



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

MEETING AGENDA

**Tuesday, November 25, 2025
 5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.
 525 Golden Gate Ave., 3rd Floor Tuolumne Conference Room**

**MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY OBSERVE AND PARTICIPATE VIA ZOOM
 VIRTUAL CONFERENCE SOFTWARE**

Meeting Recording URL

<https://sfwater.zoom.us/rec/share/uLIM0dmV6NdMtuA0e2imGpxsIFrRwjL1b9gBkcxvM7HFgmGAeJIG1NKdGUvAug9I.3V0IrMEI9-BpR8L8>

Meeting Recording Passcode
 490560

Mission: The Water Subcommittee reviews water supply system reliability, water conservation, recycling, regional cooperation efforts, and other relevant plans and policies. ([Admin Code 5.140-142](#))

Members:

Jennifer Clary (Chair) (D11)	Aaron Hebert (D9)	Thomas Smegal (M-
Douglas Jacuzzi (D4)	Eliahu Perszyk (M-Large	Reg'l Water Customers)
	Water User)	

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

Staff Liaisons: Lexus Moncrease and Lupita Garcia
 Staff Email for Public Comment: cac@sfwater.org

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Call to Order and Roll Call at 5:36 pm

Members Present (3): Jacuzzi, Hebert, Smegal

Members Absent (2): Clary, Perszyk

Staff/Presenters (2): Diedre Andrus, Dela Morris, Erin Corvinova

Members of the public: Walter Van Riel.

*Member Clary marked presented at 5:41pm. Quorum maintained.

Daniel Lurie
 Mayor

Joshua Arce
 President

Stephen E. Leveroni
 Vice President

Avni Jamdar
 Commissioner

Meghan Thurlow
 Commissioner

Kate H. Stacy
 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.



2. Approval of the [September 23, 2025 Minutes](#)

A motion was made (Hebert) and seconded (Smegal) to approve the September 23, 2025, Minutes.

The minutes were approved without objection.

Public Comment: None.

3. Report from the Chair

- Chair welcomes committee members, staff, and the public

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. Presentation and Discussion: [SFPUC Affordability Policy Update](#), Erin Corvinova, Financial Planning Director, SFPUC

- Resource: [SFPUC Affordability Policy](#)

Presentation:

- SFPUC Affordability Policy Update
- Need for Affordability Metrics and Target
- Key Considerations in Developing Policy
- Affordability Policy Background
- Affordability Evaluation Process
- Defining Terms for Affordability Policy
- Income: Using Two Metrics
- Adopted Water/Sewer Target
- Latest Affordability Projection – February 2025
- Projected Discounted Bills and Affordability Target
- Current Status

Discussion:

- **Member Jacuzzi** asked when showing the cost increases in both water and wastewater, does the SFPUC have an idea of how much of the rapid growth of cost in wastewater is allocated to the cost of financing versus implementation.

Staff Corvinova responded it is very significant. Most of the capital plan in wastewater is being debt-funded right now by either loans or SFPUC bonds and that is adding a significant amount of cost to the wastewater enterprise to afford these capital projects.

Member Jacuzzi commented the increases on the water supply side are not as dramatic and asked if this is taking the planned alternative water supplies that have been discussed in this committee over the past couple of years.

Staff Corvinova responded for this forecast because it is tied into the 10-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) which was adopted last

February, it did not include the full suite of alternative water supply projects that are included in the Alternative Water Supply (AWS) report. The ones that have passed the threshold are in the startup and planning funding phase, nothing is currently being constructed as far as she is aware.

- **Member Jacuzzi** commented some of the AWS projects that were discussed were rather expensive and should be informed if they will be happening or not and how that might affect the increase of water rates.

Member Corvinova responded now that we have this too, we do run a lot of scenarios and will get requests from water or wastewater saying they are considering doing a project and ask what the rate increases would need to be to afford the project. It has been a while since she has run numbers on AWS projects but can do it for the Water Enterprise.

- **Member Hebert** commented one of the roles of the CAC is to review the capital plan which is still yet to be presented and asked what percent of these increases is related to capital projects.

Staff Corvinova responded she does not have an immediate answer. There is a table but would need to find it.

Member Hebert commented he is aware of a variety of capital projects that need to be done, and they are important but often at tension with affordability and it would be helpful to have the CAC educated about when to advocate or not advocate for something and knowing how it will impact affordability is something the CAC would like to be aware of and asked for broad-stroke information to be shared with the CAC.

