

Patrick Monette-Shaw

975 Sutter Street, Apt. 6
San Francisco, CA 94109

September 13, 2025

Ed Harrington, Chair
Commission Streamlining Task Force
c/o City Administrator's Office
City Hall, Room 316
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

"This Task Force should leave both the Rate Fairness Board and the SFPUC's Citizens' Advisory Committee just as they currently are!"

Re: San Francisco PUC's "Citizens' Advisory Committee" and "Rate Fairness Board"

Dear Mr. Harrington and Commission Streamlining Task Force Members,

Don't eliminate or combine the SFPUC's **"Citizens' Advisory Committee"**

The City Administrator's *"staff discussion"* recommendation to the Streamlining Task Forces claims that the Public Utilities Citizens' Advisory Committee's scope of purpose is limited to only providing recommendations about long-term strategic, financial, and capital improvement plans of the SFPUC, while the larger, main SFPUC Commission itself oversees the same topics, and more, and holds approval authority for various departmental functions, such as budget and contracts.

The City Administrator asserts that because members of the public may continue to engage with the SFPUC department via the SFPUC Commission on such topics, the Streamlining Task Force should consider eliminating or combining the Citizens' Advisory Committee.

Currently, the Advisory Committee's members are appointed by the Board of Supervisors, including one from each Supervisorial District. I will be advocating with the Board of Supervisors that they should reject any recommendation the Streamlining Task Force may recommend to the Board of Supervisors to eliminate or combine the Citizens' Advisory Committee, if that's what this Task Force decides to recommend today.

After all, the BLA financial analysis has documented that the Advisory Committee only receives with part-time employee *"soft costs"* of just \$58,307, that likely won't disappear if the Advisory Committee is combined with the larger Public Utilities Commission, as the BLA report noted.

As well, the BLA report noted that should a decision be made to make a specific consolidation of combining two bodies into one, an additional study should be undertaken. The BLA added for good measure on page 13:

"To the extent that the Commission Streamlining Task Force considers specific consolidations, an analysis of both entities' costs and functions will be essential."

In other words, at this point the key question about each entity's more detailed costs and their specific functions haven't been conducted, and it's completely unclear who will conduct those two assessments, when, and at what additional cost — or if the Commission Streamlining Task Force will just charge ahead and recommend combining bodies without a clear answer of how the mandated functions will be carried out, and by whom, and who will perform any additional *"essential"* specific cost analyses on combining any two specific bodies.

Recommending combining these two bodies today in the absence of the additional analyses is wrong, premature, and myopic, since the *"Staff Discussion"* in the City Administrator's staff memo narrative provided **neither** of the two additional analyses that the BLA recommended be performed..

As well, the staff recommendation to the Streamlining Task Force is to change the larger Public Utility Commission's current role to nominate a candidate for the PUC General Manager, or enter into an individual contract with a General Manager, also to a *"consultative role"* only role and eliminate the Commission's sole authority to fire the General Manager as a department head, and also change the City Charter §15.105 provision that SFPUC Commission members can only be

September 13, 2025

San Francisco PUC's "Citizens' Advisory Committee" and "Rate Fairness Board"

Page 2

removed "*for cause*" to removing Commissioners "*at will*." But the staff recommendation also creatively suggests that the Task Force "*may wish to partially deviate from the Governance Commission template*," and perhaps allow **only** the Port Commission to continue nominating a department head. Why is the Port Commission "*special*" and allowed to keep nominating their preferred Department Heads, but other bodies — including the SFPUC — aren't allowed the same "*special*" status?

Another staff recommendation to this Task Force's is to "*consider keeping*" the "*Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board*," which assists the SFPUC with maintaining transparency and accountability on utility rates set for both residential and retail customers. The BLA report notes the Rate Fairness Board utilizes a scant \$9,824 in part-time employee *soft costs* that also won't translate into any "*hard cost*" savings to the City's budget. Staff have recommended "*aligning*" the Fairness Board to the arbitrary template by moving the establishing authority from the City Charter to the Administrative Code.

This Task Force should leave both the Rate Fairness Board and the SFPUC's Citizens' Advisory Committee just as they are, and take no action on either body.

Sincerely,

/s/

Patrick Monette-Shaw

cc: Rachel Alonso, Project Director, City Administrator's Office