



## Notice

### Regular Meeting of the Commission Streamlining Task Force City and County of San Francisco

**Daniel Lurie**  
**Mayor**

**Wednesday, August 6, 2025**  
**1:00 pm**

City Hall, Room 408  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Meeting will also be broadcast online and remote public comment will be available via WebEx event. To view the online presentation, join the meeting using the link <https://tinyurl.com/2as8mnce4> and password PropE. Members of the public may use email address [CommissionStreamlining@sfgov.org](mailto:CommissionStreamlining@sfgov.org) to join the WebEx meeting if needed. To join by phone, dial 415-655-0001 and enter access code (webinar ID) 2663 418 7190 followed by ##. See page 3 for additional remote public comment instructions.

## Agenda

### 1. Call to Order

Chair Ed Harrington called the meeting to order at 1:01 pm.

### 2. Roll Call

Ed Harrington, Chair	seat 4 - Board of Supervisors designee (public sector labor representative)
Jean Fraser, Vice Chair	seat 5 - Mayor's designee (expert in open and accountable government)
Andrea Bruss	seat 3 - City Attorney's designee
Sophie Hayward	seat 1 - City Administrator's designee
Natasha Mihal	seat 2 - Controller's designee

Hannah Kohanzadeh called roll. With all five members present, a quorum was established.

### 3. Announcements (Informational Item)

While the Task Force did not call public comment for item 3, because, as Chief Assistant City Attorney Jon Givner clarified, the Task Force is not required to take public comment on items when the Task Force does not hold a discussion, public comment was received from one speaker:

- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:  
For Agenda Item #3, I believe City Attorney Jon Givner just provided incorrect oral legal advice to Chair Harrington. Bodies subject to the Sunshine Ordinance must take public comment for each agenda item on a meeting's agenda, including "Closed Session" items (except perhaps for Special meetings, and excluding the Board of Supervisors), even for "Informational" agenda items at the start of a meeting. My comment on Agenda Item #3, "Announcements" deals with this: Yesterday I checked this Task Force's website page for today's meeting, and there were only a few hyperlinks to background material files. Suddenly

this morning, three background files appeared for Agenda Item #6, “Templates and Criteria for Governance and Regulatory Bodies,” plus three documents appeared for Agenda Item #7, “Legally Required Bodies and Staff Working Groups.” Three of those documents totaled 73 combined pages, which the public didn’t get to read before this meeting. This must stop!

#### **4. General Public Comment**

Public comment was received from five speakers:

- David Pilpel commented on the arts and museums departments and bodies stating they could be consolidated into a single department and commission for arts, leisure and recreation rather than stand alone entities and bodies. He also recommended that all charitable gifts or trust given to the City should be incorporated into this general arts, leisure, and recreation department and commission for oversight rather than creating distinct entities for each charitable item, should state law permit it.
- Barbara Platz, a former California Emergency Medical Services commissioner, expressed support for Proposition D (Nov. 2024) and the current Commission Streamlining Task Force’s work. She commented on general challenges to simplify bureaucratic processes in San Francisco.
- Michael Siracusa expressed support for the Task Force’s methodical approach to examining current bodies. He advocated for the Task Force to provide the Mayor with more centralized authority to more effectively govern. He supported distinct templates for governance and appeals bodies.
- Carlos Funes, a violin maker and restorer, commented on personal challenges with the Department of Building Inspection and unpermitted structures.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:  
It was disturbing seeing the Streamlining Task Force’s document, “Preliminary Recommended Actions for Borderline Inactive Bodies,” listing 22 bodies struggling to meet regularly and achieve quorum because they met fewer than 4 times in 2024, had vacancy rates greater than 25%, or met both criteria.

Among bodies deferred for a decision on whether to retain or eliminate, was the “Citizens’ General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee,” staff recommended deferring action on whether to eliminate. CGOBOC hears periodic updates on the status of bond-funded projects approved by voters, totaling in the billions of dollars from General Obligation Bonds.

The solution to bodies having problems meeting quorum due to vacancies, is to require the appointing authorities to recruit more aggressively and fill vacancies, not eliminate the bodies!

CGOBOC must not be eliminated and placed under control of a City Department, precisely because it involves citizen oversight of bond measures passed by the voters.

#### **5. Consent Calendar (Action Item)**

The Task Force considered approval of the draft minutes from the June 18, 2025 meeting and for the July 16, 2025 meeting. Chair Harrington highlighted the edits staff made to the June 18, 2025 meeting minutes to correct an error caught by Patrick Monette-Shaw.

During public comment, one speaker, Patrick Monette-Shaw, provided comment and submitted the following written summary:

I want to thank Rachel Alonso, Project Director from the City Administrator's Office, and her staff for revising the June 18 meeting minutes to comply with requirements in the Sunshine Ordinance. Ms. Alonso and her staff are doing incredibly great work supporting this Commission Streamlining Task Force!

Chair Harrington responded that the Task Force appreciated and seconded the recognition for Ms. Alonso and her staff.

