



KA WAI OLA

WATER FOR LIFE

Honolulu Board of Water Supply
Stakeholder Advisory Group Meeting 60
Thursday, April 16, 2026, 4:00 – 6:00 pm
Online via Zoom

Meeting Notes

PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION OF MEETING NOTES

The purpose of these notes is to provide an overview of the Board of Water Supply (BWS) Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting. They are not intended as a transcript or as minutes. Major points of the presentations are summarized herein, primarily for context. Copies of presentation materials were provided to all participants and are available on the BWS website. Participants made many comments and asked many questions during the meeting. These are paraphrased to be more concise.

ATTENDEES

This was an in-person meeting in which 12 stakeholders participated, in addition to BWS staff, consultants and members of the public. The stakeholders represent diverse interests and communities island wide.

The following Stakeholders Advisory Group members attended:

Alison Richardson	Coca-Cola Company
Bob Leinau	Resident of Council District 2
Cynthia Rezentes	Resident of Council District 1
Helen Nakano	Resident of Council District 5
Jicky Ferrer	AARP Hawaii
John Reppun	KEY Project
Josh Stanbro	Hawaii Council
Mahealani Cypher	Resident of Council District 3
Mark Fox	Environmental
Matt Bailey	Castle Hospitality Group
Ryan Obrero	Honolulu Board of Realtors
Shari Ishikawa	Hawaiian Electric Company

WELCOME

Facilitator Dave Ebersold welcomed everyone to the 60th meeting of the BWS Stakeholder Advisory Group.

Meeting objectives were identified as:

- Water demand projections
- Potential future sources
- Accept notes from meetings #58 and 59
- PFAS and emerging contaminants management

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

FUTURE WATER DEMAND PROJECTIONS

Dave invited Carl Lundin, Environmental Engineer with CDM Smith, to present the methodology being used to forecast water demand through 2055. Carl explained that the analysis begins with historical islandwide water production and consumption data measured in million gallons per day (MGD). BWS converts this information into gallons per person per day (GPPD) by dividing total water use by the population served. This metric is then used in a calibrated demand model to identify the factors that influence water use and project future demand. Future per-person demand projections are combined with population forecasts to estimate future islandwide water demand.

QUESTION: Bob Leinau asked whether agricultural water use is included in the per-person demand calculations and noted that agricultural consumption could misrepresent gallons-per-person figures. Carl explained that the GPPD metric includes all potable water use served by BWS, including residential, commercial, industrial, and agricultural customers connected to the system. Dave Ebersold added that the analysis includes agricultural customers connected to the BWS potable water system but does not include non-potable agricultural water sources operating outside the BWS system.

Carl reviewed historical demand trends over the past 30 years and noted that while O‘ahu’s population increased during much of that period, overall water demand declined. Seasonal fluctuations remain evident, with higher demand during summer months and lower demand during winter months, but the long-term trend shows decreasing water use. When demand is normalized by population, the reduction in per-person consumption becomes even more apparent.

Q: Mark Fox asked whether O‘ahu’s population is actually declining and questioned whether the apparent reduction in demand was simply the result of population changes. Carl responded that the population-served estimates do indicate slight declines in recent years, although the figures are estimates. He noted that even when population changes are considered, per-person water use has continued to decline over time. Kathleen Elliott-Pahinui added that water use increased steadily through the 1980s before the launch of BWS conservation programs. Since then, average daily water use has steadily declined despite continued population growth. She added that while BWS often cites an average production of approximately 145 million gallons per day, recent wet weather conditions reduced average daily demand to approximately 120 million gallons per day.

Carl continued his presentation explaining that BWS developed an econometric demand model to better understand the drivers of water use. The model tested numerous variables and found the strongest correlations with climate-related factors such as temperature, precipitation, previous-month precipitation, and consecutive days without rainfall. Additional variables included unemployment rates, water rates, and non-revenue water. Using these factors, BWS developed a statistical model that closely represents historical demand patterns and can be used to project future demand. The model found that higher temperatures generally increase water demand, while higher water rates tend to reduce consumption.

Carl then described how future climate projections developed as part of earlier Water Master Plan were incorporated into the model. Using low, medium, and high emissions climate scenarios, BWS evaluated how future temperatures and rainfall patterns could affect water demand. Climate factors alone resulted in a modest increase in future demand projections, while projected population growth also contributed to slight increases. However, when a scenario assuming annual water-rate increases of approximately three percent was incorporated, projected demand began trending downward, indicating that water rates remain one of the strongest factors influencing long-term water consumption.

Q: Josh Stanbro asked whether the climate projections account for changing rainfall patterns, such as more intense storms separated by longer dry periods, rather than just total rainfall amounts. Carl confirmed that the model incorporates variables such as consecutive dry days, current precipitation, previous-month precipitation, and temperature. So, the model captures changing rainfall patterns and variability rather than relying solely on total rainfall amounts.

Q: Josh Stanbro asked why future population projections show growth when recent population trends appear relatively flat or declining. Carl explained that BWS relies on population projections prepared by the Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism (DBEDT), which currently forecast modest population growth over the planning horizon.

Q: Josh Stanbro asked whether the water-rate assumptions reflect currently approved rate increases or assume additional future increases. Carl explained that the model assumes annual water-rate increases of approximately three percent throughout the planning period to offset average inflation. Dave clarified that the analysis is intended to evaluate how increasing water costs influence customer behavior and future water demand.

Q: Cynthia Rezentes asked for clarification regarding the three-percent annual increase and whether it represented inflation or actual water-rate increases. Dave explained that the model assumes water rates increase by three percent annually and does not separately account for inflation. The purpose is to evaluate how higher customer water bills (even if only increasing at inflation) may influence water consumption patterns.

Q: Mahealani Cypher asked whether a three-percent annual increase would effectively amount to approximately fifteen percent over a five-year period and noted that customers are paying for water service rather than the water resource itself. Dave responded that the model is focused on customer bills and historical evidence showing that higher water costs are associated with reductions in water consumption over time.

Carl continued his presentation sharing the water demand forecast results. Under the baseline scenario, demand is projected to remain relatively stable through 2055, decreasing slightly from current levels. The forecast suggests that conservation efforts, demographic trends, and rate impacts largely offset the effects of climate change and population growth. He emphasized that the forecast is intended to provide a planning basis rather than a precise prediction and will be updated periodically as conditions change.

Q: Ryan Obrero asked whether higher sewer charges, rather than water rates alone, could be contributing to reduced water demand because customers often view their water and sewer charges as one combined bill. Carl explained that BWS tested both water and sewer rates in the model, but because the two charges tend to move together, the model could not clearly separate their individual

effects. He agreed that customers are likely responding to the overall bill rather than only the water portion.

Carl then presented a more detailed analysis at the Development Plan Area (DPA) level. He explained that while islandwide demand trends are useful for long-range planning, BWS also needs to understand regional differences in water use, population growth, land use, and system demands. Using O'ahu's eight Development Plan Areas, BWS evaluated current and projected gallons per person per day (GPPD) across different regions of the island. He noted that most areas cluster around the islandwide average, while North Shore and Wai'anae show higher apparent usage because potable agricultural meters are included in those regions. Conversely, Central O'ahu appears lower than average due in part to how water system boundaries overlap development plan boundaries.

Carl explained that when future demand projections are applied at the regional level, most Development Plan Areas are projected to experience a 13–14% reduction in per-person water use by 2055. He noted that increasing water costs remain the largest factor driving these reductions, while climate variables account for much of the variation between regions. However, agricultural demand in Wai'anae and North Shore introduces additional uncertainty because those uses are more difficult to isolate within the analysis.

Q: Cynthia Rezendes noted that many mainland communities have implemented aggressive landscaping and turf-replacement incentives that significantly reduce outdoor water use. She asked whether the projected reductions assume similar conservation programs and incentives. Carl explained that the projections are not based on specific future conservation programs. Rather, they reflect current trends and existing conditions. Dave Ebersold added that comparisons with other utilities are not intended to be direct apples-to-apples comparisons, but rather illustrate the range of water use across different communities and climates.

Q: Josh Stanbro asked whether future large-scale water users, such as data centers, military facilities, or other major developments, are incorporated into the projections. Carl explained that known development projects are included in the near-term forecasts, but projections further into the future rely primarily on population growth estimates because specific large-scale projects beyond the near term are difficult to predict.

Q: Ryan Obrero asked whether projected reductions in water demand could reduce the need for future infrastructure projects, such as developing new wells and water sources. Carl responded that the relationship between projected demand and future source development would be addressed in the upcoming source evaluation portion of the presentation.