Staff Corvinova responded yes.

- **Member Hebert** commented the SFPUC targets for income will be different compared to other utilities because of the higher average incomes and asked in the broader utility world what would affordable utility rates look like.

Staff Corvinova responded there is a big report the SFPUC did prior to adopting this policy which summarize what other think tanks, industry associations, and regulators use. One of the most common metrics is one that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) uses. They don't claim it's about affordability, but people interpret it that way that takes the median household income and says combined water and sewer bill should not exceed 4%. That works out because our median incomes are higher so that's why we target the adopted 3%. The SFPUC is basically themselves to a higher standard with the acknowledgement that even though incomes are high, much of it is going to rent.

- **Member Smegal** commented they are doing a little bit of work in their strategy project around affordability and ran across a data difficulty and wanted to ask about the San Francisco side of it which is that the bill at least as we see it, represents that for single-family homeowners and is that generally the case in San Francisco and if most people in multifamily units are not individually billed for water or wastewater.

Staff Corvinova responded most of the multifamily buildings are master metered.

Member Smegal asked if any data analysis has been done.

Staff Corvinova responded it super challenging because once it passes the meter, the SFPUC does not know who is paying that bill. It all depends on the terms of the lease, or if it is a Homeowners Association (HOA), what they put into their HOA guidelines. In some cases, it is passed to the tenants in others the landlord just eats the cost of the rate increases and in others they may divide it up equally. Tenants and others in master metered buildings are referred to in the water utility industry as hard-to-reach customers. It is hard to give them discounts and hard to know how they are being impacted by things. The one thing the SFPUC has not been able to do and is not incorporated into the policy but was part of the research done to develop the policy is that the American Community Survey which is a product done by the Census asked what do you pay in your monthly water bill and whether it is paid to a landlord or to a utility. The SFPUC to have a data scientist cross reference self-reported data to with the other demographic information in the report as well as individual incomes and provide the SFPUC one report showing at the individual household level with error bars around every estimate, what percentage of SFPUC customers were over that affordability target. The target right here is based on average usage for a single-family household but when looking at income it is looking at all of San Francisco.

Member Smegal asked if it was a little conservative.

Staff Corvinova responded she believes so because we don't know the total number of households in the multifamily buildings but do believe that on average, multifamily residents use less water because they have less irrigation compared to single-family.

- **Chair Clary** asked if they have looked at energy customers because it will capture a lot of the multifamily households there and if there is thought about providing a subsidy.

Staff Corvinova responded we do have to keep our water and power revenues separate for legal purposes so if we wanted to subsidize people via their energy bill for their water usage that's a lot of obstacles to do so and has heard of other utilities looking into it.

- **Member Clary** commented the SFPUC has developed a policy and process for data sharing and if they have thought about it because it could be used to pick up the affordability program.

Staff Corvinova responded we have seen the SFPUC tool and is something they are interested in, but a challenge is trying to match up customers where they don't have a way to cross reference even our own CleanPowerSF billing data with water and sewer billing data.

Chair Clary commented the proposal would be you request the CARES data which is the low income rate assistance program for energy from PG&E and they'd be required to give it to you and the investor-owned utilities have been matching up the data since 2010 and they say it takes a person a couple of days to do it and appreciates the SFPUC trying to keep rates down as a way to approach affordability because it goes up faster than inflation and

asked how many people are able to take advantage of the program now and what are you budgeting for future enrollment.

Staff Corvinova responded Staff Morris and Staff Andrus will be presenting on this later tonight.

- **Member Jacuzzi** asked if the projections also consider water conservation over the next 20 years.

Staff Corvinova responded they do and have incorporated into financial models household growth which are new customers entirely. We also assume that per capital water usage does decline as people conserve water and one of the reasons for conserving water is rates going up and SFPUC does it best to forecast all those factors.

Public Comment:

- **Walter Van Riel** commented everyone is paying the same amount for the cost of water where some people don't make a whole lot of money and others make a lot of money, so it is unfair everyone is paying the same amount. For some people water is very expensive and for others it is inexpensive. The average cost is an 8% cost increase and asked how this compares with the CPI and standard cost of living.