Following discussion, the Task Force proceeded with a motion to approve the June 18, 2025, and the July 16, 2025, meeting minutes initiated by Natasha Mihal. The motion was seconded by Andrea Bruss and passed unanimously by voice vote.

## **6. Templates and Criteria for Governance and Regulatory Bodies (Action Item)**

*Materials: [Presentation](#); [Governance Templates](#); [Appeals and Regulatory Templates](#)*

Joanna Bell, Senior Performance Analyst from the Controller's Office, presented template elements for the ideal structures of governance bodies and regulatory bodies, as well as criteria to determine when a template would apply and whether bodies should be maintained, modified, or eliminated.

The first part of the presentation covered whether distinct templates are needed for protected governance and general governance bodies. Task Force members reviewed the proposal for a protected governance body template, which was designed to insulate some public bodies from political influence when a body has oversight of assets or funds requiring long-term outlook to manage appropriately or when bodies make decisions that potentially hold direct impact to the job or compensation of elected officials.

**Members agreed to have only one general governance body template citing that certain bodies may be treated as exceptions rather than creating a distinct template for those bodies.** The Task Force acknowledged this approach will require them to review bodies individually.

The second part of the presentation reviewed whether distinct templates are needed for all decision-making bodies – governance, regulatory, and appeals bodies. Task Force members heard arguments for one template for all decision-making bodies, two templates for governance and appeals bodies, and three templates for governance, appeals, and regulatory bodies. **The Task Force opted for two templates to clearly note fundamental differences between governance and appeals bodies.**

The Task Force then discussed **template components for governance and appeals bodies**. Joanna Bell encouraged the Task Force to make decisions on all template components so that staff could apply their decisions in the staff recommendations for each body but noted that the Task Force could defer some decisions to their November meetings.

### Appointing Authority

- Governance bodies: The Task Force agreed on mayoral appointments only.
- Appeals bodies: The Task Force decided to maintain the status quo for the purpose of staff recommendations and defer the template decision for a future meeting. Vice Chair Jean Fraser shared a rationale for split appointments to protect members from undue political influence.

### Appointment Confirmations

Staff presented the idea of no confirmation process for both governance and appeals bodies, allowing effective immediate confirmation, and allowing the Board of Supervisors (the Board) to veto a mayoral

appointment with a 2/3 majority within 30 days of the appointment. The Task Force discussed whether the Mayor should also be able to veto the Board's appointments. The discussion noted while it may seem strange for the Mayor to be unable to veto the Board's appointments, the number of appointments the Board makes are few, especially in contrast to the number of mayoral appointments. Chair Harrington noted there is oversight over the Board appointments via the Rules Committee, which makes a recommendation to the full Board on the appointments the Board seeks to make.

- Governance bodies: Task Force agreed to vote later in the meeting on whether the Board may veto a mayoral appointment with 2/3 majority within 30 days. Andrea Bruss appreciated that this approach will standardize a process currently lacking in consistency.
- Appeals bodies: Task Force agreed on no confirmation process, allowing effective immediate appointments, but allowing the Board to veto the appointment with 2/3 majority within 30 days.

#### Commissioner Removal Process and Authority

Chair Harrington offered that for governance bodies the Board could veto any removal with a 2/3 majority within 30 days, remarking that it could protect commissioners from punitive or arbitrary removals. Natasha Mihal suggested that Chair Harrington's idea not be adopted into the general template but could be used as exception when evaluating individual bodies.

- Governance bodies: The Task Force agreed to vote later in the meeting on whether commissioners should serve at will and if the Board may veto any removal with a 2/3 majority within 30 days.
- Appeals bodies: The Task Force agreed to go to a vote later in the meeting on whether commissioners should have more protections and only be subject to removal for cause.

#### Term Lengths and Term Limits

- Governance bodies: The Task Force agreed that term lengths should be 4 years and there should be 3 term limits.
- Appeals bodies: The Task Force agreed that term lengths should be 4 years and there should be 3 term limits.

#### Commissioner Qualifications

- Governance bodies: Specific qualifications should be determined by the authorizing legislation of the body; if no specific requirements are listed, then the appointing officer must publish a statement articulating the appointee's qualifications.
- Appeals bodies: Require specific qualifications; authorizing legislation should include specifics dependent on the needs of the body.

#### Compensation and Benefits

Task Force members weighed the pros and cons of including healthcare benefits for current governance bodies commissioners but decided the topic was not necessary for staff to produce recommendations on bodies, so they deferred their decision making.

- Governance bodies: Decision deferred to a November meeting.
- Appeals: Decision deferred to a November meeting.

#### Establishing Authority

Task Force members noted the significance of the decision and opted to defer decision making since staff may make recommendations on bodies without this topic settled.

- Governance bodies: Decision deferred to a future meeting.
- Appeals bodies: Decision deferred to a future meeting.

### Sunset Dates

- Governance bodies: No sunset dates.
- Appeals bodies: No sunset dates, But require evaluation of workload and purpose every five years.

