San Francisco Water Power Sewer
Services of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

525 Golden Gate Avenue, 13th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
T 415.554.3155
F 415.554.3161

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Citizens' Advisory Council
Wastewater Subcommittee

MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, September 8, 2026
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.

Zoom recording:
https://sfwater.zoom.us/rec/share/HFpw4ZNsWrRU47n0oQ3iUSEisiI3urqd4cPbzHG6E8MuoCzfWsyXvodZibkrbXnV.zIz0oaX4FrSbzJa4?startTime=1788913830000

Passcode:
866161

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

Erin Roach Chair (D2)	Amy Nagengast (D8)	Loretta Dickerson-Smith (M-Engineering/Financial)
Douglas Jacuzzi (D4)	Arthine Cossey van Duyne (B-Environ. Justice)	

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 5:33PM.**

   Present (4): Roach, Jacuzzi, Nagengast, Cossey van Duyne

   Absent (1): Dickerson-Smith

   Staff/Presenters: Will Logsden, Joel Prather

   Members of the Public: Terrain Studio

2. **Approve the July 14, 2026, Meeting Minutes**

   A motion was made (Jacuzzi) and seconded (Nagengast) to approve the July 14, 2026, meeting minutes pending correction from Member Jacuzzi, who requested an update to his comment referring to nearly 11 billion gallons of water that are produced by impervious surfaces on the Westside.

   The minutes were approved pending the edit without objection.

   Public comment: None.

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

Joshua Arce
President

Stephen E. Leveroni
Vice President

Avni Jamdar
Commissioner

Kate H. Stacy
Commissioner

Meghan Thurlow
Commissioner

Dennis J. Herrera
General Manager

3. **Report from the Chair**
    - Chair Roach welcomed Members, SFPUC 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 (*2 minutes per speaker*)**

    Public comment: None

5. **Presentation and Discussion: WWE Urban Watershed Planning Division – Grant Programs,** Joel Prather, Wastewater Enterprise Assistant General Manager, Will Logsdon, SFPUC Utility Specialist - Wastewater Urban Watershed Planning

    Presentation:
    - Urban Watershed Planning Division Grant Programs
    - Agenda
    - Green Infrastructure City-wide Strategy
    - City-Wide Green Infrastructure Strategy
    - Transform the Storm
    - Grants and Resources
    - Green Infrastructure Grant Program
    - Everett Middle School
    - Urban Watershed Stewardship Grant Program
    - GI Grants for Homes
    - Floodwater Grant Program
    - Questions?
    - Thank you!

    Discussion:
    - **Member Nagengast** asked if this was tied together with the storm water ordinance to incentivize people to reduce their impervious pavement.

      Staff Logsdon responded that in 2023, the rate structure changed to allocate a portion of the rates to stormwater. We already had the green infrastructure grant program for large properties, but we didn't have an incentive for residential scale customers. We knew that out of our total customer base; the majority are residential customers. This program was an attempt to pilot that and see what they looked like at the residential scale. This is a grant to provide for construction of the project. Then once the project is complete, the customer is eligible for monthly credit on their monthly stormwater bill. It's the same thing for green infrastructure grant projects on a school – as long as they continue to maintain it and submit a checklist, they get a monthly credit on the stormwater portion of their bill. I think of it as a supplement for the property owner to maintain the project.

    - **Chair Roach** asked if this is for anywhere in San Francisco and commented it seemed like this was still piloting when we talked last.

      Staff Logsdon responded that at the residential scale, we are still in the pilot phase where we've identified two West Side zip codes and two East Side zip codes. Sunset and Parkside then Hunters Point/Bayview and Visitation Valley, I think Portola and the zip codes over there. Generally, with the funding we have, we've been able to identify enough interested property owners that we haven't felt the need to expand citywide. It'll depend on the resources in the next phase of the program if we move out of the pilot. We've been trying to look

for a good representative distribution of residential properties. For example, on the West Side you have sandy soils with different architecture and residential types of properties. On the East Side you have rockier, clay soils. That gives us good information on how to do different types of green infrastructure in different areas and apply that citywide. That was the goal with the pilot. We've extended it and now we're sort of reaching the end of the pilot.

- **Member Cossey van Duyne** asked if there is a map of all the project locations or a planned percentage for the projects.

  Staff Logsdon responded there have been updates to the website and there is an interactive map for where grantees are located. It might be something that's kind of spread out across the website, but we'd like to have one comprehensive map of both the grant projects and the capital projects.

  Member Cossey van Duyne commented that she's looking at how it applies to the Environmental Justice communities (EJ) and the EJ regions within the city and how that communication is being done. She asked if there is a plan to leverage or pay attention to that distribution and opportunities.

  Staff Logsdon responded that it's a great question and something we're definitely cognizant of. The green infrastructure application has a co-benefit requirement, and one of those co-benefits is environmental justice. There's the opportunity to score more points or score higher if your property is in an EJ area as defined by city planning. We've worked with the Community Benefits team to really increase outreach in that area. These projects are really driven by the grantees, so it's hard to know how much our outreach contributed to this. We did see a large uptick in applications coming out of the Southeast and SFUSD wanting to prioritize these projects for these schools. Examples are Visitation Valley Middle School, Visitation Valley Elementary, Thurgood Marshall High School, and El Dorado Elementary. All are in construction or recently completed. Our quarterly report has the number of projects that are in EJ areas – I think it's about two thirds, around 21 or 22 are in EJ areas. It's something we want to prioritize. Our goal was to have about half of the projects in Visitation Valley and Bayview Hunters Point. Part of that was identifying constraints around different soil types but also being cognizant of how we're distributing resources.

- **Member Cossey van Duyne** asked about Chinatown and Tenderloin as potential sites.

  Staff Logsdon responded that from the green infrastructure side of things, they're physically challenging due to the density and the amount of space available for these types of improvements. We've not found a lot of opportunities there. We've looked at an alley in Chinatown that was one of our pilot capital projects. There may be some other water stewardship projects that have happened in that area. It tends to be really constrained from the amount of space, the soil, and it's steep in a lot of places. Those create challenges for these types of projects.

- **Member Cossey van Duyne** commented that one impervious surface type is rooftops and that they can be rooftop gardens, butterfly habitats, and use community garden approaches.

  Staff Logsdon responded that is something we've been interested in green roofs or vegetated roofs are something that would be an eligible thing we could fund through these programs. New York City has seen a lot of success - it's a

popular facility type in their green infrastructure programs. We haven't seen a lot of that in applications.

Member Cossey van Duyne commented that last Fall, she had the opportunity to meet with the EJ team within the city's climate group and there are several community-based farming groups there, that had no idea you guys existed. Those guys are all over the place, and they're concerned because their normal go-to grants might not be available, so there may be opportunity to backfill from within these urban greening opportunities.

- **Member Cossey van Duyne** asked if SFPUC is looking at water and quantifying the amounts of water saved using sustainability or volumetric water benefit accounting calculations, that could allow for potential collaborations with corporations who have ESG goals around stormwater, to support some of the projects as they go to market.

  Staff Logsdon responded that we do a lot of tracking of stormwater captured with our program. We have not really connected that with other corporate metrics. There is some overlap with water, specifically drinking water project types, that also offset potable drinking water demand, for irrigation. We try to document what that volume is, but I don't think we have connected that to these other ESG metrics.

  Member Cossey van Duyne further commented that big organizations are going through the capacities of creating scopes of water, scopes of energy and carbon, there are a lot of residents in the city that have global targets on water resilience that they need to make. There are a lot of organizations that are part of bigger initiatives that are going after green infrastructure activities where they have mandates to offset their footprint in use of water. Given the kinds of businesses that are going to be flexing in the city, you might be able to help them with that goal.

- **Chair Roach** commented that she is very zoned in on the Marina and the El Niño year we're about to have. She asked what projects have been done there.

  Staff Logsdon responded that it's likely the RPD's Marina Triangle project. They received a green infrastructure grant for rain gardens in their parking lots.

  Chair Roach asked if it is done yet, commenting that it looks like there's green infrastructure bordering the east harbor.

  Staff Logsdon responded that he thinks it's in design right now. This map for the large parcel green infrastructure grant is only showing projects that we've looked at for that one. It would likely be the Marina Triangle Improvements Project. Next is likely Fort Mason – there are some small raingardens funded through the water stewardship grants. With this project in the Marina, the idea will be to expand that along the waterfront.

  Chair Roach asked if anyone has ever talked about doing a project between Broderick Street and Fillmore along Marina Boulevard, if that would be feasible, and if it would be helpful.

  Staff Logsdon responded that anything to get stormwater off the street into the ground, as opposed to into the sewer system, is helpful. That would be a whole city block improvement, like a public works project. Along those lines, if you were to put in green infrastructure along the west side of Marina Boulevard or south side, it would mean taking out the parking.

Chair Roach commented that it wouldn't be popular, but we must do something. She asked what she could advocate for in her neighborhood.

AGM Prather responded he would implore her to advocate to those residents on that street for the floodwater grants. On an individual basis, you can do so much more at the residential level than infrastructure at the city block level costing hundreds of millions of dollars that would take years.

- **Chair Roach** asked how long the process is for floodwater grants from application to construction.

  Staff Logsdon responded he would check with his colleague who runs the program and follow up.

- **Chair Roach** commented that it would be great to get someone from the SFPUC to address the community in the November town hall on November 9th to address floodwater concerns. Flood resiliency and preparedness would be a popular topic.

  AGM Prather asked Chair Roach to send the town hall info to SFPUC staff.

- **Member Nagengast** asked if this is the first year we're doing the urban water stewardship grant. What's the runway for that one?

  Staff Logsdon responded it's the first year we're bringing it fully in house. It's funded through our two-year operating budget.

  AGM Prather commented if it's in our operating budget it'll be funded indefinitely, aside from the money being needed somewhere else. There's no end date necessarily. They're starting out in the operating budget, so they'll start the next operating budget being in there and in theory funded every year, unless the money is hypothetically moved to address a regulatory need or some greater need.

- **Member Nagengast** commented that it's helpful to know and asked staff to talk about the efficacy of some of these programs. For example, for Green Infrastructure she came across a number around 0.5 gallons per dollar. She asked if there are similar estimates on stormwater avoidance.

  Staff Logsdon responded that the metric we like to use is cost per acre, meaning impervious acres, which are the main culprit of storm runoff. We set our goals as being more cost effective than the capital projects – lower cost per acre. When it was launched, it was around $765,000 per acre in 2019. Each year we use a local index for construction costs and costs of inflation to set our cap. Projects will be below that metric for us. Right now, that's around $1.1 million per acre, so we can't award a grantee more money than that. If you have a school with 1 acre of asphalt, they're eligible for $1.1 million in funding. Those projects are more performance-based. With the watershed stewardship grants, we don't really track at that level, and they're not designed the same way.

- **Member Nagengast** asked on efficacy more broadly, if there are two programs and you're going to fund one and not the other because they're both funded with operational dollars, what metric is a good crosswalk between small projects and big projects? How do you start to talk about efficacy of the programs?

AGM Prather responded that this brings up a very good point. We want to make sure that ratepayer dollars are invested in the right places.

Staff Logsdon commented that we haven't really had to decide between programs so far. We try to think about not just the stormwater benefit but the benefit to ratepayers and the public benefit.

- **Member Nagengast** asked how we quantify that across all our programs. Some of them might be more water-based, some might be more community-based. How do we highlight what those are? In other spaces, bottom line cost-benefit analysis works in some realms and not others. These programs are multidimensional. The easier part is probably on the engineering side, dollars per water saved, and what is the community impact? How do we lift up the great work?

  Member Jacuzzi commented on the importance of connecting with the Communications team so they can get that word out.

