



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

MEETING MINUTES

**Tuesday, May 27, 2025
5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.**

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

Meeting Recording URL

<https://sfwater.zoom.us/rec/share/vBBsaSylwhWUcJCx9FJ3VvxRiMtdagH6SyRPNS38tq4HFjEyBU1O-QHfcBaAoogr.u2LijpUBtnKUceL0>

Meeting Passcode

672399

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)	Eliahu Perszyk (M-Large Water User)
Douglas Jacuzzi (D4)	Amy Nagengast (8)	Thomas Smegal (M-Reg'l Water Customers)

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 5:31 pm

Members present at roll call (5): Clary, Jacuzzi, Hebert, Nagengast, Perszyk

Absent (1): Smegal*

Staff/Presenters Present: Eddy So, Raymond Mah, Enio Sebastiani, Shailen Talati, Andrew DeGraca, Natalie Stone

*Member Smegal joined the meeting at 5:35 pm. Quorum maintained.

2. Approval of the [March 25, 2025](#) Minutes

Daniel L. Lurie
Mayor

Kate H. Stacy
President

Joshua Arce
Vice President

Avni Jamdar
Commissioner

Steve Leveroni
Commissioner

Dennis J. Herrera
General Manager



A motion was made (Jacuzzi) and seconded (Perszyk) to approve the March 25, 2025 minutes.

Approved without objection.

Public Comment: None.

3. Report from the Chair

- Chair welcomes committee members, staff, and the public
 - Welcomed new Committee member, Aaron Herbert and did introductions.

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. Presentation and Discussion: [Public Health Goals](#), Eddy So, P.E. Senior Water Quality Engineer, SFPUC

Presentation:

- 2025 Triennial Update for Public Health Goal (PHG) Evaluation
- PHG Evaluation
- ACWA PHG Report Guidelines 2025
- PHG Development
- Water Quality Levels
- Contaminants Above PHGs
- Bromate
- Bromate (con'td)
- Hexavalent Chromium (CR-6)
- Cr-6 (cont'd)
- Lead
- Lead Reduction and Outreach Efforts
- Lead Service Line Inventory
- PHG Future Action Recommendations
- Questions

Discussion:

- **Member Nagengast** asked how these compare to SFPUC's target levels.

Staff So responded some use 40% as the target and others use 80%. bromate and hexavalent chromium for example are below the 40% target level. Lead does not have a target level because there was no lead within the distribution system and the lead detection is in the tap samples at select residential customers where they had to meet the lead Cover Rule Site Selection Requirement.

- **Member Smegal** asked is the 40% target, 40% of the Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) so like 4 for parts per billion (ppb).

Staff So responded yes and for example, in valent chromium 40% of 10 is 4.

- **Chair Clary** commented she is not fond of the PowerPoint presentation because as an advocate, she does not agree with how everything was presented and asked where the SFPUC believes the bromate is coming from, considering the long challenge San Francisco has had with disinfection by-products and if it is a temporary issue.

Staff So responded they found bromate was increasing starting from June 2024 to November 2024 and during this time, the bromate level in the raw water was increasing. While they have not come to a final conclusion, the SFPUC believes it is related to the lowering of the San Andreas reservoir for construction and exposing more natural soil to the environment. While the increase is temporary, the bromate level in the soil continues to be about 20 to 22 parts per billion based on the last 8 years of data.

- **Member Smegal** asked if the increases are only seen at the local sources or if it is seen through out Hetch Hetchy considering it originated in Tesla.

Staff So responded by law we are required to monitor bromate because we use ozone. In Hetch Hetchy, the geological formation is mainly rocks so there has not been significant bromide. In the local water, the geological formation is a mix of clay, soil, seeds so compared to Hetch Hetchy, there will be more significant levels.

Staff Sebastiani further responded that it is UV and chlorine disinfection for Hetch Hetchy.

- **Chair Clary** asked if the chrome 6 increase is also related to the drawdown of the San Andreas Reservoir and if the SFPUC is seeing water treatment as to converting any of the chrome 3 to chrome 6.

Staff So responded chrome 6 was detected in the local water sources including San Antonio, Calaveras, and the San Andreas reservoir but it was just slightly above the detection limit. It was detected in the local raw water sources, but it was not detected in the water and the chrome 6 was detected in the local groundwater. chrome 3 naturally has a higher percentage than chrome 6 in the natural soil. When chrome 6 was not under the drinking water standard it was regulated as total chrome by the State Board and the EPA. During the oxidizing situation, some of the chrome 3 will be oxidized to Chrome 6. The chance for this happening at the treatment level is very low.

- **Chair Clary** asked how many homes are currently being tested for lead and if they were long term where they are tested year after year

and if the detection is consistent or new and if a household is testing at or above detection, are there any special steps taken and if any grants or inspections are provided.

