supply options (presentation attached).

Presentation was given by Alison Watson from RMC. Paula Kehoe and Molly Petrick were present to answer questions.

Question & answer:

R.Hansen: Are there cost estimates to install 261,837 systems?

A.Watson: We didn't develop cost estimates for this phase. However, future phases may look at that.

A.Lantsberg: Scenario 5 took the maximum of 1-4 and added them up. Did you look at combination of options? For example, a house doing graywater and rainwater harvesting?

A.Watson: We didn't look at that at this stage. We're currently not planning to. The issue is that it becomes very site-specific. Difficult on city scale, but doesn't mean it can't be done. Didn't do it at this stage.

D.Carmignani: How do you do calculations on open landscapes for rainwater supply?

A.Watson: Took CEMAS data for 1917 through 2005. Period of record – rainfall record and took average rainfall by month. Used SF planning GIS coverage to find percentage of impervious by categories. Looking at area of SFR and percentage of impervious areas, and rainfall from historical data. Excluded streets. Specific to single family residences.

A.Jensen: To the extent of if supply comes at one time of the year and demand at another time of the year, what percentage of storage of rainwater in the city a constraint?

A.Watson: The availability of storage was a constraint in the scenarios – when we looked at implement rainwater scenario, we assumed the specific storage sizes and carryover storage – limited to some extent, but because of the size we used, it didn't seem to limit it too much. It is still a consideration and that was one of the assumptions that went into scenario 1. Didn't limit the 44 MGD, but it limited 3 MGD in the rainwater scenario.

S.Bjorgan: What existing rainwater programs do they give to the owner of a single family residence?

P.Kehoe: We have a laundry to landscape program – offer \$100 landscape fit for \$5. ***** could not hear other programs offered***** Currently, that's the only thing that's accepted without a permit. On the residential side is laundry to landscape. We also offer a permit rebate – if you change your bathroom, we offer up to \$225 off departmental inspection and permit for outdoor irrigation.

D.Romero: New developments – is there anything in place based on incentives for contractors?

A.Watson: In the projected recycled water service areas for 40,000 square feet, there is currently an ordinance for dual plumbing. Nothing of city scale beyond that. In terms of cost to implement, it varies depending on the installation.

D.Pilpel: Was this the link where the report goes to? Part of the reports? Is there a more detailed summary?

S.Gautier: There's a 49 page appendices document linked together.

A.Watson: Also called a summary.

D.Pilpel: How does this coordinate with the wastewater LIDs?

A.Watson: purpose of this was to look at water-side and offsets – did not consider LIDs. Focused on potable offsets.

D.Pilpel: Have the wastewater folks looked at this? Does this make sense to the wastewater crowd?

A.Watson: Did work with them.

D.Pilpel: Although you talk about water offset, there's also a wastewater impact/inflow. Has that part of it been checked out?

A.Watson: No, it hasn't.

P.Kehoe: We worked with WWE on the development of this.

D.Pilpel: Operational impact. At some point we reduce the sewage inflow on the wastewater side/treatment plant. If a bunch of water goes away only on certain days depending on demand and supply.

P.Kehoe: We will follow up with them on that.

M.Marshall: The 44MGD of potential supply – that's just all the stormwater we get plus some seepage that may come from above or below, maybe actual sub-ground water versus other seepage?

A.Watson: Rainwater plus seepage water, but also includes graywater and blackwater. About 21MGD rainwater, about half. This was looking at onsite, looking at hardscapes in the city, not including streets. Looked specifically what could be captured on rooftops. Not directing to the sewage system. Parcel by parcel basis.

M.Marshall: How much do you charge us for this work?

A.Watson: Spent up to 90,000. Took us about 5 months to do work. Don't have another contract and reached capacity. No money to do next phase yet.

J.Clary: Next steps – Paula. The Transbay terminal no longer a redevelopment area. Looking how to do combo graywater stormwater treatment, separate system for high rises.

P.Kehoe: Transbay is still continuing to propose the graywater stormwater system for their own systems: toilet flushing and irrigation. SPFUC is looking at a program to look at new commercial mixed use developments and commercial developments to taking onsite water for toilet flushing and irrigation purposes. We are actively working on this.