Q: Bob Leinau asked whether the projections incorporate land use plans, zoning changes, and population forecasts contained in the City's General Plans and Sustainable Communities Plans. Carl explained that the analysis primarily relies on population projections prepared by DBEDT and does not directly incorporate General Plan or zoning assumptions. Kathleen Elliott-Pahinui added that those planning documents are utilized during BWS's watershed management planning efforts.

Q: Cynthia Rezendes asked whether the projections account for Wai'anae potentially becoming a Water Management Area under the Commission on Water Resource Management. Dave responded that the current demand projections do not incorporate potential future Water Management Area designation.

Carl then reviewed DBEDT population projections through 2055, noting that overall population growth is expected to be relatively modest at approximately 3-4% islandwide over the next 30 years. Most of

that growth is projected to occur on the south side of O‘ahu, particularly in the ‘Ewa region, while several other Development Plan Areas are expected to experience stable or declining populations. Combining these population projections with the projected reductions in per-person water use results in generally declining total water demands across most regions of the island. ‘Ewa was the primary exception, where population growth is expected to offset conservation-related reductions in per-person demand and produce increased overall water demand.

Q: Mahealani Cypher noted that East Honolulu showed only a modest decrease in projected demand and asked why the reduction was smaller than in other regions. Carl explained that East Honolulu is projected to experience some population growth, which partially offsets reductions in per-person water use and results in a smaller overall decline in demand.

Q: Bob Leinau asked how climate uncertainty is factored into projections extending 30 years into the future. Carl explained that BWS updates the analysis periodically to ensure planning remains accurate and responsive to changing conditions over time.

Carl concluded his presentation by noting that the demand projections represent a broad, islandwide assessment and that additional analyses are underway to evaluate the impacts of transit-oriented development, affordable housing projects, and other concentrated growth areas. These demand projections will ultimately be used to inform the source evaluation and future water supply planning components of the Water Master Plan.

FUTURE WATER SUPPLIES

Dave introduced Bill Fernandez, Water Resources Engineer with CDM Smith, to present on future water supply needs and alternative water resources. Bill explained that while earlier demand projections showed overall water use declining over time, BWS must still plan for future water supply needs because of uncertainty associated with climate variability, groundwater quality concerns, and unforeseen events.

Bill reviewed the major stressors that can affect O‘ahu’s water supply system, explaining that climate change may alter precipitation patterns and groundwater recharge, with more rainfall occurring in intense storm events that generate runoff rather than aquifer recharge. Reduced recharge could eventually affect sustainable yields, limiting the amount of groundwater that can be withdrawn over time. He also discussed groundwater quality concerns, including contamination from spills, legacy agricultural chemicals, saltwater intrusion from over-pumping, sea level rise, and other unforeseen events. Bill noted that changes in demand patterns and the geographic distribution of water use can also create infrastructure challenges, even if overall islandwide demand declines.

Bill presented the results of a pumping capacity analysis conducted as part of the Water Master Plan update. The analysis evaluated whether BWS’s infrastructure is capable of meeting demand within each pressure zone by comparing projected demand against available firm pumping capacity. He explained that the review identified five pressure zones where additional pumping capacity, water supplies, or infrastructure improvements may eventually be needed. Bill emphasized that the analysis focused specifically on infrastructure capacity rather than groundwater availability or climate-related impacts and was intended to identify areas where future investments may be necessary to maintain reliable service.

Bill next discussed alternative and supplemental water supply strategies that could help meet future needs. These included continued investments in water conservation, seawater desalination, stormwater capture and aquifer recharge, recycled water programs, and on-site water reuse systems.

He noted that BWS is already investing in several of these approaches and that evaluating all available options is necessary to ensure long-term water security.

Bill then highlighted BWS's ongoing conservation programs, including WaterSense rebates, WaterWise audits, and trade ally partnerships that help businesses improve water efficiency. He also noted that the Department of Environmental Services (ENV) recently joined BWS in offering joint conservation rebates, doubling the value of many rebate incentives. Since 2018, the rebate program has issued approximately 21,000 rebates, provided \$1.6 million in incentives, and is estimated to save approximately 117 million gallons of water annually.

Q: Josh Stanbro asked how the cost-effectiveness of conservation compares to developing new water supplies such as wells or desalination. Bill explained that developing a new water source can cost roughly \$10 million per million gallons of capacity, though costs vary by project type. Kathleen Elliott-Pahinui added that conservation remains the most cost-effective and least expensive method of meeting future water needs when compared to developing new supplies.

