



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

MEETING MINUTES

**Tuesday, April 20, 2021
 5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.**

PARTICIPATE VIA BLUEJEANS VIRTUAL CONFERENCE SOFTWARE

Meeting URL

<https://bluejeans.com/868410021>

Phone Dial-in

408.317.9253

Meeting ID

868 410 021#

This meeting is being held by Teleconference Pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order N-29-20 and the Sixteenth Supplement to Mayoral Proclamation Declaring the Existence of a Local Emergency Dated February 25,2020

During the Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) emergency, the San Francisco Public Utilities Citizens Advisory Committee's (SFPUC CAC) regular meeting room, 525 Golden Gate Ave., 3rd Floor Tuolumne Conference Room, is closed. CAC Members and SFPUC staff will convene CAC meetings remotely by teleconference. Members of the public are encouraged to submit their public comment on agenda items in advance of the teleconference meeting by emailing comments to cac@sfgwater.org. Comments submitted no later than 12 PM Tuesday the day of the meeting will be read into the record by SFPUC CAC Staffing Team members during the teleconference meeting and will be treated as a substitute to providing public comment during the meeting. Persons who submit written public comment in advance on an agenda item or items will not be permitted to also provide public comment on the same agenda item(s) during the meeting.

Mission: The purpose of the SFPUC CAC is to provide recommendations to the SFPUC General Manager, the SFPUC Commission, and the Board of Supervisors regarding the agency's long-term strategic, financial, and capital improvement plans ([Admin. Code Article XV, Sections 5.140 - 5.142](#))

Members:

Anietie Ekanem, Chair (D10)

- Marria Evbuoma (D1)
- Suki Kott (D2)
- Steven Kight (D3)
- VACANT (D4)
- Emily Algire (D5)
- Amy Zock (D6)
- VACANT (D7)
- Amy Nagengast (D8)

Moisés García (D9)

- Jennifer Clary (D11)
- Austin Hunter (M-Environmental Org.)
- Nicole Sandkulla (M-Regional Water Customers)
- Mark Tang (M-Engineering/Financial)
- Eliahu Perszyk (M-Large Water User)
- VACANT (B-Small Business)
- VACANT (B-Environmental Justice)

London N. Breed
 Mayor

Sophie Maxwell
 President

Anson Moran
 Vice President

Tim Paulson
 Commissioner

Ed Harrington
 Commissioner

Newsha Ajami
 Commissioner

Michael Carlin
 Acting
 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.



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

Staff Liaisons: Tracy Zhu and Mayara Ruski Augusto Sa
Staff Email for Public Comment: cac@sfwater.org

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Call to order and roll call

Members present at roll call: (9) Ekanem, Kott, Algire, Nagengast, García, Clary, Sandkulla, Tang, Perszyk

Members absent: (4) Evbuoma, Kight, Zock, Hunter

Staff: Betsy Rhodes; Manisha Kothari; Paula Kehoe, Sarah Triolo; Julie Ortiz

Members of the Public: Lara Egbeola-Martial; Nicole Cheng

2. Approve [March 16, 2021](#) Minutes

Motion was made (Clary) and seconded (Ekanem) to approve the March 16, 2021 Minutes

AYES: (9) Ekanem, Kott, Algire, Nagengast, García, Clary, Sandkulla, Tang, Perszyk

NOES: (0)

ABSENT: (4) Evbuoma, Kight, Zock, Hunter

Public Comment: None

3. Report from the Acting Chair, Mark Tang

- Leadership Development
- Welcome members, staff, and the public
- Commitment to share Air District Building Decarbonization Resource

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:** [SFPUC's Draft 2020 Urban Water Management Plan](#), Sarah Triolo, Water Resources Specialist, Water Enterprise

SFPUC Resources

- SFPUC Urban Water Management Plan website: www.sfpuc.org/uwmp
- [Draft 2020 Urban Water Management Plan](#)

Outside Resources

- Pacific Institute's [Assessment of Urban Water Demand Forecasts in California report](#)
- Pacific Institute's [Forecasting Urban Water Demand in California presentation](#) at the League of Women Voters.

