



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

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Tuesday, June 27, 2023  
 5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.  
 525 Golden Gate Ave., 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Tuolumne Conference Room**

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

**Meeting URL**

<https://sfwater.zoom.us/j/85671650951?pwd=UnhHWIBDWmxpUXNOZ05XQjA3dWF4Zz09>

**Phone Dial-in**

669 219 2599

Find your local number: <https://sfwater.zoom.us/j/85671650951?pwd=UnhHWIBDWmxpUXNOZ05XQjA3dWF4Zz09>

**Meeting ID / Passcode**

856 7165 0951 / 354173

**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:**

<b>Jennifer Clary (Chair) (D11)</b>	Suki Kott (D2)	Amy Nagengast (D8)
Nicole Sandkulla (M-Reg'l Water Customers)	Eliahu Perszyk (M-Large Water User)	Douglas Jacuzzi (D4)

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

**Staff Liaisons:** Mayara Ruski Augusto Sa, Lexus Moncrease, and Jotti Aulakh  
 Staff Email for Public Comment: [cac@sfwater.org](mailto:cac@sfwater.org)

**London N. Breed**  
 Mayor

**Newsha Ajami**  
 President

**Sophie Maxwell**  
 Vice President

**Tim Paulson**  
 Commissioner

**Tony Rivera**  
 Commissioner

**Kate Stacy**  
 Commissioner

**Dennis J. Herrera**  
 General Manager

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call at 5:30 pm**

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

Members Absent: (1) Sandkulla

Staff: Julie Ortiz, Manisha Kothari, Betsy L. Rhodes, Paula Kehoe, and Natalie Stone

Members of the Public: Jodi Soboll, Moisés García, and Walter Van Riel

**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 [April 25, 2023, Minutes](#)

Motion was made (Kott) and seconded (Jacuzzi) to approve the April 25, 2023, Minutes.

AYES: (5) Clary, Perszyk, Kott, Jacuzzi, and Nagengast

NOES: (0)

ABSENT: (1) Sandkulla

Public Comment: None

## 3. Report from the Chair

- Chair welcomes committee members, staff, and the public

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: [Water Conservation Services Overview](#), Julie Ortiz, Water Conservation Manager

### *Presentation*

- SFPUC Conservation Services
- Indoor Assistance
- Outdoor Assistance
- Tool, Alerts and Outreach
- School Education
- Summer 2023 Conservation Outreach
- 2023 Partnership with the SF Giants
- For More Information

### *Discussion*

- **Chair Clary** commented that this saves water because the water is not run until it is hot and asked what the rebate amount was.

**Staff Ortiz** responded that it was \$100. She noted that the pumps have evolved and can be installed by the hot water heater if the bathroom does not have an electrical outlet.

- **Chair Clary** asked what the difference in cost was between a heat pump water heater and a recirculating water heater.

**Staff Ortiz** responded that a heat pump heater is an entirely new heater, which can be costly. She noted that the rebate is \$100, which could be increased.

- **Chair Clary** asked if the rebate has worked.

**Staff Ortiz** responded that few people follow through on this and that is why the SFPUC continues its outreach efforts.

**Member Jacuzzi** commented that it would be a great idea to increase the rebate incentive.

- **Member Perszyk** commented that the steamed sterilizer rebate was \$2500 and asked if there was a threshold where the rebate became custom and was based on the water savings.

**Staff Ortiz** responded that the SFPUC would look at that on a case-by-case basis.

- **Member Jacuzzi** asked if the SFPUC was planning on incorporating a flume heater monitoring device.

**Staff Ortiz** responded that because the SFPUC's retail service area has smart meters and a platform to monitor water use, they do not want people going into the meter box and disrupting the wires and the meter transmission unit.

**Member Jacuzzi** commented that he liked the alarm component of the flume device.

**Staff Ortiz** responded that the SFPUC's platform, MyAccount, does not offer a real time alarm service but does have good data.