J.Clary: So, what Transbay is planning on is what you built into this and does not exceed what you are looking at.

P.Kehoe: Right.

T.Jones: Did you look at existing recycling programs in the city or are there no existing recycling programs?

A.Watson: There are a small number of developments currently using onsite supplies. Did look at that.

P.Kehoe: Excluded 1.6 MGD per day projected for westside recycled water program serving Golden Gate Park, Presidio, Lincoln Park Golf Courses. Not part of these projections.

T.Jones: Are these projections or actual exists right now?

P.Kehoe: There is no recycled water – that's a project we are currently proposing and working toward. There will be a Haring Park Recycled Water project – serve to the Golf Course using Daly City's recycled water. Partnership with Daly City to build pipeline for recycled water – completing the project in 6 months. Lake Merced Golf uses recycled water from Daly City.

T.Jones: So there is some recycled water being used in the City.

D.Cain: Recycled water ordinance – is 40,000 ground square footage or total square footage of project?

A.Watson: It's a development over 40,000 square feet.

D.Cain: Special designated areas on east side?

A.Watson: And west side – mainly eastern SF, Golden Gate Park, portions of west side under ordinance. And 10,000 irrigation that falls under this.

D.Cain: For all building types?

A.Watson: Yes.

D.Cain: Some projects built under this ordinance, so there are numbers now.

A.Watson: Yes, Mission Bay.

A.Jensen: Comment – the work that's been reported is valuable whether you like the numbers resulted or not. Puts forth methodology, framework to do analysis.

D.Pilpel: Programs existing with rebates – one or two page summary of conservation programs? Rebates? How much we've set aside and what has been used and experience?

P.Kehoe: Just prepared report for Commission on rainwater program. Memo describes program and contents of program, participants, survey, but does not have potable offset because it doesn't have enough time to capture that data.

D.Pilpel: Make this a committee request over this past fiscal year? Look at that compared with budget. Can track where the money is with benefit.

J.Clary: Moving forward, look at costs, yields. The idea that one site one supply doesn't make sense – need to understand how combinations of supplies work. Tracking actual investment – came up during non-quorum meeting. Is there a one-stop shop to understand this? Big blue home. Track yield achieving over time. Want to understand SFPUC to create mechanism on tracking this – measure that over time. How to incorporate the wastewater program with this. May have conflicting priorities that could impact actual supplies available.

9. Review of SFPUC Commission's Advance Calendar and requests for future agenda items by members of the CAC, staff, and general public. Next regularly scheduled Full CAC meeting March 27.

T.Jones: Wastewater Enterprise Construction in Progress – lists of projects completed and in process – all progress of these. Can start listing out districts receiving projects. Community benefits – could be community detriments. 2% of construction costs go to arts programs – beautify the city. Put it on next meeting's agenda with SFPUC supporting documents.

Next meeting topics:

S.Bjorgan: Community benefits, real estate.

J.Pruithill: Community benefits by district.

D.Cain: Community benefits with projects by districts. Matrix that shows by district what enterprise money is being spent.

A.Jensen: Community benefits.

A.Lantsberg: Community benefits – capital expenditures driven by specific needs. What are the above and beyond things by districts.

T.Jones: Community benefits.

R.Hansen: N/A

W.Farrell: Redistricting.

M.Marshall: not for next meeting, but next one or two meetings – Restore Hetch Hetchy filing papers for ballot initiative. Want to come in and brief CAC.

D.Carmignani: Community Benefits.

J.Clary: Under Community Benefits – SFPUC negotiating 2% with Arts Commission – hired a consultant to develop a report around community benefits. Environmental justice.

D.Pilpel: Districts and community benefits.

D.Romero: Community benefits.

Next full CAC discussion topic: Community Benefits, environmental justice by districts – discuss construction projects, public benefits, impacts

10. Adjournment – Meeting adjourned at 06:58 p.m. T.Jones moved to adjourn.

A.Lantsberg seconded.