



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

MEETING MINUTES

**Tuesday, October 28, 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/MZgdf0MyqWwcF01PpKFSUQE4EzlwI_naE7-UwI_d1Vz113HyY-75NVvR1gl747pl.YFh8uXEIzVzTzBvw

Meeting Passcode

208415

Mission: The Wastewater Subcommittee shall review sewage and stormwater collection, treatment, and disposal system replacement, recycling, and other relevant plans, programs, and policies ([Admin. Code Article XV, Sections 5.140 - 5.142](#)).

Members

Amy Nagengast, Chair (D8)	Erin Roach (D2)	Andrea Baker (B-Small
Douglas Jacuzzi (D4)	Maika Pinkston (M-Enviro.	Business)
	Org)	

D = District Supervisor appointed, M = Mayoral 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 (3): Nagengast, Jacuzzi, Roach

Members absent (2): Pinkston, Baker

Staff/Presenters: Sarah Minnick, Joel Prather

2. Approve the [July 8, 2025](#) Minutes

A motion was made (Jacuzzi) and seconded (Roach) to approve the July 8, 2025, minutes pending an editing change from “waiting” to “wading”.

The minutes were approved without objection.

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



Public Comment: None.

3. Approve [September 9, 2025 Minutes](#)

A motion was made (Jacuzzi) and seconded (Roach) to approve the September 9, 2025, minutes.

The minutes were approved without objection.

Public Comment: None.

4. Report from the Chair

- Welcome members, staff, and the public
- [San Francisco files final brief in SCOTUS case](#)
- [Public Memo re CCSF v. U.S.E.P.A.](#)
- [CCSF v. U.S.E.P.A. Oral Argument Audio](#)
- [U.S. and California take Enforcement action against S.F. for Clean Water Violations](#)

Public Comment: None.

5. 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.

6. Presentation and Discussion: [Pathways for Flood Resilience in SF Building Code](#), Sarah Minick, Urban Watershed Planning Manager, SFPUC Wastewater Enterprise

- Resources:
 - [March 2025 WW CAC Presentation – Wet Weather Prep and Response](#)

Presentation:

- San Francisco's Flood Resilient Building Code Update
- Agenda
- Flood Resilience Framework
- Legislative Strategies
- Flood Resilient Building Code Modifications
- Potential To Update SF Building Code
- Flood Resilient Building Code Modifications
- Align SF Design Requirements with CA State Code
- 2060 Folsom Street
- Estimated New Constructions Rates
- Benefit Cost Analysis: Overview
- Benefit Cost Analysis: Storm Events
- Cost Estimate Exercise
- City Agency Coordination
- SF Planning Department Coordination
- Outreach Summary
- CA Assembly Bills Update
- Schedule – SF Legislative Process

Discussion:

- **Chair Nagengast** asked if there is some overlap in the SFPUC flood risk zone and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)'s flood area.

Staff Minick responded there is a tiny bit over by Islais Creek where there are 3 parcels in the FEMA and stormwater map. On the westside, it is the beach which is not super relevant because it is not going into the parcels.

Member Jacuzzi commented unless it is a big tsunami then it would go over the dunes.

- **Member Jacuzzi** commented he appreciates seeing the methodology and thanked Staff Minick for including this in the presentation.

Staff Minick responded it is also important for SFPUC to include this because a couple of different ways were tried, and it is important to keep records of the different methodologies.

- **Chair Nagengast** asked in the mitigation scenarios such as flood proofing, is there the need to redo this later down like you would need to if you owned a home and needed to redo the roof and is that cost benefit included in the analysis.

Staff Minick respond that is a good question and does not think it is in there but can ask the AECOM team and believes these were assumed the interventions would last for the life cycle of a building which industry standard is assumed to be 50 – 70 years.

- **Chair Nagengast** commented it would be helpful to think about it from the operational phase versus the first cost phase and the benefit of the cost and better understand the life cycle cadence. Ideally, it would be helpful to think about the operational benefits and any other costs that you might incur over the 50–75-year lifetime.

- **Member Roach** asked what LOS stands for.

Staff Minick responded it stands for level of service. When we build new capital projects in the collection system, we design them to manage 5-year, 3-hour storm.

- **Chair Nagengast** asked how insurance fits into this model.

Staff Minick responded our stormwater flooding area is what FEMA calls Zone X meaning it is outside of a FEMA flood zone, and you get a lower cost of flood insurance. SFPUC did partner with FEMA, and we have a page on our website about how to find the lower cost of flood insurance and have done outreach on this. Over the course of 10 years, 150 people in San Francisco have flood insurance which is a very low percentage. It is cheaper than earthquake insurance, but it is not one of the things people are super excited to put at the top of the investment list because it is extra, and people are already worried about their cost of living and home insurance. There is also another piece where people think they don't have to worry about floods because it won't happen to them. We also did a training in partnership with FEMA for brokers because most brokers do not

deal with flood insurance and are not aware of the FEMA flood zone in San Francisco because unlike New Orleans or a place like that, flooding is not top of mind in the insurance or real estate industry.

