

From: [aeboken](#)
To: [REG - BSC Clerk](#); [Deborah Murphy](#); [Charles Head](#)
Subject: **PART 2** Written Submission to Ballot Simplification Committee (Council) re Agenda for July 28, 2026 Meeting for Charter Amendment for Boards and Commissions BF260536
Date: Monday, July 27, 2026 2:14:35 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

TO: Ballot Simplification Committee (Council)

FR: Eileen Boken,
State and Federal Legislative Liaison

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods*

*For identification purposes only.

RE: **PART 2** Written Submission to Ballot Simplification Committee (Council) re Agenda for July 28, 2026 Meeting for Charter Amendment for Boards and Commissions BF260536

Following up on my written submission from July 24, 2026.

Title and Summary Version 1
(Screenshot included in July 24, 2026 written submission.)

"10) expanding the Public Utilities Commission's exclusive charge over matters related to water, power, and sewer infrastructure and services;"

Title and Summary Version 2
(Screenshot included in July 24, 2026 written submission.)

"10) updating the Public Utilities Commission's exclusive charge over matters related to water, power, and sewer infrastructure and services;"

Legislative Digest version 1
(Screenshot attached.)

"• For the Public Utilities Commission department, make general updates; expand the PUC's exclusive charge to encompass design, in addition to construction, management, operation, and use of water, power, and sewer infrastructure, facilities, and associated real, personal, and financial assets."

Legislative Digest version 2
(Screenshot attached.)

"• For the Public Utilities Commission department, make general updates; update the PUC's

exclusive charge to encompass design, in addition to construction, management, operation, and use of water, power, and sewer infrastructure, facilities, and associated real, personal, and financial assets."

The Legislative Digest fails to indicate and explain the amendment from version 1 "expand" to version 2 "update".

The SFPUC is the only City department with exclusive charge.

No water utilities in the U.S. or internationally appear to have exclusive charge.

The SFPUC was granted exclusive charge in Prop E (November 2002).

Some voters weren't even alive then and for others it's a distant memory.

And yet, neither the legislation itself nor the Legislative Digest makes any attempt to define exclusive charge.

Should this legislation have even been moved forward in the first place?

Should the responsibility to explain exclusive charge to the voters be the responsibility of the BSC or should the City Attorney review the legislation again with the possible action of withdrawing it from the November ballot?

###

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone