



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

MEETING MINUTES

**Tuesday, May 24, 2022
 5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.**

PARTICIPATE VIA ZOOM VIRTUAL CONFERENCE SOFTWARE

Meeting URL

<https://sfwater.zoom.us/j/83020176308?pwd=cTVmaHZBOW5TcWpCTG5OUg5YZm5qZz09>

Phone Dial-in

669 219 2599

Find your local number: <https://sfwater.zoom.us/j/83020176308?pwd=cTVmaHZBOW5TcWpCTG5OUg5YZm5qZz09>

Meeting ID / Passcode

830 2017 6308 / 756754

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](#))

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@sfwater.org. Comments submitted no later than 12 PM 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.

Members:

Jennifer Clary (Chair) (D11)	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 and Jobanjot Aulakh
 Staff Email for Public Comment: cac@sfwater.org

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.

London N. Breed
 Mayor

Anson Moran
 President

Newsha Ajami
 Vice President

Sophie Maxwell
 Commissioner

Tim Paulson
 Commissioner

Ed Harrington
 Commissioner

Dennis J. Herrera
 General Manager



ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Call to Order and Roll Call at 5:37 pm

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

Members Absent: (1) Sandkulla

Staff presenters: Eddy So, Andrzej Wilczak, Mah Raymond, Andrew DeGraca, and Manouchehr Boozapour

Members of the Public: None

2. Approval of the [March 22, 2022](#) Minutes

Motion was made (Kott) and seconded (Nagengast) to approve the March 22, 2022 Minutes.

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

NOES: (0)

ABSENT: (1) Sandkulla

Public Comment: None

3. Report from the Chair

- Chair welcomes committee members, staff, and the public
- Chair Clary noted that there was a general discussion about the need to be more specific and less detailed on the minutes to reduce its length
- Chair Clary noted that she was unable to attend the workshop about the impact water reduction had on wastewater. Member Perszyk commented that he did attend. Member Nagengast commented that this would potentially be a conversation for the Full CAC.

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. Issue: [2022 Public Health Goal Report](#), Eddy So, Senior Water Quality Engineer, Water Enterprise

Action: Learn about the findings of the Public Health Goals Report

Resource: [2022 Public Health Goal Report](#)

Presentation

- 2022 Triennial Update for Public Health Goals (PHGs) Evaluation
- PHG Evaluation
- ACWA Guidelines
- MCL vs. Operational Target vs. PHG
- 2022 PHG Report Summary
- Report Summary (cont'd)
- Optimized Corrosion Control & Monitoring SFPUC Efforts on Reducing Lead
- Lead Reduction Efforts (cont'd)
- Lead User Service Line (LUSL)
- LUSL (cont'd) – As of May 2022
- PHG Future Action Recommendations
- Questions

Discussion

- **Member Nagengast** asked what DLR stood for.

Staff So responded that it was the detection limit for reporting purpose.

- **Member Nagengast** commented that Staff So had the maximum containment level, the public health goals, and the water quality targets. Nagengast noted that the SFPUC did not meet the public health goal for bromate and asked how the SFPUC did in terms of the water quality for that.

Staff So responded that they met the MCLs (Maximum Contaminant Level). Staff So commented that the SFPUC was below the MCL value and that bromate is typically at one or less than one parts per billion. Staff So added that it was higher than the PHG (Public Health Goal), which was .1, but they were at least eight times lower than the MCL and slightly above the DLR, which was 1.

- **Member Nagengast** asked whether in this instance the DLR was the same as the SFPUC's water quality target.

Staff So responded that they are different things. Staff So explained that the SFPUC's target was set around typically 40% to 60% of the MCL's value. Staff So continued that the results of their compliance monitoring were around 1, so it could be below the DLR or slightly higher. Staff So commented that they were always below the target.

- **Member Jacuzzi** asked what the pH target was and if it was raised to reduce corrosion.

Staff So responded that the minimum pH target was 8.2 in the system whether they were regional or in the City. Staff So commented that the State Board established that the SFPUC's value should not be less than 8.2, and they typically operate above 8.9 to maintain that.

- **Member Jacuzzi** asked whether there were components of lead within the zinc galvanization itself or was it just the connectors.

Staff So responded that there were two possibilities with one being from the galvanized coating itself and with the other being lead coming out from the connectors.

Staff DeGraca commented that the industry did not consider coatings to be high risk for lead but one of the concerns for the galvanized line was that corroded lines would allow lead absorption. Staff DeGraca added that a piece of lead upstream with a galvanized line could be absorbed onto the corrosion of the galvanized lines, which is the biggest concern currently.

- **Member Perszyk** commented that UCSF dental clinics have failing disinfections straws , and the manufacturer said it was due to the chlorine and iodine in the sourced water. Perszyk commented that when he received the water quality reports, he saw the chlorine as being steady over time, but iodine was not included in that report. Perszyk asked if Staff So would expect a variation in iodine over time and if he could review the data with someone from the Water Quality Division.