Presentation:

- UWMP Background
- Key Changes Since 2015: Changes in California Water Code and SFPUC System
- Historical Retail Demands and Per Capita Usage
- Updated Retail Demand Projections
- Future Demand Projections Driven by Housing and Jobs Growth
- Updated Retail Demand Projections
- Projected Retail Demand and Per Capita Usage
- Supply Projections to Meet Retail Demands
- Total Projected Demands on the Regional Water System
- Projected Supply Availability: Normal Years
- Projected Supply Availability: Impact of Bay-Delta Plan Amendment in Dry Years
- Water Shortage Contingency Plan: Addressing Retail Water Shortages
- Alternative Water Supply Planning
- Public Comment Process & Next Steps

Discussion:

- **Chair Ekanem** asked if, on the residential side, enforcement will be the same in all districts or if different metrics will be used. Would also like to better understand how shortages will be managed.

Staff Triolo responded that the water shortage contingency plan addresses all the sectors, not just residential but also irrigation customers, commercial, and municipal. Depending on the severity of the water shortage, the SFPUC would be asking for demand reductions from all those sectors. In terms of the wholesale customers, the approach to water shortage is governed by the water supply agreement. That contract defines how water would be allocated in the event of a shortage. Therefore, the UWMP did not redefine what that contract has laid out.

- **Chair Ekanem** asked if all districts will be treated equally.

Staff Triolo responded that there is no provision that enforcement would be done differently in different areas. The plan gives flexibility on how to allocate shortages, but enforcement will be based on billed water consumption and whether the customer has met their allocation, and not based on location.

- **Member Perszyk** asked for an explanation in the background calculations resulting in a negative Energy Intensity (kWh/volume) number when reporting Energy Intensity.

Staff Triolo responded that the Energy Intensity Calculation includes energy that was generated as part of water delivery. The number is negative as the hydropower generated using the Regional Water System creates a negative. It turns out that the result is a significantly negative number when we compare that to the energy that is required for water supply, treatment, and distribution. Gravity is a big part of distribution, and energy is being used for treatment. We are producing more energy than what is being used.

- **Member Clary** commented that this meeting should be considered as a public comment meeting since it was noted as such in the plan, and the meeting is being recorded and minutes are being taken. Member Clary asked if the per capita water use is calculated separately for multi-family and single-family residences. Clary also commented that her assumption is that multi-family per capita is lower than single family residential. Since the growth is in multi-family, it is surprising not to see a continuing reduction in the per capita water use in the chart.

Staff Triolo answered that the SFPUC does have the calculation of those per capita numbers separately, but staff does not have those numbers available now and could be provided next week. Multi-family is lower than single-family. One of the things that is preventing continuing reduction in multi-family use is that part of the demand projection is accounting for active conservation from engagement in the programs. The estimates of active conservation are based on projections of about five years and passed that the estimates are not as good because some of the programs expire, new programs might be implemented and what savings those might generate. We expect that they may be additional conservation savings to be had that could lower those residential per capita but those are not forecasted that far out into the future. We might see that demand reduction when we redo our forecast in five years. The residential per capita might go down a little bit.

Member Clary asked that more information be provided next week during the CAC Water Subcommittee meeting.

- **Chair Ekanem** commented that there is no way to measure for the multi-family. HOAs pay for utilities and it is unclear how use is measured.

Staff Triolo responded that the Conservation team can better answer this question and they will be presenting to the Water CAC next week. Multi-family accounts bundle dwelling units together under one account. The demand projections use both historical data and the number of dwelling units. There is an estimation where the account data is divided by the number of dwelling units, which provides an average of water consumption.

Chair Ekanem commented that if it is not directly billed, it is hard to change behavior. If individuals are not aware of the calculation, it is harder to incentivize conservation.