6. **Presentation and Discussion:** [Customer Assistance Program & Post Covid Moratorium Resumption of Collections Overview](#), Dela W. Morris, Program Manager, SFPUC

Presentation:

- Customer Assistance Program (CAP) & Post COVID Moratorium Resumption of Collections Overview
- Introductions
- Background
- Overview of the Customer Assistance Program
- Customer Assistance Program (CAP) Eligibility Requirements
- Available Options for Customers to Apply for the Customer Assistance Program (CAP)
- Application Business Process Overview
- What Service does TransUnion Provide?
- What services does HSA Provide?
- What Disqualifies Applicants from the CAP Program?
- CAP Approvals
- CAP Financials and Program Highlights
- Four-Year Arrearage Financials
- Current Arrearage Financials
- 2025 Resumption of Collections Highlights
- Customer Assistance Provided – Past
- Customer Assistance Provided – Current
- Things in the works for 2026
- Feedback/ Q&A

Discussion:

- **Member Hebert** thanked Staff Morris for the detailed presentation and congratulated her on mastering so much material in such a short

amount of time and asked how the SFPUC has thought about connecting to people who might be paying through their landlord or a split bill or if it is implicitly included in their rent.

Staff Morris responded Staff Corvinova said it best earlier in that it is hard to gauge what a customer's usage is when it is in a building with mixed-use or a multi-use building. Unless the landlord is making the decision to split the bill equally which would not necessarily be fair if you have 4 people in one unit and 1 in another so there is such discrepancy on the usage and it is hard to justify giving a discount to these facilities, especially when funds are so limited.

Staff Andrus further responded this is a commonly asked question among the utility forum and learned that other utilities who tried to tackle this were not successful because it is hard to manage the landlords. The SFPUC has limited staffing and was fortunate to have Staff Morris onboarded and they are going to try to find solutions with the current resources available. The SFPUC is going to continue to monitor and if someone finds a success pilot or a successful way to manage this, we will look into it.

- **Member Smegal** asked if there is law or regulation in San Francisco that keeps the SFPUC from shutting off service to a landlord who has decided not to pay the utility bill.
- **Member Andrus** responded the SFPUC tries not to shut off but there is nothing in writing.

Chair Clary commented one of the issues is they require one of the tenants to become the responsible party and collect the water bills and asked if the SFPUC has that practice for example the Academy of Art that had a \$5 million dollar bill.

Staff Andrus responded we feel proud of the successful negotiations to get those payments going as it has been a challenge.

Chair Clary commented the Water Board's AB401 report suggested debit cards or something for low-income assistance in multifamily dwellings. This report is a little outdated since it came out right before COVID, but they were looking at 3 types of bill assistance, crisis assistance and tenant assistance and for the past 5 years the focus is on bill assistance because the statewide net estimate is about \$120 million.

- **Member Hebert** commented the number of delinquent accounts has an alarming rise and it was a very manageable number before the pandemic and asked if the rise was due to rising income inequality.

Chair Clary further commented every water agency will show you the same data.

Member Smegal commented in a way it was permission to not pay your water bill. During the 2008 financial crisis, everyone still paid their water bill because no one at the State or Federal level said we are going to pause collections, however, during the pandemic something psychological shifted once the State said don't worry about your water bill. Those balances built up which are not going to clear very easily and will need to find a way to pay no matter what their income level is.

- **Chair Clary** asked what kind of analysis has been done about who is able to access the low-income assistance program and if they have looked at demographic and neighborhood breakdown and commented while you are trying to make it as accessible as possible, it could create some barriers for people who don't speak English as their first language.

Staff Morris responded they looked at the data and this is why additional language for applications were implemented. Letters are also sent out to customers in various languages and the SFPUC has a language line where they can use a translator to have a conversation with the customer.

Staff Andrus further responded we also have done an analysis regarding zip codes, ethnicities and other demographics. We have plans to do more targeted outreach in junction with External Affairs.

- **Chair Clary** asked if there is a budget and how much can the program grow because there is a limit to the non-rate revenue.

Staff Morris responded the budget is \$8 million dollars right now and this is why it is important to start identifying other available resources. They are currently in the post-evaluation verification (PEV) process and there is a shift to identify some resources to this. She is also participating in a CAP steering committee that has brought several administrators from the utilities across the country to talk about best practices and one of the biggest pain points being discussed is how to identify additional funding to grow individual CAP programs.

- **Chair Clary** commented that she congratulates Staff Morris on her hard work because this program has gone far in a short amount of time and asked if there are conversations with East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) because they have been doing this a lot longer and if they discussed flow restrictors.