Staff So responded that iodine was not regulated, and there was no MCL. Staff So explained that iodine typically would not show up in their water because it mainly comes from Hetch Hetchy and high elevations. Iodine is not normally present in rivers, lakes, and Hetch Hetchy because its rock is granite. Staff So added that sea water could be a source of iodine. Staff So commented that they normally did not see iodine and they did not normally monitor for it.

Member Perszyk responded that iodine was at 10.6 PPM (Parts Per Million) at Buchanan Dental Center.

Staff So responded that he could recheck their database and that iodine was monitored in the past but not routinely.

- **Member Jacuzzi** commented that the slide that mentioned lead and copper did not mention the copper portion of testing. Jacuzzi asked if there was any copper used on the utility side of the meter.

Staff So responded that most of the meters in the past were made of brass, and brass and bronze are made of zinc and copper. Staff So explained that bronze means a high percentage of copper, and brass means a higher percentage of zinc. Staff So commented that brass meter might have lead components. Staff So commented that the lead-free requirement in California dates to 2010, ahead of the EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) by four years. Staff So commented that even though the new lead definition percentage was much lower than the old definition of lead by the EPA, there would still be some lead no matter what. Staff So commented that the meter manufacturers have been re-working their productions to try to achieve compliance with the lead-free requirement in California to be able to sell those meters in California. Staff So commented that the lead component in those so-called lead-free meters was significantly less than the old days, but that does not mean absolutely zero lead because lead makes the parts more machinable.

- **Staff Jacuzzi** asked if there is any copper along the distribution lines from the utility to the meter.

Staff So responded that most of the pipeline is ductile iron and some older pipelines are cast iron. Staff So commented that main lines four inches and above typically do not use copper, as it is not rigid as ductile iron. Staff So commented that he could not 100% say that there was no copper wire, but the percentage of copper in the distribution system is not that high.

Staff DeGraca commented that the service lines from the mains to the meter into the home are typically copper. Staff DeGraca commented that their leaded copper monitoring action level was 1300, and they were typically in the hundreds. Staff DeGraca commented that they were well below when it came to copper levels, and it was related to their corrosion control program.

Member Jacuzzi commented that the longer the copper pipe, the higher the copper parts per billion would be when it finally reached the tap. Jacuzzi commented that they seem to always ignore the groundwater that is mixed in with the Hetch Hetchy water and that that was not being reported to them in the various presentations to the CAC. Jacuzzi asked where the groundwater was tested before being blended.

Staff So responded that they do include the groundwater raw water data in their water quality report. Staff So commented that they included that groundwater data in the raw water before the blending just for informational purposes because people were not drinking the water directly from the wells, and it had been blended with service water. Staff So commented that they do have the raw water data from the wells, and that they do not have lead or copper in the ground water.

Member Jacuzzi responded that there are concerns about contaminants in groundwater because it is groundwater from an urban area that is getting mixed. Jacuzzi added that it would be helpful for the CAC to know where the groundwater falls on the various levels of potential contaminants, as well as when and where the groundwater is blended in at its raw source.

- **Member Nagengast** asked Jacuzzi whether he had seen this data: https://sfpuc.org/sites/default/files/programs/local-water/220520_SFGW%20Blend%20Report_Final.pdf.

Member Jacuzzi responded affirmatively.

- **Chair Clary** commented that they have annual meetings on groundwater and the SFPUC posts their groundwater quality monitoring, which is something the CAC has been tracking closely. Chair Clary asked whether the SFPUC's tier three monitoring would incorporate any multi-family homes for lead monitoring and if the SFPUC monitored any multi-family buildings with their current lead monitoring program.

Staff So responded that the requirement was to first focus on the single residential buildings.

- **Chair Clary** asked for a follow up as most people live in multi-family buildings. Chair Clary commented that this was a failing of the lead and copper rule in terms of San Francisco. Chair Clary commented that looking at the SFPUC's lead and data program, there seems to be a considerable amount of money coming to California from the infrastructure program through the SRF (State Revolving Fund) that the SFPUC could take advantage of. Chair Clary then asked if the SFPUC had considered sponsoring a grant program to help people update lead on the customer side of the meter.

Staff DeGraca responded that they were looking at many different places, and the thing was influx in terms of what the EPA would allow and what the State would allow. Staff DeGraca commented that there was additional disadvantaged community money of which San Francisco may receive \$6.5 million, which would be nice to use for the customer side replacement. Staff DeGraca commented that they have been thinking about submitting an SRF loan request just for their utility side, but what has been happening on the customer side has been a big unknown.

Chair Clary responded that it would be great to get an update on that once the money came through, which might be after October in the next year.