Q: Jicky Ferrer asked how much it currently costs to drill a new well. Kathleen responded that new wells currently cost approximately \$5 million to \$7 million each to construct.

Q: Jicky Ferrer asked how much a desalination plant costs to construct. Kathleen stated that the current estimated cost of the Kalaeloa Seawater Desalination Project is approximately \$240 million.

Bill then highlighted the Kalaeloa Seawater Desalination Project, explaining that the facility will use reverse osmosis technology to treat seawater drawn from a deep brackish aquifer below the freshwater lens and is designed to produce between 1.7 and 2.5 million gallons of drinking water per day. The facility is intended to serve customers in Campbell Industrial Park, Kapolei Business Park, and the Deep Draft Harbor area.

Q: Mahealani Cypher asked how concentrated brine generated by the desalination process will be disposed. Bill explained that brine will be injected into shallower wells that discharge into a brackish aquifer and that disposal methods have been incorporated into the project design and permitting process.

Q: Jicky Ferrer asked whether the desalination facility is based on proven technology and whether environmental concerns have been fully evaluated. Bill explained that the project is being designed and constructed by a team of local and mainland firms using established desalination technology that has been successfully deployed elsewhere. Dave Ebersold added that all required permitting and environmental review processes have already been completed.

Q: Mark Fox asked about emerging subsea desalination technologies that use deep ocean pressure to reduce energy consumption and whether BWS had evaluated that approach. Bill explained that a significant portion of desalination costs come from the energy required to generate pressure for reverse osmosis treatment. He noted that deep-ocean desalination concepts seek to utilize naturally occurring ocean pressure to reduce those energy requirements, though such systems require significant ocean depth to operate effectively. Dave Ebersold declined to comment on the effectiveness of the subsea desalination technology.

Q: Jicky Ferrer asked whether renewable or green energy sources would be incorporated into the desalination project. Kathleen stated that renewable energy is not currently part of the project design.

Bill then discussed a stormwater capture and aquifer recharge project currently being developed in Nuʻuanu Valley. The project would convey excess stormwater from Nuʻuanu Reservoir No. 4 through a treatment process and then inject the water into the aquifer, allowing it to recharge groundwater supplies before eventually reaching the Kalihi Wells. Bill noted that the project is currently undergoing preliminary engineering design and environmental review. He also explained that the project could incorporate hydroelectric generation by utilizing the elevation change between the reservoir and the recharge location. Additionally, he noted that the Department of Facility Maintenance (DFM) is developing a Stormwater Master Plan that will evaluate a broader range of stormwater capture, recharge, and green infrastructure opportunities across Oʻahu.

COMMENT: Josh Stanbro shared his enthusiasm for the Nuʻuanu project, noting the historical significance of hydroelectric power generation in Nuʻuanu Valley, where water-powered electricity helped illuminate ʻIolani Palace in the late 1800s.

Q: Bob Leinau asked how stormwater would be treated before being injected into the aquifer. Bill explained that the project would avoid capturing water immediately following major storm events when turbidity is highest. Instead, water would be withdrawn after sediment has settled and would undergo lower-level filtration using cartridge filters rather than more expensive treatment technologies such as reverse osmosis.

Bill continued his presentation to discuss recycled water and water reuse. He reviewed several forms of reuse, including non-potable recycled water used for irrigation and industrial purposes, indirect potable reuse (IPR), and direct potable reuse (DPR). He explained that Honouliuli currently produces approximately 7 MGD of high-quality recycled water for irrigation uses, as well as 1-2 MGD of reverse osmosis-treated recycled water used for industrial applications. Bill also discussed ongoing efforts to expand graywater and water reuse opportunities through policy initiatives and future Department of Health regulations.

Q: Helen Nakano asked why Japanese toilet designs with handwashing basins that reuses water for flushing are not more widely used in Hawaiʻi. Bill acknowledged the efficiency of the concept but was unsure why the technology has not become more common locally. Dave suggested that U.S. plumbing code requirements may be causing issues.

Bill highlighted Kuilei Place as a local example of an advanced graywater reuse system. He explained that the development will capture graywater from sinks, showers, and laundry facilities and reuse approximately 30,000 gallons per day for toilet flushing and landscape irrigation. The project contains roughly 1,000 residential units and demonstrates how on-site water reuse can reduce potable water demand in high-density developments.