AGM Prather further responded in theory, you would think that your policy writer would consider the fact that you have no valuables on the first floor because you accounted for this in your building and therefore you would see a lower rate.

- **Member Roach** asked how residents know what their design flood elevation is and if there is a map.

Staff Minick responded there is a map, and we added the flood elevations last year. It was a big deal for transparency. In the past, there was a lot of concern about publishing that kind of information and it was great to have it out there where people can have access to it. The map when zoomed in shows contours and when you click on them it will say something like "13". This is not a depth; it is an elevation in relation to city data. So, let's say this table is the surface of your parcel and your table is at an elevation of 12, then if you had the 100-year flood, the model showing you will probably see 1 foot of flooding.

AGM Prather further responded you are not going to get 13 feet of flooding, but you are 13 feet above city data, and this is explained on the website so please read all the disclaimers because if you don't interpret the numbers right, it can become very scary quickly.

- **Chair Nagengast** asked if Treasure Island is included in the 100-year flood risk map and if Treasure Island is a flood risk and they are included in the FEMA Zone map.

Staff Minick responded they do have flood risk and flood risk from sea level rise. Since Treasure Island is on a separate sewer, one caveat to be aware of is the SFPUC flood risk map is based on our H&H model, the combined system only and it is a future project to offer the same level of data for our separate sewer areas like Hunters Point, Treasure Island, Mission Bay, and Candlestick.

Chair Nagengast commented if she were a new developer on Treasure Island, she would need to meet and go through Department of Building Inspection (DBI) and must succumb to the 100-year flood zone.

Staff Minick responded for redevelopment, there is a regulation in the Public Works Code called the Subdivision Regulations and in that subdivisions are required to manage the 100-year curb-to-curb in the streetscape. The subdivision would apply to Treasure Island, and they will comply because our value add with the building code is there are no subdivisions in our flood zones. We have parcel-by-parcel development in streets that are flooding. Treasure Island is surcharging right now which is a method where you take the soil, let it sit there so it's compacting but they have to go up 3 feet just for their construction elevation and then they have a novel financing mechanism where a certain threshold of sea level rise will trigger the investment of the Homeowners Association (HOA) fees that they've been collecting over time to build the adaptive measure around the island on top of the berm that is already there.

AGM Prather further responded that we have a historical layer upon layer development opposed to a new development which must start from the ground up with their utilities where they can plan to manage the 100-year storm on the surface, 5-year below it.

Member Jacuzzi commented it would be great to have Treasure Island acknowledged on the maps.

Staff Minick responded it is on there, the map is just zoomed in.

- **Member Jacuzzi** asked if property affected by the flood zones how up on the Planning Department's property information map and if it will show historical information.

Staff Minick responded yes, we integrated to PIMSS in 2019, and they originally were owning it and then they asked if we would own it so that we could update it more easily so now we own it but are still on PIMSS.

- **Member Roach** commented this is great work, but it is obviously relevant to new construction and in established neighborhoods that are experiencing flooding it doesn't feel like the grant program even gets close to the cost of upgrades the SFPUC is proposing.

Staff Minick responded it depends on the depth of flooding because the map encompasses flooding that is 6 inches or deeper so some of them have very little flooding and a grant could help them. Some have more flooding, and we are looking at our cap right now which is currently \$100,000 per parcel and we have not updated it for inflation since it started. In 2019 people were asking if we have enough money to raise a home like they do in New Orleans and at the time executive leadership said we don't have that now but bring us a case where somebody wants to do that and that will be a data point for us to understand if this is a need. We have never had anyone come to us and it would be an interesting data point to see because that would get us to a different price point. Right now, people do seem to be able to implement a lot of what they need with the grant program but if they wanted to raise their homes, they would not be able to cover it.

- **Member Roach** asked if SFPUC has any data points on homes that have been retrofitted and how much they cost and how effective it was.

Staff Minick responded we have all the data from our grants that we've implemented, however those have not all experienced the exact storm that is in the model because the model is a fictional storm that probably almost never happens in the world.

AGM Prather further responded for each of the grants we give out, there must have been a claim filed because there needs to be some sort of gatekeeper and asked if we track claims that have been filed after things have been implemented.

Staff Minick responded anyone can apply for that program if we have space. We do track if they have flood claims filed post implementation. We

don't survey them after a storm to see what happened and it would be good to survey them after a storm.

- **Member Roach** asked if anyone could apply for a grant if they're in a zone that warrants and whether they've had an incident.