Staff Andrus responded yes, they were discussed.

- **Member Smegal** asked for the presenters to come back in a year or two to receive an update.

Public Comment: None.

7. **Discussion and Possible Action:** [Resolution on Salmon Restoration Projects](#), Jennifer Clary, Water CAC Chair

- **Member Smegal** commented the only thing that might cause timing to pause is that the Scientific Basis report in September was a draft.

The fourth whereas clause was updated to “Whereas the Board in September 2025 released an updated draft Scientific Basis Report...”

Member Clary responded she does not care about what the State Water Board is doing. In 2016, they passed the flows in 2019, they said they were going to do voluntary agreements to get it done faster and since then nothing has happened. Her intent behind the resolution is to say since the intent of the voluntary agreements was to get things done more quickly, just start doing it and save the salmon population. The op-ed that was recently published sounded like they are already doing it and looking at 77 acres of habitat.

- **Member Smegal** commented the graph is puzzling as a strategy from the non-government organizations (NGOs) because why not let them fail if it is not going to work.

Chair Clary responded the cost of failure is extinction.

Member Smegal commented he understands this, but they only have an 8-year window and if they fail then it goes back to the other stuff.

Chair Clary responded it is a tough conversation to say I am going to allow you to keep making mistakes in the hopes it gets better down the line.

- **Chair Clary** commented there is a difference of opinion with leadership and Bay Area Water Supply & Conservation Agency (BAWSCA) to which she disagreed with the testimony provided at the hearing. Since some basic disagreements exist in the committee, something that they can all agree on is investing the money right now. This resolution was also seen by Peter Drekmeier, and he is fine with it as well.
- **Member Hebert** commented a whereas clause should be included that shows one of the principal impacts of our water supply is this unavailable conflict.

A whereas clause was included in the beginning to say “Whereas, Since the inauguration of Hetch Hetchy System in 1932 salmon populations have been endangered by increasing diversions from the Tuolumne River, creating an untenable situation between water supply for agriculture and the Bay Area and the needs of salmon.”

Member Smegal commented endangered is a coded word.

The first whereas clause was updated from "...salmon populations have been endangered" to "...salmon population have been significantly impacted..."

Member Hebert commented instead of untenable situation, it could read difficult trade off.

The first whereas clause was updated from "...creating untenable situation..." to "...creating difficult tradeoffs..."

- **Chair Clary** commented another problem is San Francisco uses the agricultural districts as a reason to not do things and there is a contractual agreement however, San Francisco must pay more money than the agricultural districts and maybe they should pay for the 1/3 that they are only responsible for.

Member Smegal commented the therefore clause should include language having the SFPUC work with partner agencies to expedite implementation since they are not going to be able to independently expedite implementation such as the LaGrange Bridge.

The therefore clause was updated to include "work with its partners to..."

- **Member Smegal** commented in the further resolved clause should reflect that the SFPUC has a biannual budget and should include the SFPUC CAC recommends funding to be identified.

The further resolved clause was updated to "Further Resolved, the SFPUC CAC recommends that project funding be included in the SFPUC bi-annual budget, to be published in January 2026."

- **Member Smegal** commented the fifth whereas clause should reflect that commercial salmon fishing has been cancelled statewide.

The fifth whereas clause was updated to reflect salmon season was cancelled statewide since 2022.

Member Hebert commented in the Therefore, be it Resolved clause it should include these actions should be taken regardless of the State Water Board.

The Therefore, be it Resolved clause was updated to "...regardless of the timing of Board actions on the TVA."

- **Member Hebert** asked if this was going to be presented at the Full CAC meeting.

Chair Clary responded yes, and the Full CAC needs to pass it for it to be considered.

Member Smegal left the meeting at 7:16 pm. Quorum maintained.

A motion was made (Hebert) and seconded (Jacuzzi) to adopt the resolution.

The motion was passed with the following votes:

Ayes (3): Clary, Jacuzzi, Hebert

Noes (0):

Absent (2): Perszyk, Smegal.

Public Comment: None.

8. Staff Report

- No Staff Report

Public Comment: None.

