

525 Golden Gate Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102 T 415.554.3282 F 415.554.3161 TTY 415.554.3488

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

Meeting Minutes
Monday, October 15, 2012
5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.
525 Golden Gate Ave 2nd Floor O'Shaughnessy Conference Room

#### Members

Richard Hansen (D1) Diane Mokoro (D5) Art Jensen (M-Reg'l Water Customers)

David Pilpel, Chair (D4) Jennifer Clary (D11) Karen Donovan (Public Member)

M = Mayoral appointment, B = Board President appointment

Staff: Amy Sinclair

#### **ORDER OF BUSINESS**

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, and Agenda Changes

The meeting was called to order at 5:36pm.

Committee Members Present: D.Pilpel; D.Mokoro; J.Clary; A.Jensen;

K.Donovan.

Committee Members Absent: R.Hansen.

SFPUC Staff Present: A.Sinclair; B.Palacios; M.Koenig

Members of the Public Present: Andrew Lipsett

Agenda Changes: none

2. Presentation, Discussion, and Possible Action: <u>Eastside Recycled Water Project Update</u>, Barbara Palacios, SFPUC Project Manager

The SFPUC has a commitment to limit the supply of water taken from the system to no more than 265 million gallons per day (MGD). To accomplish this goal we are diversifying our water supply portfolio. We are continuing our active conservation programs, developing groundwater, and planning to develop 4 MGD per day of recycled water in San Francisco.

Recycled water projects in San Francisco include three projects:

Harding Park, which will soon begin delivering recycled water; Westside, which is in the design phase; and Eastside, where we have started planning efforts to develop 2 MGD of recycled water for development, etc.

The reason is to diversify our water supply portfolio, making sure we can meet our long term water demands. Recycled water is a good way to meet our non-potable needs.

The City is committed to using recycled water. That commitment began in 1991 with the Recycled Water Ordinance which set the stage for planning a recycled water program here in the city. That ordinance required dual plumbing that most developments now have or will be installing. In 2009, that commitment to recycled water was further endorsed with park code amendments which require the use of non-potable water to irrigate parks. Recycled water is a drought-proof supply of water and we believe it is an investment in the City's sustainable future.

Edwin M. Lee Mayor

Anson Moran President

Art Torres Vice President

Ann Moller Caen Commissioner

Francesca Vietor Commissioner

> Vince Courtney Commissioner

Harlan L. Kelly, Jr. General Manager



Most folks know that recycled water is wastewater that is treated through several steps. A recycled water facility would add two additional steps, filtration, and disinfection.

There is also a treatment approach called scalping, where wastewater is collected directly from the sewer. All four steps would take place: primary, biological, filtration and disinfection. Recycled water and gray water are not the same thing. Gray water is collection from within a home it may contain some soap and is clean enough to use in a garden.

On the east side, our highest demand customers include mostly new developments such as Mission Bay, Candlestick Point, Hunters Point, etc. These have or will have dual plumbing to receive recycled water.

We have been focusing on site evaluation, looking at size, potential availability, proximity to source water, and proximity to customers.

Five sites have been identified: Seawall Lot 337 (SF Port), Pier 70 (SF Port), Pier 90-94 (SF Port), Selby & Evans (State of California), and Griffith Pump Station (SFPUC).

An alternatives analysis will be developed using these five sites and will consider decentralized treatment (two facilities), centralized treatment (one facility), and source water (either Southeast effluent or sewer water).

Evaluation criteria will take a triple-bottom line approach and include environmental, social, technical criteria and cost.

Recommended alternatives are to be identified and presented to the Commission before proceeding.

Our goal is to complete the alternatives analysis early next year. We are planning another outreach event and then we will circle back with our commission in the months that follow. We hope to start environmental review next year.

### Questions and Discussion:

J.Clary: Can you explain your site selection because I think these sites were realistic when we discussed them seven or eight years ago but I went to a meeting with the Giants recently and they showed me their multi-million square foot development proposal for Seawall Lot 337. If you were to take one acre of that, it would be a significant cost. I don't really understand how practical these sites are.

B.Palacios: We are working with the Port and the Giants on the concept at Seawall Lot 337. We met with them on Thursday.

D.Pilpel: What is the size of the space you would need? If it is centralized versus de-centralized?

B.Palacios: One acre. If it is decentralized, we are assuming the demand would be split between the two. A scalping plant, which has the two extra steps, we are estimating about an acre for about half the flow of a conventional secondary effluent treatment plant.

J.Clary: I am still a little disappointed in your site selection. I think these are unrealistic. Can you tell me what the water quality is at the location if you're going to have a scalping plant?

B.Palacios: We've sampled the wastewater at the different sewer locations near these sites and the total dissolved solids (TDS) is high, about 1000 parts per million (PPM). The evaluation of each site will take into account the treatment requirements at each site to meet the target goals. We've set a finished water TDS goal of 450 PPM for the finished recycled water.

A.Jensen: On the evaluation criteria, the slide says environmental, social, technical, and cost. What specific examples of criteria do you have? Is it published somewhere? On cost, are you looking at lifecycle costs and bundling them together? Are you using ranking criteria?