- **Member Jacuzzi** commented that he did take advantage of the toilet replacement program about 15 years ago for his rental properties, but he had issues with the replacement toilets. He added that he eventually replaced those toilets with a 1 gallon per flush pressure assisted system and asked if the SFPUC planned on incorporating toilets with pressure technology.

**Chair Clary** responded that there was an earlier version of the 1.6 flush rate toilet and that has improved later.

**Staff Ortiz** responded that the toilets must meet performance testing with the current toilet replacement program. She noted that for residential settings, the replacement toilet has a flush rate of 1gallon of water per flush or less and for commercial properties the flush rate was 1.28 gallons of water per flush because the SFPUC is looking for maximum savings.

- **Chair Clary** commented that East Bay MUD (Municipal Utility District) has publicly named their largest water users for the last two droughts, but the SFPUC has not done something similar to reveal who are the biggest water users.

**Staff Ortiz** responded that the SFPUC has rules and regulations in place and chose to do extensive outreach towards customers who were averaging 500 gallons of water use per month. She noted that East Bay MUD's threshold was higher at 1,000 gallons of water per

month. Staff Ortiz added that the SFPUC contacted those users with letters and followed up to give them a warning before possibly moving to more restrictive measures. She commented that the public disclosure would occur if those users were assessed a fee or a fine.

- **Member Nagengast** commented that it would be great if the SFPUC could include water information with the electricity bill because renters are not aware of their water use when they are paying their water bill to their landlord.

**Member Kott** commented that HOAs (Homeowner Associations) are similarly set up.

**Chair Clary** commented that she posts the water bill in her building, but people still do not seem to pay attention to it.

**Staff Ortiz** responded that it would be helpful if the account/property holder could share or post the bill. She noted that the SFPUC is willing to come out and talk with big property owners to incentivize them to post the water bill to let renters know about their water usage.

- **Member Kott** asked if the SFPUC's system knows when it is billing to an HOA.

**Staff Ortiz** responded that they could do a search through their billing system to pull up HOAs, but it is possible that it would not retrieve all accounts associated with an HOA.

Public Comment:

- **Jodi Soboll** asked what year the toilets with a flush rate of 1.6 and 3.5 gallons per flush were released because people might not know their flush rate, but they might have an idea when they replaced their toilet.

**Staff Ortiz** responded that the toilets with a 1.6 flush rate have been out for about ten years, and the toilets with a 3.5 flush rate have been out for about 30 years. She commented that with the program, the SFPUC will go out and do a free Water-Wise evaluation because people do not know the age of their toilets.

- **Jodi Soboll** asked if the hot water recirculation pump had any impact on under floor heating.

**Staff Ortiz** responded that it did not.

- **Jodi Soboll** commented that the Water Subcommittee could brainstorm ways to publicize the water bill.

**Chair Clary** responded that people have been trying to brainstorm how to encourage conservation in multi-family buildings but even showing people the bill will not matter because they are paying an HOA fee.

- **Moisés García** commented that he appreciated the focus on commercial laundromats because there have been many closures of

laundromats in the Mission District. He added that he also appreciated the focus on community gardens.

6. **Presentation and Discussion:** [Alternative Water Supply Plan Overview](#),  
Manisha Kothari, Alternative Water Supply Planning Manager

*Presentation*

- Alternative Water Supply (AWS) Plan
- Need for Alternative Water Supply Plan
- Basis for Planning: Definitions
- Basis for Planning: Influencing Factors (Drivers)
- Plan for Obligations, Build for Demands
- Alternative Water Supply Projects
- Gap in Meeting Demands
- Recommendation Highlights
- Key Takeaways
- Schedule and Next Steps

*Discussion*

- **Chair Clary** commented that Treasure Island was not included in some of the maps and asked that it be included on the final version of the report.
- **Chair Clary** asked what the 244 mgd (million gallons per day) number on slide 5 was.

**Staff Kothari** responded that the number represented demand projections from purchases from the Regional Water System.

- **Chair Clary** asked what the purchases were for the Regional Water System last year.