Q: Jicky Ferrer asked whether condensate generated by air conditioning systems would also be incorporated into the Kuilei Place water reuse system. Bill stated that condensate recovery was not specifically identified in the project information he reviewed.

Q: Jicky Ferrer asked whether BWS plans to develop educational materials or best-practice examples based on the Kuilei Place project to encourage broader adoption of similar technologies. Bill explained that BWS is not currently offering special incentives for those systems but expects to see more developments adopting water reuse technologies as awareness and implementation increase.

Q: Bob Leinau asked about the cost-effectiveness of building-level water reuse systems and whether treatment costs are ultimately passed on to homeowners. Bill explained that while treatment systems require capital investment, maintenance, and operating costs, the long-term water savings are expected to generate net savings over time.

Q: John Reppun asked whether affordable housing projects should incorporate dual plumbing systems and water reuse infrastructure as population growth continues in areas such as 'Ewa. Bill explained that water reuse systems require dual plumbing systems to be installed during initial construction. He noted that the feasibility of such systems depends on development density and economics, with larger, higher-density projects generally offering greater opportunities for cost-effective implementation.

COMMENT: Ryan Obrero observed that while water reuse systems provide important conservation benefits, the cost of implementing such systems can present challenges for affordable housing developers.

Bill concluded by highlighting the Salesforce Tower in San Francisco as an example of a large-scale blackwater recycling system that treats wastewater from toilets, urinals, and other building uses for reuse in toilet flushing and HVAC operations. Following the presentation, stakeholders viewed the Southern California Water Coalition educational video, "Every Drop Matters," which provided an overview of water recycling, indirect potable reuse, and direct potable reuse technologies.

ACCEPT MEETING 58 and 59 NOTES

Meeting 58 and 59 notes were approved.

PFAS AND EMERGING CONTAMINANTS MANAGEMENT

Dave introduced Michelle Sorenson and Sierra Johnson of Brown & Caldwell to provide an update on BWS's ongoing PFAS management efforts. Michelle explained that the presentation built upon the PFAS discussion introduced at the March meeting, continuing series of updates. She noted that BWS remains in the midst of developing its long-term PFAS management strategy and that the purpose of the presentation was to revisit several stakeholder questions raised during the March meeting, provide additional technical context, and discuss how BWS is evaluating long-term PFAS risks and potential solutions.

Michelle first revisited several stakeholder questions from the March meeting. She explained that national monitoring data collected by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) shows that PFAS concentrations in people have generally declined over the past two decades. Since the early 2000s, reductions in the production and use of certain PFAS compounds have corresponded with significant decreases in PFAS levels detected in human blood: PFOS levels declining by more than 85 percent and PFOA levels declining by more than 70 percent. Michelle noted that these trends demonstrate the effectiveness of regulating PFAS at its source to reduce human exposure.

Michelle also discussed actions Hawai'i has taken to address PFAS. She noted that Hawai'i has been proactive in restricting PFAS-containing products, including a 2022 ban on PFAS-containing firefighting foam and food packaging materials, as well as legislation that would expand restrictions to additional products such as food serviceware, cosmetics, and personal care products. Michelle added that the Hawai'i Department of Health has established environmental action levels for PFAS and has conducted extensive sampling efforts involving public water systems, schools, private water systems, wastewater, landfills, areas affected by Red Hill contamination, and more. These efforts are intended to improve understanding of PFAS occurrence and distribution throughout the state.

Michelle compared PFAS regulations and occurrence levels in Hawai'i to those in other jurisdictions, explaining that countries regulate PFAS differently, with some establishing limits for individual compounds and others regulating cumulative concentrations. She noted that the United States has some of the most stringent PFAS drinking water standards in the world, with maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) of four parts per trillion for both PFOS and PFOA. Michelle said that among approximately 10,000 public water systems nationwide that have been tested for PFAS, roughly one-quarter have detected regulated PFAS compounds. More than half of those systems reported PFAS concentrations higher than the highest levels ever detected by BWS, indicating that while PFAS has been detected in some O'ahu wells, the situation is generally comparable to or less severe than many locations elsewhere in the United States.