B.Palacios: For social, we're looking at noise, visual impacts, and jobs. For environmental, we're looking at impacts to historical resources. There are not many biological resources. We've developed draft materials. Cost criteria determination is in process. This information will be the output of the next goround.

Public Comment: Andrew Lipsett (A.Lipsett). When we built the Southeast Treatment Plant, I thought it had a 45 year life span.

J.Clary: It is 65 years old.

A.Lipsett: I recall a few months ago the SFPUC saying that we have to push through a contract to make repairs right away because things are failing. As a ratepayer I want to make sure that we are able to maintain the system. I don't want to pay for three plants all in one lifetime. It is getting a bit pricey. How are we going to budget for proper maintenance? We need to look at a cost-benefit analysis and at the operating budget.

D.Pilpel: Comment taken. When we have completed the next round about lifecycle costs, we will schedule a presentation.

Presentation, Discussion, and Possible Action: <u>Eastside Recycled Water Project Outreach and iPad Survey Update</u>, B.Palacios and A.Kastama presented on Eastside Recycled Water Project Outreach and iPad Survey Results (so far).

Public outreach has been a major part of the project. We want to make sure that we are getting the information out to the public and ensure that they know we are looking at potential sites. We have been talking to the public since last summer. We want to know what stakeholders feel is important. We had two open houses in November 2011: one in Mission Bay and one at the Southeast Community Facility.

On digital outreach, we are working with a company called Civinomics, who is using iPad for survey research. This has been a great way to step-up our outreach. We have been able to talk with hundreds of people in one-on-one settings and we have an online website version of the survey as well. Site information has been the primary topic of outreach and we've also asked for feedback on project priorities.

Over 630 iPad interviews have taken place so far in various neighborhoods of the City. We sent out email blasts to our stakeholder lists. We also did a hard mailing to people within a quarter mile of each site, with over 11,000 addresses. We also have kept our website current with information on each site. We also have a new local water supply blog: sfwater.org/localwater.

Based on the surveys, no one site has been considered completely unfavorable. In terms of project priorities, most people rated the project as important. A second round of iPad surveys is now underway. Civinomics conducted surveys over the weekend at the October 13<sup>th</sup> Southeast Community Health Fair.

A.Kastama added that the iPad surveys took place in populated areas near the proposed sites so we could be face to face with people who live and work near the sites.

## Questions and Discussion:

D.Pilpel: How many surveys took place on Saturday, October 13<sup>th</sup>? Manu Koenig (From Civinomics, M.Koenig): Approximately 35 to 45 interviews took place.

A.Kastama added at least another 20 people stopped by the tables to learn about the project but did not take survey.

A.Jensen: How many people have taken the survey on the website?

M.Koenig: About 30 so far. It is interesting because online is often the best way to reach people but talking directly to people can be more effective.

J.Clary: Having to register to take the survey was a frustration for me. Where are the survey respondents from, in terms of neighborhoods, and what were the variations in responses? We have asked for a report.

A.Kastama: 19 different zip codes were represented in the 630 interviews. Our report does not break them down by specific zip code, but that can be provided.

M.Koenig: We plan to go back out to zip code 94124 since many of the sites considered are in that area.

### **Public Comment:**

A.Lipsett asked about how many jobs are related to the location of the plant. Will jobs be only during the construction of the plant? Will jobs change by location? Also, didn't the reports on climate change a few years ago state that some of these locations may be underwater in a few years?

J.Clary: We can show from the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) maps that show what areas could be underwater. There is a specific state mandate that requires accounting for five feet of sea level rise.

D.Pilpel: On your comment about jobs, we often see local jobs in the construction of the plants but it does not always carry through to long-term jobs.

## 4. Staff Report

A.Kastama stated that we also did groundwater tasting at the October 13<sup>th</sup> Southeast Community Health Fair and had over 100 people participate.

She stated that we anticipate the Draft EIR on groundwater by approximately January 2013. We are going forward with groundwater tastings in October and November at various farmers markets and events in areas where groundwater would be used.

A.Kastama stated that the Harding Park Recycled Water Press Conference will take place soon, on a date to be announced.

Public comment: none.

**5.** Approval of the September 17, 2012 Meeting Minutes. J.Clary moved; D.Pilpel seconded. Approved as amended with corrections from A.Jensen and D.Pilpel.

Public comment: none.

Minutes approved without objection.

### 6. Report from the Chair

D. Pilpel provided a detailed handout titled Expectations for the Water Subcommittee Going Forward. He has met with staff and discussed his expectations going forward. He would like to focus the subcommittee more on operations and people.

Public comment: none.

# 7. Future Agenda Items

D.Pilpel: Eastside Recycled Water Project Update

A.Kastama stated that T.Young is meeting with CAC members to plan meeting topics in advance. We are looking at the Commission's advance calendar so that we can plan ahead.

- 8. Public Comment: none.
- 9. Next regular meeting is scheduled for Monday, November 19, 2012
- **10.** Adjournment The meeting was adjourned at 7:05pm.