Staff DeGraca responded that the process to get federal money is slow. Staff DeGraca added that they might see some money next year at the earliest

Public Comment: None

6. **Issue:** [Contaminants of Emerging Concern \(CECs\) in Drinking Water 2022 Report](#), Andrzej Wilczak, Senior Water Quality Engineer, Water Quality Division, Water Enterprise

Action: Learn about the findings of the 2022 CEC Report

Resource: [Contaminants of Emerging Concern \(CECs\) in Drinking Water 2022 Draft Report](#)

Presentation

- SFPUC Water Quality Division (WQD) Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CECs) in Drinking Water – 2022 Report
- What are CECs?
- Outline
- Background: CEC Drivers
- Background: CEC Approach
- Technical Reviewers
- Changes Since 2016 Report
- Changes in 2022 Report
- Proposed 3 General Types of Contaminants and 10 CEC Groups

- Progress Update Since 2019
- Progress Update Since 2019 (Contd.)
- Proposed 2022 CEC Priorities and Work Plan for Drinking Water
- Proposed 2022 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
- Report/Project Schedule
- Next Steps
- Questions

Discussion

- **Member Perszyk** mentioned that the executive summary shows a matrix of different CEC (Contaminants of Emerging Concern) presence in different SFPUC water resources with some shown as unknown or possible. Perszyk asked what the strategy was to move those to yes or no.

Staff Wilczak responded that the matrix was a summary table for their questions and answers for each group of contaminants that they have included in the report of screening evaluation tables. Staff Wilczak explained that the goal of the screening evaluation tables is to provide a digest for the reader of what they knew about the newest scientific information and what their judgment calls were. Staff Wilczak commented that the yes or no classifications were judgment calls as not everything is known. Staff Wilczak gave an example of how to best remove PFAS (polyfluoroalkyl substances) and commented that the reason why it was medium and not low was because there was a regulation looming, so it cannot be a low priority for the SFPUC if the regulation is coming.

- **Member Perszyk** asked if things listed as unknown mean they are low priority based on the evidence or if they are not being monitored. Perszyk also asked if there is a plan to monitor anything that was classified as unknown.

Staff DeGraca responded that if they do not have the science, the method, or the tools, they need to wait for them to be developed and rely on other methods that might be experimental or by comparison. Staff DeGraca commented that once the method or tools are developed, the goal is to try to get from an unknown to a yes or no.

- **Chair Clary** asked if the microbial waterborne pathogens were part of the SFPUC's filtration avoidance requirement from the EPA.

Staff DeGraca responded negatively and added that they put this in the context of contaminants of emerging concern. Staff DeGraca explained that some contaminants are might be a health risk but not in a regulated category.

- **Chair Clary** commented that there was a problem with the algal blooms a few years ago in the winter. Chair Clary asked if the SFPUC

was seeing less of that now that they have instituted treatment on the local reservoirs.

Staff DeGraca responded that algal blooms are seasonal depending on reservoir elevation, the amount of runoff, nutrients, and sunlight. Staff DeGraca commented that he could not say that they had seen any more or any less, but they did install activated carbon, which has helped them deal with some of the short-term spikes. Staff DeGraca commented that they were also in the process of building an ozonation facility as part of the design, which would be a critical tool. Staff DeGraca commented that once that was done in a few years, then they would have a much more robust treatment scheme for the East Bay, which was where the contamination occurred last time.

Staff Wilczak commented that the Calaveras Reservoir was low and that made it more susceptible to blooms. Staff Wilczak commented that the elevations were higher now with the new dam and the hypolimnetic oxygenation system was in place. Staff Wilczak commented that on the microbials, the concern was about regrowth of the bacteria or other micro-organisms in the distribution system and not the source water.

- **Chair Clary** asked whether the chrome six was moving out of this report into the PHG report with the next update in anticipation of the regulation finally being adopted.

Staff DeGraca responded affirmatively. Staff DeGraca commented that it will become regulated and no longer fit into the CEC category.

Public Comment: None

7. Staff Report

No report from Staff.

Public Comment: None

8. Future Agenda Items and Resolutions

Standing Subjects

- Groundwater
- Water Quality

Specific Subjects

- Groundwater Update
- Update on Water Use and Conservation Efforts
- Water Enterprise Environmental Stewardship Policy Implementation Report
- Integrating Tribal Leaders into SFPUC Land Management Decisions
- State Board Water Rights
- Debate about Bay Delta – Member Sandkulla suggested everyone watch the February 5, 2021 Commission workshop about the Voluntary Agreement
- Affordability
- COVID and Long-term Affordability Program
- Implementation of 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 for final confirmation of the next scheduled meeting, agenda and materials.

Public Comment: None

10. Adjournment

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

Meeting was adjourned at 7:05 pm.