- **Member Algire** commented that Staff Triolo mentioned that rationing programs would be enforced first in the irrigation sector, then

residential, then commercial sector. Member Algire then asked how this order was chosen and what is the rationale behind it.

Staff Triolo confirmed that the order is correct. Irrigation may include large golf courses (although they may also be classified as commercial customers), HOAs with shared irrigation areas, and several other large irrigated areas. The rationale behind asking irrigation customers to conserve first is that the SFPUC wants to cut outdoor irrigation before asking residences and businesses to conserve indoor water use. The economic impact of rationing on businesses is also considered.

- **Member Clary** asked staff to explain water loss - what it entails, how it is measured and why your report estimated no reduction in water loss, despite new state requirements to address this area of water waste.

Acting Chair Tang commented that his was also his question and added that the numbers state it is about 10 percent of the retail deliveries and asked what that means.

Staff Triolo stated that she can follow up next week with more specific information. The water loss encompasses a couple of things, such as the physical loss through leaks in the infrastructure and metering errors. It is primarily water that is physically lost through the infrastructure. There are leak detection programs to identify leaks and help customers repair those leaks, and the asset management program is also focused on repairing leaks in the broader distribution system.

Acting Chair Tang commented that it looks like the projections are at six for each subsequent five-year period and 2020 is higher and it is not going to decrease without a fix.

Staff Triolo responded that the 2020 number is an anomaly, not typical, and that is why the number is projected to return to a more normal level. Staff Triolo offered to get more information about it.

Member Clary asked if the water loss in San Francisco include firefighting or if that is metered.

Staff Triolo answered that she is not sure, and that it may be included.

Member Clary commented that State law requires local water agencies to be more specific about tracking, recording and reducing their water loss, and keeping it at six million gallons is probably a little higher than what she would anticipate and maybe the SFPUC is still trying to figure out how to implement that rule.

Staff Triolo stated that it is likely a conservative estimate.

Member Clary shared the page on the State Water Board website with new water loss requirements:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/conservation_portal/water_loss_control.html

- **Member Kott** asked what happens with population growth in cities like San Francisco - is there ever a concern that the infrastructure will not support the population beyond a certain point?

Staff Triolo responded that this is one of the reasons why the Plan is done, and that try to anticipate what our demands might be and if we have the water supply to meet those demands. We redo the plan every five years to check how we are doing. There is no good answer to explain which level we would no longer be able to continue to supply water.

Member Sandkulla added that this is a question that the wholesale customers are dealing with. There isn't a ready answer because cities are expected to meet their required housing allocations from the State and there are penalties if you don't. The expectation is that infrastructure will be developed to support them, but that is a serious question that most of the wholesale customers are struggling with the projections given the reliability as a result of the Bay-Delta Plan. That has been flagged as a potential issue because there is not enough reliability. Reliability is an issue during dry year use.

- **Member Nagengast** asked staff to frame each of the "purposes of the UWMP" in terms of how the UWMP impacts the consumer instead of the agency's use. It would be great to make the plan more tangible to customers and the public.

Staff Triolo responded that the UWMP is intended to be an agency document as a summary of our planning processes and it is not intended to be a guide for consumer behavior. Could think a bit more about the question and future impacts on rates.

Member Nagengast asked how the plan is used other than compliance and what are the outcomes. It would be helpful to have the plan translated into a more tangible and consumable way, to understand projects happening in each neighborhood.

Member Sandkulla answered that the plan is essentially a presentation of the current plan, but it becomes a roadmap for the next five years and where the agency is going to invest in, how it will operate during a drought, and what projects will be executed. It is an opportunity for the public to agree or disagree with the proposed plans, such as liking or disliking the agency's approach to drought, conservation, reliability. It is an opportunity to have public discussion about the plans. The SFPUC needs to respond to all comments in a public document before they adopt the Plan. This committee wanted to provide strong feedback and it is a way to dialogue and engage. This will be the document that the Commission will use for the next five years for investments, approval and developments.

- **Acting Chair Tang** commented this is important work. Projecting demand and supply is a big deal and it is a roadmap and looking at the opportunities is great, such as to reduce water waste.

Public Comment: None

6. **Presentation, Discussion and Possible Action:** [Resolution Supporting the Southern Skyline Boulevard Ridge Trail Extension Project](#), Eliahu Perszyk, Water Subcommittee

Discussion:

- **Member Sandkulla** commented that the last paragraph states that "the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Citizens Advisory

Committee supports continued docent-led access to increase public education of our regional water system and a thorough investigation into the creation of an annual permit program” and asked if that is what the plan is.

- **Member Perszyk** answered positively and added that the investigation is ongoing.
- **Member Nagengast** added that the idea is to encourage a robust investigation.
- **Member Algire** asked whether the SFPUC consulted local Indigenous representatives (Amah Mutsun, Ramaytush) or consultants (Kanyon Konsulting) about what they would want to have done with the land around which these extended trails are being proposed.
- **Member Clary** responded that it would be a CEQA requirement and it would be covered in the CEQA document.
- **Member Perszyk** added that there is a land permit that was just issued to allow indigenous people on the land and there is ongoing work with indigenous representatives.
- **Member Kott** commented that it is not new acquisition of the property, it is opening the land for trail use.
- **Member Kott** suggested consistently using the same name for the trail.
- Modifications were made to use the following title “Fifield-Cahill Ridge Trail” consistently.
- All ‘whereas’ were changed so that all paragraphs would start with capitalized words.

Motion was made (Sandkulla) and seconded (García) to adopt the resolution.

The motion PASSED with the following votes:

AYES: (9) Ekanem, Kott, Algire, Nagengast, García, Clary, Sandkulla, Tang, Perszyk

NOES: (0)

ABSENT: (4) Evbuoma, Kight, Zock, Hunter

Public Comment: None.

7. **Discussion: One Year Reflection of Shelter-in-Place**, Mark Tang, Acting Chair

- Brief review of one year of Shelter in Place.

**Member Sandkulla had to leave at 6:54pm.

Public Comment: None

8. **Staff report**

- Announced that Austin Hunter resigned from the CAC
- Reminder for CAC seats seeking members
 - District 3
 - District 4
 - District 6
 - District 7

- Small Business Seat appointed by Board of Supervisors' President
- Environmental Justice Seat appointed by Board of Supervisors' President
- Regional or Statewide Environmental Group appointed by the Mayor

Public Comment: None

9. Future Agenda Items and Resolutions

- Affordability and Arrearage Pilot Program – *tentative May*
- Agency-wide Planning & Policy on Climate Change & Adaptation
- Interagency Working Group on Sea Level Rise
- Contracting Process
- Education Resolution
- PUC Properties and City Department Partnerships
- Water Equity and Water Access for Homeless
- Workforce Programs
- Water Rights and Raker Act
- Water Use and Parks
- Flooding Protection
- Water Quality Report
- Green New Deal
- Micro Hydroelectric Power
- Prop A Bond Funding
- Commissioner Visits

Adopted Resolutions for Follow Up

- Resolution in Support of Interim Emergency Rate Assistance Program and Revised Community Assistance Program [adopted July 21, 2020](#)
- Resolution in Support of a Skilled and Diverse Utility Workforce [adopted February 19, 2019](#)
- Resolution Honoring the Life, Activism, and Contributions of Dr. Espanola Jackson to the Local Community [adopted on April 19, 2016](#)
- Resolution on Balboa Reservoir [adopted March 15, 2016](#)

10. **Announcements/Comments** The next FULL CAC meeting will be on May 18, 2021. Visit www.sfpuc.org/cac for confirmation of the next scheduled meeting, agenda and materials.

11. Adjournment

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

Meeting was adjourned at 6:58 PM