9. Future Agenda Items and Resolutions

Standing Subjects

- Groundwater
- Water Quality

Specific Subjects

- Integrating Tribal Leaders into SFPUC Land Management Decisions
- State Board Water Rights
- Water Enterprise Environmental Stewardship Policy Implementation Report
- State of the Regional Water System Report – Bi-annual report
- Drought resilience: 3-year water supply update
- Water Equity and Homelessness
- Water Treatment Plant Tour
- Sunol Watershed Tour
- Capital Plan Update

Adopted Resolutions for Follow Up

- Resolution in Support of a Resilient Water Supply [adopted August 17, 2021](#)
- 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 Improved Communications Related to the San Francisco Groundwater Supply Project [adopted August 21, 2018](#)
- Resolution in Supporting Stewardship and Public Access in the Redeveloped Lake Merced West Property [adopted in March 15, 2016](#)
- Resolution on Impacts of Drought on System Maintenance and Improvements [adopted January 19, 2016](#)

Public Comment: None.

10. Announcements/Comments Please visit www.sfpuc.org/cac for final confirmation of the next scheduled meeting, agenda, and materials.

Public Comment: None.

11. Adjournment at 7:17 pm

For more information concerning the agendas, minutes, and meeting information, please visit www.sfpuc.org/cac. For more information concerning the CAC, please contact staff by email at cac@sfgwater.org or by calling (415) 517-8465.

Disability Access

The following services are available on request 48 hours prior to the meeting; except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline shall be 4:00 p.m. of the last business day of the preceding week: For American sign language interpreters or the use of a reader during a meeting, a sound enhancement system, and/or alternative formats of the agenda and minutes, please contact Lexus Moncrease at (415) 517-8465 or our TTY at (415) 554-3488 to make arrangements for the accommodation. Late requests will be honored, if possible.

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. Individuals with chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should call our accessibility hotline at (415) 554-6789.

LANGUAGE ACCESS

Per the Language Access Ordinance (Chapter 91 of the San Francisco Administrative Code), Chinese, Spanish and or Filipino (Tagalog) interpreters will be available upon requests. Meeting Minutes may be translated, if requested, after they have been adopted by the Committee. Assistance in additional languages may be honored whenever possible. To request assistance with these services please contact Lexus Moncrease at (415) 517-8465, or cac@sfgwater.org at least 48 hours in advance of the hearing. Late requests will be honored if possible.

語言服務

根據三藩市行政法第91章"語言服務條例", 中文、西班牙語和/或菲律賓語口譯服務在有人提出要求後會提供。翻譯版本的會議記錄可在委員會後要求提供。其他語言協助在可能的情況下也可提供。請於會議前至少48小時致電(415) 517-8465 或電郵至 [\[cac@sfgwater.org\]](mailto:cac@sfgwater.org) Lexus Moncrease 提出口譯要求。逾期要求, 在可能狀況下會被考慮。

ACCESO A IDIOMAS

De acuerdo con la Ordenanza de Acceso a Idiomas "*Language Access Ordinance*" (Capítulo 91 del Código Administrativo de San Francisco "*Chapter 91 of the San Francisco Administrative Code*") intérpretes de chino, español y/o filipino (tagalo) estarán disponibles de ser requeridos. Los minutos podrán ser traducidos, de ser requeridos, luego de ser aprobados por la comité. La asistencia en idiomas adicionales se tomará en cuenta siempre que sea posible. Para solicitar asistencia con estos servicios favor comunicarse con Lexus Moncrease al (415) 517-8465, o cac@sfgwater.org por lo menos 48 horas antes de la reunión. Las solicitudes tardías serán consideradas de ser posible.

PAG-ACCESS SA WIKA

Ayon sa Language Access Ordinance (Chapter 91 ng San Francisco Administrative Code), maaaring mag-request ng mga tagapagsalin sa wikang Tsino, Espanyol, at/o Filipino (Tagalog). Kapag hiniling, ang mga kaganapan ng miting ay maaring isalin sa ibang wika matapos ito ay aprobahan ng komite. Maari din magkaroon ng tulong sa ibang wika. Sa mga ganitong uri ng kahilingan, mangyaring tumawag sa Lexus Moncrease at (415) 517-8465, o cac@sfgov.org sa hindi bababa sa 48 oras bago mag miting. Kung maari, ang mga late na hiling ay posibleng pagbibigyan.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code §2.100] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220 San Francisco, CA 94102, Phone: (415) 252-3100/Fax: (415) 252-3112, Email: ethics.commission@sfgov.org.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, by mail to Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244 San Francisco, CA 94102-4683; by telephone 415-554-7724, by Fax 415-554-7854, or by email: sotf@sfgov.org

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.