Staff So responded in 2024, 50 homes were tested, and it is according to the existing Lead and Copper rule. There were more than 100 homes in the pool but not everyone is willing to do the monitoring and were lucky to get the minimum 50 homes. The majority had lead below the detection limit of one and out of the 50, there were about 10 homes that had their levels about 5 ppb and the homes are not being compared year to year because households may participate one year and not participate another year. Regulatory action level is still 15, these levels are still below the regulatory action level, there is no requirement to do anything and in the letter sent by the SFPUC, outreach language from the US EPA and State Board would tell them if your water has been sitting for a couple of hours, you need to flush it before using it and do not use hot water for baby formula or cooking.

Staff DeGraca further responded that historically what the SFPUC has done is if they are above the action level, we also offer for the inspector to take a look.

Member Perszyk asked if the level is above 0, is it clearly communicated that any lead above 0 parts per billion is a health safety risk.

Staff Mah responded on the SFPUC website there are different fact sheets for different audiences so there are some for childcare facilities and for residents. The fact sheet on the childcare center does have reference for 0 goal that the American Pediatrics Association has.

Chair Clary asked when homeowners are sent their results is it clearly communicated there is no safe level of lead and if the SFPUC is going to provide any assistance for folks who may have lead levels above 1,5 or 15. and asked for copies of what is being sent to homeowners be sent to the Staff Liaison so CAC members can view.

Staff DeGraca responded that there are some documents where that's mandatory language and they are going to and hoping to restart the program in 2027 and currently the issue is just resources to ensure consistent delivery to everyone. Right now, staff are anticipating what the demands are going to be and are trying to get all the schools, including private and San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) to participate in the program.

- **Member Hebert** commented the understanding is staff are working overtime to replace lead-based service line and there are lead components on the customer side indicated by the diagrams and asked when someone in their home get the lead results are there any industry estimates from the amount that is coming from the supply side and how much is estimated to come from the customer side.

Staff DeGraca responded SFPUC is currently in the process of removing the last lead user service line and that replacement started in 2020 and is anticipated to be completed within next year which will be 4 years ahead of the proposed completion year of 2030. Once this is done, all the lead pipe that we know will be out of the distribution system and brass fixtures and lead solders potentially in the homes will be the source of lead people see. There is no lead in the distribution system. To say how much and where is difficult and SFPUC has done monitoring in some schools where we've done sequential samples and in sample places found 20 bottles had lead and it appears like a lead solder running along throughout the building and the fixtures that exist in that building.

Chair Clary commented her understanding of the school testing site around the State was the vast majority of lead was found in the fixtures and new fixtures have a much lower allowed lead content so replacing fixtures is a good first step.

Public Comment: None.

6. Presentation and Discussion: [SFPUC Water Quality Division Contaminants of Emerging Concern in the San Francisco Drinking Water System - 2025 Update](#), Raymond Mah, Senior Environmental Engineer, SFPUC

Presentation:

- SFPUC Water Quality Division (WQD) Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in the San Francisco Drinking Water System – 2025 Update
- What are CECs?
- Outline
- Background: CEC Drivers
- Background: CEC Approach
- Background: CEC Approach (continued)
- Background: Technical Reviewers
- Proposed 3 General Types of Contaminants and 10 CEC Groups
- Progress Update Since 2022
- Progress Update Since 2022 (continued)
- Proposed 2025 CEC Priorities
- Microbial Waterborne Pathogens
- Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS)
- DBPs (Nitrosamines)
- DBPs (other than nitrosamines)
- Harmful Algal blooms and Algal Toxins
- Inorganics
- Organics
- Low Priority CEC Groups
- Next Steps
- Questions

Discussion:

- **Member Jacuzzi** commented at the last water subcommittee meeting; surface water runoff being directed to Lake Merced was discussed and the concern of the speed that it takes stormwater to rush off the streets and enter Lake Merced and it would be great to see the different divisions within PUC collaborate to ensure the water does get routinely tested so we know the quality before it goes into the lake asked what emerging contaminants should we be concerned about that might suddenly be a problem and if testing would happen after the water would go into the lake and if testing would happen before it goes into the lake.

Staff Mah responded definitely a lot of oils could be synthetic, organic chemicals, volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and microplastics. Any type of recycled water project has an associate engineer that is hired so they stay attuned of what is happening. In terms of drinking water sources, the SFPUC does watershed sanitary surveys that do assessment of what are potential contaminants and industrial activities, wells, and other sources and since this would be part of a new source of water that would be brought into the system, it would require a sanitary survey.

Member Smegal asked is the idea of the lake water to be contiguous with the groundwater that they might be pumping out of the West Side.