**Staff Kothari** responded that it was 198 mgd.

- **Chair Clary** asked if the SFPUC was anticipating a 46 mgd increase by 2045.

**Staff Kothari** responded that the increase is not based on the SFPUC interpreting the data, and that the 46 mgd increase by 2045 is based on data and what the numbers are.

- **Chair Clary** asked if the numbers are based on the contracts that the SFPUC has with their wholesale and retail customers.

**Staff Kothari** responded that it was based on the projections that each individual wholesale customer and retail customer has provided.

- **Chair Clary** commented that the SFPUC was expecting a 25% increase in demand in 22 years and asked what direction the demand has gone in the last 22 years.

**Staff Kothari** responded that it has gone down.

- **Chair Clary** commented that it had gone down about 20%.

**Staff Kothari** responded that the 198 mgd number for last year includes rationing because there was system wide rationing last year.

- **Chair Clary** asked what the top annual demand number was over the last decade.

**Staff Kothari** responded that the information is in the AWS Plan.

- **Chair Clary** commented that the SFPUC had a projected 300 mgd demand for 2025 in 2005. She noted that this was an overestimation due to the housing demand and job growth in the Bay Area. Chair Clary added that the SFPUC would want their demand numbers to be as high as possible to fight the water boards and noted that this is based on her own perspective.
- **Chair Clary** asked if the timeline for the alternative water supply projects was far out because the rates had not been released yet.

**Staff Kothari** responded that the rates take a long time to build, so the plan is to implement the SF-Peninsula Regional PureWater, Alameda County Water District-Union Sanitary District Purified Water, and the South Bay Purified Water projects between 2040 and 2045. She added that the Daly City Recycled Water Expansion and Los Vaqueros Reservoir Expansion projects would occur sooner.

- **Member Jacuzzi** asked why local groundwater was not included as a potential alternative water supply source in the presentation.

**Staff Kothari** responded that that the local groundwater project is included in the 244 mgd because it looks at how much water San Francisco needs from the Regional Water System beyond the local groundwater. She commented that from the 244 mgd number, the retail demand is 73.5 mgd from the Regional Water System after the implementation of the local groundwater project.

- **Member Jacuzzi** asked about the Westside Recycled Water Project specifically about the difference between tertiary and purified water.

**Staff Kothari** responded that the project is for irrigation of green spaces in the City, and that the water is not for drinking.

**Staff Kehoe** responded that there is a difference between tertiary treated water and advanced treated water.

- **Member Jacuzzi** asked if there would eventually be a location for the project.

**Staff Kothari** responded that the San Francisco Purified Water Project was in early planning and would reduce the 244 mgd by 4 mgd.

- **Chair Clary** asked If the SFPUC was considering something similar for the east side of the city.

**Staff Kothari** responded that there would be two plants on both the east and west side of the city that would be 2 mgd each.

- **Member Perszyk** commented that the State Water Resource Control Board is coming out with direct potable reuse regulations later in the

year. He noted that the Southeast Treatment Facility receives 80% of the City's sewage and asked if the SFPUC could recycle that and put it back into the drinking water system in the future or would they have to wait for the regulations to come out.

**Chair Clary** asked if there is an issue with saline intrusion.

**Staff Kothari** responded that the SFPUC did a study in 2021 that looked at the maximum recycling potential. She noted that the maximum potential of recycling is based on proposed regulations and that the SFPUC does not have to wait for the regulations to start planning. Staff Kothari added that there are requirements in the proposed regulations such as blending requirements. She commented that the SFPUC has done an analysis on that, which she can share with the Water Subcommittee.

- **Member Perszyk** asked how the SFPUC settled on 2 mgd coming from the Southeast Facility.

**Staff Kothari** responded that the report evaluated four different scenarios and looked at cost and infrastructure requirements for the Purified Water Project. She commented that the 2 mgd represents starting small, and it does not preclude future phases from doing more if necessary.

- **Chair Clary** commented that when water is treated, much of it is lost. She asked how much water the SFPUC would lose in the process.