Staff Minick responded it's the opposite. Anyone, even if they are outside of the flood zone can apply but they need to have had an incident so they demonstrate they impacts from flooding and that can be a written description or photographs. We recently updated our grant guidebook that's online and shows the program eligibility requirements and how to apply.

AGM Prather further responded if constituents ever ask about this, the best place to direct them is the website.

Public Comment: None.

7. **Discussion:** [Wastewater CAC FY 2025-2026 Priorities](#), Amy Nagengast
Wastewater CAC Chair

- Resources:
 - [SFPUC Wastewater CAC Year in Review FY23-24](#)
 - [SFPUC CAC FY2023-2024 Annual Report](#)
 - [SFPUC CAC FY2022-2023 Annual Report](#)

Presentation:

- SFPUC Wastewater CAC: Year in Review FY 24-25 (July 2024 – June 2025)
- WW CAC Priorities FY 24-25
- FY 24-25 Priority Topic Accountability
- FY 25-26 Priority Discussion
- WW AGM Priorities Discussion FY 25-26
- WW CAC Priorities Discussion FY 25-26
- Thank you

Discussion:

- **Member Roach** thanked Chair Nagengast for preparing the presentation and thinking about the priorities and would love to go on the tour.

Chair Nagengast responded the tours are open to the public and must be advertised as a public meeting.

AGM Prather commented they are giving public tours at Southeast Plant recently and those are advertised through our external group with groups of up to 20 so we could do one specifically for the Wastewater CAC meeting but would need to limit it and have a waiver signed.

"Tours" was added as priority number one on the FY 2025-26 Priority List. "Treasure Island Plant (Envision Platinum award), operational Spring 2026" was listed as the first subtopic under priority number one. "Biosolids/Headworks (In construction)" was listed as the second subtopic under priority number one.

- **Member Roach** commented she likes the two legal cases, the capital plan and currently does not understand how flooding and unauthorized discharges and asset management team will be useful but will defer to the rest.
- **Member Jacuzzi** commented he is honored to have AGM Prather and Staff Minick at the same table. For the focus on the Green Infrastructure, it is particularly important to stay in a straight path and it is very relevant with Staff Minick's presentation tonight and particularly the comment about the collection system capacity because we want to focus on the source rather than the solution. Some areas flood naturally and that will never change other areas are flooding because we make them flood and we can treat that symptom through these grants and asked if the CAC meetings are useful to SFPUC staff.

Staff Minick responded that AGM Prather and her just had a conversation where the AC are part of the SFPUC's link to the public and both feel that this is very important and we want to do more outreach because it would be great to have members of the public learn and hear what the CAC is stewarding and the questions being asked but it is hard to get members of the public to come.

Member Jacuzzi commented the topic he hears the most from constituents in his district is sewage on the beach and he would have phone calls frequently with former Supervisor Gordon Mar and the supervisor makes an impact in being able to get the public out within their district.

Green Infrastructure was added as priority number two on the FY 2025-26 Priority List.

- **Member Roach** commented she represents District 2, and these topics are pertinent and would value staff's input in what the priorities should be given we want to bring that back to our constituents.
- **Staff Moncrease** asked if the other suggested priorities by Chair Nagengast should be added to the FY 2025 – 26 priority list.

Member Jacuzzi commented he is a believer in focusing and not creating a huge list and we should focus on a resolution this year.

Outcome and Impacts from litigation (Bay + Pacific Ocean) and Capital Plan Update & Renewal were added as the third and fourth priorities on the FY 2025 – 26 Priority List.

Member Roach left at 6:34 pm. Quorum was lost at 6:34 pm and the meeting was adjourned at 6:34pm.

8. Staff report

9. [Future Agenda Items and Resolutions](#)

- Adopted Resolutions for Follow Up
 - Resolution in Support of SFPUC Class A Biosolids Local Distribution Program [adopted August 21, 2018](#)

- Resolution in Support of Cityworks Interns Recommendations [adopted on November 21, 2017](#)
- Resolution in Support of Equitable Green Infrastructure Implementation throughout the Southeast Sector of San Francisco and throughout the City [adopted on June 20, 2017](#)
- Resolution Urging SFPUC Commission to Initiate Planning and Environmental Review for Building a New Community Center at Third and Evans and to Direct Staff to Develop an Interim Greenhouse Environmental and Workforce Development Program [adopted on October 18, 2016](#)
- Resolution Supporting the SFPUC to Conduct Robust Community Engagement to Determine the Community's Preference for Remodeling Southeast Community Facility at 1800 Oakdale or Building a New Community Center at 1550 Evans [adopted on January 19, 2016](#)

10. Announcements/Comments Visit www.sfpuc.gov/cac for final confirmation of the next meeting date.

11. Adjournment at 6:34 pm

For more information concerning the agendas, minutes, and meeting information, please visit www.sfwater.gov/cac. For more information concerning the CAC, please contact 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) 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: 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.