  Member Nagengast commented on the importance of first and foremost, emphasizing the multidimensional benefits for these great things, and to say it's more than about just dollars or whatever metric that can crosswalk these.

- **Member Jacuzzi** commented that it was great to see the Far Out West Community Garden in the materials. He also thanked staff for the great public workshop that was held. He asked staff to give an update on the grant cycle.

  Staff Logsdon responded that Fall is the start of our application cycle and the applications are both due at about the same time around November 16. It is anticipated to keep that annual cycle. This approach helps to give time to review applications, get awards out so they can start projects and begin construction the following summer.

  Member Jacuzzi asked about current thinking about how to make the GI grant more attractive to private property owners. He noted appreciating the changed wording on deed restriction. Still, maintenance agreement is a recorded document, and it still will in many cases put a property owner in breach of their mortgage contract if they apply without approval. He encouraged staff to consider a contractual method versus a recording method. He asked if there are other considerations that may make the process more appealing to large property owners that are sophisticated.

  Staff Logsdon asked if he was specifically asking about the maintenance piece of it.

  Member Jacuzzi responded that this was one example. Commercial property loans run for about five to seven years. Every time someone refinances, they want you to disclose everything that's recorded - it's one more hurdle. The property owner can't arbitrarily have an encumbrance recorded on a property without having that approved by a lender.

  Staff Logsdon responded that we're open to ideas and that change was in response to feedback we received in response to the declaration of deed restrictions that in some cases may be too cumbersome for a private property to take on. So, we changed that to be open to other types of things that can be recorded, such as a maintenance agreement against the property. The 20 year maintenance agreement for these projects is intended to align with the lifecycle

of a green infrastructure facility. The thinking there is, if we're investing our capital dollars in a facility, we want it to perform as if it were our own asset even if we're not the ones maintaining it. If we're spending $1 million to $2.5 million on a project, we want to see that full 20 year maintenance period happen. If there are other ways to ensure that, we're open to it.

- **Member Jacuzzi** asked about a site location on the map that was approved but won't be funded with a recorded document.

  Staff Logsdon responded that some of the colors may be off in the map. Blue shows interested properties or site visits.

- **Member Jacuzzi** asked if an applicant could apply for more than one urban water stewardship grant annually.

  Staff Logsdon responded he would ask the program manager and follow up.

- **Member Jacuzzi** asked if there are any updates regarding a new residential program on the horizon, noting the expiration of the pilot for residential properties.

- **Staff Logsdon** responded that it was always the intent to do the pilot and evaluate what it can look like citywide. We've been looking at programs in other cities and reflecting on what we've learned through this program. We're evaluating whether to continue with a similar model. The program management consultant who we hired through solicitation, that contract will be ending after the current round of funding. The question is, where do we go from there? The grant program model or something similar to that, or something else on the table is that it could be something more like a rebate model. For example, it could be similar to the rain barrel program the Water Enterprise offers, where people can get a rebate for a portion of the cost. There's some onus on the local market and property owners to go out, hire someone to do the work knowing they'll get reimbursement. Seattle has had success with that model. That rebate approach is something we're exploring. We don't yet have a confirmed approach from here.

- **Member Nagengast** commented about on-bill financing, for energy savings for example, and wondered if anything similar exists for the water side. Not necessarily here, but in the ecosystem.

  Member Jacuzzi commented that he would recommend a rebate program that goes directly to the installer.

Public Comment: None.

6. SFPUC Communications (Information Only)

a) Future Agenda Items and Resolutions
b) Correspondence Log
c) Public Memo re CCSF v. U.S.E.P.A.
d) CCSF v. U.S.E.P.A. Oral Argument Audio
e) U.S. and California take Enforcement action against S.F. for Clean Water Violations

Public Comment: None.

7. **For announcements/comments please visit sfpuc.gov/cac for final confirmation of the next meeting date.**

   Public Comment: None.

8. **Adjournment at 6:50PM.**

For more information concerning the agendas, minutes, and meeting information, please visit sfpuc.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@sfwater.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@sfwater.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@sfwater.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.