**Staff Kothari** responded that they would lose 20 to 25%.

- **Chair Clary** asked what kind of public engagement programs the SFPUC was considering given the loud response to groundwater in the Sunset District.

**Staff Kothari** responded that any successful project in planning relies on heavy public engagement including demonstrations and tours of the facility, including water tasting. She commented that the SFPUC is reimagining their reuse system at 525 Golden Gate Avenue, so that is an opportunity to install a purified water system with a tasting station. Staff Kothari added that they can come back to discuss a comprehensive outreach strategy with the Water Subcommittee.

Public Comment: None

- **Jodi Soboll** asked for more information about the SFPUC possibly making Santa Clara and San Jose permanent wholesale customers.

**Staff Kothari** responded that the SFPUC has 27 wholesale customers and 26 of them are represented by BAWSCA (Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency). She added that out of the 26 customers, 24 have a permanent status designation, which means each of those customers have an individual supply guarantee. Staff Kothari commented that Santa Clara and San Jose are wholesale customers who are member agencies of BAWSCA since the 1970s, but their status is different because they do not have a guaranteed supply. She noted that they have a temporary interruptible contract, so the SFPUC must give them notice every year when they prepare their Water Supply Development Report in case Santa Clara and San Jose have to plan for an interruption. Staff Kothari added that the SFPUC has never

interrupted the water supply to them, and combined, they have consistently purchased about \$9 million gallons of water per day.

- **Jodi Soboll** asked what Santa Clara and San Jose would do if the service was interrupted.

**Staff Kothari** responded that they would have to find another water supply.

**Chair Clary** responded that every public water supply system has a plan that includes options if certain supply is no longer available.

- **Jodi Soboll** asked if the wholesale customers provided a breakdown of their supply needs in the information, they provided to the SFPUC regarding how much water they plan to purchase.

**Staff Kothari** responded that they did provide some breakdown and this information is available in the AWS Plan.

- **Jodi Soboll** asked if the local groundwater project was not included in the regional plan because the better San Francisco does with local projects the less they are asking from the Regional Water System.

**Staff Kothari** responded affirmatively and noted that while local groundwater is important, it is not being shown as a new project.

## 7. Staff Report

- Reminder that District 1 and District 7 seats are still vacant.

Public Comment: None

## 8. Future Agenda Items and Resolutions

### *Standing Subjects*

- Groundwater
- Water Quality

### *Specific Subjects*

- Alternative Water Supply Report Comments – *tentatively August*
- Water Conservation Efficacy/AWS Plan Update (more metrics) – *tentatively 2024*
- Affordability - *confirmed for the Full CAC*
- Green Infrastructure - *tentatively WW Topic*
- Integrating Tribal Leaders into SFPUC Land Management Decisions
- State Board Water Rights
- Water Enterprise Environmental Stewardship Policy Implementation Report
- Debate about Bay Delta – Member Sandkulla suggested everyone watch the February 5, 2021, Commission workshop about the Voluntary Agreement
- COVID and Long-term Affordability Program
- Implementation if the Bay Delta Plan Flow Requirement
- Hetch Hetchy Water and Power Division Update
- State Policy and Programs on Affordability or Low-Income Rate Assistance (LIRA)
- Bay Delta Plan and voluntary settlement agreement
- Legislative Update

- State of the Regional Water System Report – Bi-annual report
- Drought resilience: 3-year water supply update
- Water Equity and Homelessness
- State of Local Water Report
- Retail Conservation Report
- Emergency Firefighting Water System Update
- Natural Resources and Land Management Division Update
- Harry Tracy Water Treatment Plant tour

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 March 15, 2016](#)
- Resolution on Impacts of Drought on System Maintenance and Improvements [adopted January 19, 2016](#)

Public Comment: None

- 9. Announcements/Comments** Please visit [www.sfpuc.org/cac](http://www.sfpuc.org/cac) for final confirmation of the next scheduled meeting, agenda, and materials.

Public Comment: None

**10. Adjournment**

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

Meeting was adjourned at 7:05 pm.