Sierra Johnson continued the presentation, explaining that BWS's immediate PFAS response efforts are focused on implementing treatment systems at three priority well sites where regulated PFAS compounds have been detected and where the wells are critical to meeting system demands. However, she noted that the larger challenge involves planning for the future by identifying where PFAS contamination could potentially appear next and developing strategies to address those risks before they become operational problems. Sierra outlined a multi-step process that begins with identifying potential PFAS sources, assessing how likely those sources are to release PFAS into the environment, evaluating groundwater conditions and transport pathways, and prioritizing wells based on their overall risk of contamination.

Sierra explained how BWS is compiling and evaluating potential PFAS sources throughout O'ahu. These include military facilities, industrial sites, cesspools, hazardous material locations, and other areas where PFAS-containing products may have been used or released. BWS is assigning risk scores to these potential sources and combining those scores with groundwater modeling information to estimate which wells face the greatest long-term contamination risks.

Q: Bob Leinau asked what actions can be taken at the federal level to address PFAS contamination and encourage stronger regulation by agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Sierra responded that federal regulatory efforts are already underway, including restrictions and controls at the manufacturing level.

Q: Mahealani Cypher asked whether BWS has consulted with the University of Hawai'i Water Resources Research Center regarding geological and groundwater modeling needs. Sierra explained that the groundwater models being used are based on the same underlying research developed by organizations such as the University of Hawai'i and the U.S. Geological Survey. She noted that BWS is utilizing and refining those existing models specifically for PFAS risk assessment purposes.

Sierra discussed the next phase of the assessment, which will focus on groundwater modeling and hydrogeologic analysis to determine how PFAS may migrate through aquifers and potentially reach BWS wells. While source identification is largely complete, BWS is still evaluating groundwater transport pathways and assessing potential mitigation options. Although treatment projects are expected to be the primary response strategy, BWS is also exploring additional methods that may reduce PFAS risks before contamination reaches drinking water sources.

Sierra reviewed the two primary treatment technologies currently under consideration for PFAS removal: granular activated carbon (GAC) and ion exchange systems. She explained that both technologies rely on specialized media contained within treatment vessels that remove PFAS from water as it passes through the system. Over time, the media must either be replaced or regenerated. Sierra noted that GAC is already used at some facilities to remove legacy contaminants and offers

flexibility for treating multiple contaminants, while ion exchange media is more focused on PFAS and may provide longer operational life. The treatment systems currently being designed by BWS are being configured to accommodate either technology, providing flexibility as operational needs evolve.

Q: Mark Fox asked how spent granular activated carbon media is managed after it has reached the end of its useful life. Sierra said the spent carbon can be regenerated through a thermal reactivation process in which the media is heated in specialized kilns that destroy PFAS compounds. The regenerated carbon can then be reused, reducing the need for disposal.

Sierra also discussed the significant costs associated with PFAS treatment. She reported that the three PFAS treatment systems currently being designed range from approximately \$6 million to \$20 million each, depending on size and capacity. Ka'amilo Wells annual operation and maintenance costs are estimated at approximately \$300,000 per year.

Michelle concluded the presentation by emphasizing that both PFAS contamination and PFAS treatment are complex and expensive challenges that require careful prioritization. She explained that once groundwater modeling and hydrogeology analyses are completed, BWS will be able to prioritize wells based on contamination risk and evaluate potential treatment and mitigation projects based on cost, feasibility, and implementation requirements.

Michelle reviewed BWS's current PFAS implementation schedule and noted that design work for the three priority treatment sites is expected to be completed by Summer 2027, allowing treatment systems to be operational in advance of the current 2029 federal compliance deadline. She acknowledged federal discussions regarding extending the compliance schedule are ongoing but emphasized that BWS is continuing to plan around the existing 2029 deadline. Michelle also noted that PFAS planning efforts are occurring alongside BWS's response to TCP and other emerging contaminants.

Michelle closed by encouraging stakeholder feedback on how BWS communicates PFAS risks to the public. She noted that discussing risk can be challenging because it requires balancing transparency and public awareness without creating unnecessary alarm. She invited stakeholders to continue providing input on what information communities need to better understand how BWS is addressing PFAS and other emerging contaminants.

NEXT STEPS

Dave shared the list of stakeholder advisory group meetings for 2026:

- July 16 (in person)
- September 17 (virtual)
- October 15 (in person)
- November 19 (virtual)

Dave thanked the attendees for their attention and participation and concluded the meeting.