Member Jacuzzi commented it is and that it could be contaminating the basin and that Lake Merced is already on the EPA 303D list so by law we can not add contaminants.

- **Member Nagengast** commented she appreciated the priority of high, medium and low, and there are a lot of medium priorities listed, and each item had recommended actions and asked if the SFPUC is going to move forward with all of them.

Staff Mah responded that high will move forward and low and medium priorities will be depending on resources. With low priorities, it is more of a stay in tune of what is happening in the scientific community and academia doing literature reviews and staying knowledgeable on new testing methods and if there are changes, they get bumped in priority. In 2024, we did the water quality strategic plan and that is when we started prioritizing and looking at available resources to plan those out. For 2025, we will put in our report the recommendations of what we can do but for the most part we are going to try to do as much as we can but know somethings may be shifted because of the shift of SFPUC resources.

Chair Clary asked if the SFPUC is prioritizing within the medium category.

Staff DeGraca responded to some extent like nitrosamines are a higher priority because the State is talking about potential regulations so we will try to do this. Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) is a little up in the air given the stuff that is going on. The Federal and State have talked about regulations but because of new regulations there isn't anything too dramatic expected in this particular area. Some stuff like algae blooms, becomes an issue if we start seeing big blooms. Some priorities are based on situations while others are dictated by outside regulations and if a great opportunity arises to make sure we also take advantage of those.

- **Member Perszyk** commented it would be helpful to know what capital projects the SFPUC is working on to minimize emerging concerns like Lake Merced and it would be nice to see specific examples.

Staff Mah responded they key for us is if there is a capital project and there is a planning phase that they are brought on early to have a water quality engineer that knows these risks and voice's opinion on the design criteria to ensure that we reduce our risk.

Staff Talati further responded normally whenever there are capital projects we get involved in the projects early on and on example is the Crystal Springs Pipeline that has coal tar and one of the major objectives is to remove the coal tar lining.

- **Chair Clary** commented she is interest in premise plumbing and asked how do you do Legionnaires monitoring or prevention in furnance plumbing and what does that look like and if the high vacancy rate could translate into greater hazards.

Staff DeGraca responded we did monitor when we did the chloramine conversation before and after where we actually went into the buildings. The latest go around has been focused on the distribution system, and we have continued some monitoring. One of the tings that we are talking about is a potential future project developing some sort of outreach for large buildings and talking to them about how things could happen within their plumbing system and things they may want to be doing and there has been some delay because the Health Department had staffing changes. If we get into this particular program, we could start thinking about doing some premise, polling, monitoring for our own information but not something that could be geared towards every building. When we pushed to Chlorine, we saw a dramatic reduction in Legionella so that was a benefit of the chloramine conversation, but we have not gone back since we did that monitoring. Having a real outreach program and adding a monitoring component is something we are thinking about doing in the next year or two. San Francisco's water age is fairly high just in the distribution system where we have stuff that's weeks to months old and don't see problems. We do maintain a residual fairly well and do occasional consumer complaint monitor and don't see a bunch of non detects in terms of the chlorine residual. We think we're doing a fairly good job

but that not to say there are vacant buildings or parts of buildings that are not getting flushed and that would be part of the outreach telling people if you have dead ends in your buildings, you need to flush them or do something to change your plumbing.

- **Chair Clary** commented the Water Board in their monitoring of small water systems has been using total organic fluoride as a detection method which might be good because it allows to see the pfas that are not being tested for individually and asked if it is something the SFPUC is aware of and it is more cost effective.

Staff DeGraca commented we are not actively engaged in that and are focused on the 29 regulated and given our non tech monitor results are not a high priority as we don't have them in the source water. It may be something for the future but right now, given all the priorities it is just slipping down since we've had such good results.

- **Chair Clary** asked what the acronym stands for on slide 15 and on slide 16 talking about the algae monitoring and mitigation plan from 2019, is the SFPUC going to be updating or is it working for now.

Staff DeGraca responded HANs are Haloacetic Nitrones and asked if anyone else on staff remembers the rest.

Staff Sebastiani further responded we are going to be starting a project looking at correlating our algae blooms with potential stimulants to those blooms and doing some modeling to understand how the blooms occur in our local reservoirs, particularly focusing on the East Bay reservoirs because the Calaveras and San Antonio reservoirs have given significant algae blooms and we have most of the data for these reservoirs historically and try to understand how nutrients and turnover impact those blooms and come up with potential mitigations. This may lead to an update on the algae monitoring and mitigation plan.

Public Comment: None.

7. 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
- Harry Tracy Water Treatment Plant 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.

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

Public Comment: None.

9. Adjournment at 7:08 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@sfwater.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@sfwater.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 [\[cac@sfgov.org\]](mailto:cac@sfgov.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@sfgov.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: sof@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.