### Commission Size

- Governance bodies: 5-7 members
- Appeals bodies: 3-7 members

### Hiring and Firing Authority

- Governance bodies: Consultative responsibilities only.
- Appeals bodies: Not applicable.

### Policy-Making Authority

- Governance bodies: Chair Harrington disagreed with the proposed authority for “consultative responsibilities only,” citing that policy-making authority is a key power for governance bodies. Vice Chair Fraser noted her belief that the Mayor and department heads should set policy. The Task Force agreed to vote later in the meeting on what level of policy-making authority a governance body should have – consultative responsibilities only or setting policy.
- Appeals bodies: No authority to set policy but may provide recommendations on code or policies.

### Contract Approval Authority

Chair Harrington stated his support to maintain the status quo of governance bodies holding contract approval authority. Andrea Bruss disagreed with Chair Harrington, asserting since there is no set financial or trigger threshold for contracts across the City that could be universally applied to all bodies, commissions should not hold contract approval authority. Ms. Bruss stated that it should be up to the departments to determine contract approval but affirmed that commissions should hold budget approval authority which would review and monitor contract planning. Vice Chair Fraser supported Ms. Bruss’ argument, calling out that departments are allowed to hire staff without a commission’s approval so hiring external staff via a contract should be treated in the same manner. She also disagreed with the notion that commissions prevent corruption and/or fraud, citing that an auditing authority should perform that function.

- Governance bodies: The Task Force agreed to vote later in the meeting on what level of contract approval authority, if any, a governance body should have.
- Appeals bodies: Not applicable.

### Budget Approval Authority

- Governance bodies: Yes, have budget approval authority.
- Appeals bodies: Not applicable.

### Employee Discipline Authority

Joanna Bell and Jon Givner, Chief Assistant City Attorney, affirmed the Police and Fire Commissions have employee discipline authority. Chair Harrington asked whether the Civil Service Commission has employee discipline authority to which Mr. Givner confirmed the body does not implement employee discipline but hears appeals from employees and gives direction to departments and the Department of Human Resources. Mr. Givner clarified that the Police, Fire, and Civil Services Commissions legally do

not need to be the entities holding employee discipline authority, however police officers, firefighters, and civil service staff must have a forum to appeal discipline rulings.

- Governance bodies: No role. Exceptions will be made as needed.
- Appeals bodies: Not applicable.

#### Department Performance Review Authority

- Governance bodies: Yes, have department performance review authority as this is a key responsibility. Specific details about what that entails is dependent on the body/department.
- Appeals bodies: Not applicable.

#### Additional Authority Over City/Department Operations

Ms. Bell clarified this is where rates and fees would apply.

- Governance bodies: Exclude from the template.
- Appeals bodies: Not applicable.

#### Required Output and Activities

Task Force members considered whether to require governance and appeals bodies to reaffirm a statement of purpose at regular intervals but decided it was unnecessary since the body's purpose is defined in its originating legislation.

- Governance bodies: Exclude from template.
- Appeals bodies: Exclude from template.

#### Purpose and Responsibilities

Task Force members adopted Sophie Hayward's suggestion of excluding a broad definition of each body's purpose and responsibilities as it should be set by the authorizing legislation and need of each distinct body.

- Governance bodies: Exclude from template.
- Appeals bodies: Exclude from template.

Public comment was received from five speakers:

- Christin Evans, previously a commissioner on the Homeless Oversight Commission, noted that the decision-making body list excluded the Homeless Oversight Commission. In looking to clarify the criteria staff used to create the list, she noted one of the criteria are number of employees managed by a department. She raised that the Homeless Oversight Commission uses numerous contractors to complete their and the department's work and so should fit the spirit of the criteria. She also mentioned that the budget addressing homelessness has grown over the years and flagged that commissioners may purchase City health insurance and are compensated \$100 per month.
- Ryan Hazelton urged Task Force members to reflect on the upcoming policy-making and contract approval authority votes as checks-and-balances to the executive and legislative branches of the City government. He vocalized support for enshrining these abilities for commissions in the face of attempts to erode democracy and government structures at the federal government level.
- David Pilpel vocalized support for governance bodies setting policy and approving contracts. Without those two abilities he was not sure what the role of a governance body would be. He stated that it would be insufficient oversight if only department heads and the Board of Supervisors approved contracts. He wondered what the implications would be on the exclusive authorities held by the MTA and PUC. Mr. Pilpel supported the notion of providing



compensation and benefits to commissioners who work closer to full-time hours, while noting that those who meet infrequently should not receive such compensation or benefits.

- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:  
Without formal votes today on each of the questions asked on each of today's slides, it is very hard to follow what actual decisions you made today on each slide. And it's not clear whether many of the questions asked of you today are simply being deferred to your meetings in November and December.

It's also not clear how the questions asked today will find their way into the final versions of the templates. Will today's decisions be summarized into a separate document before being incorporated into the final templates? I will submit my specific concerns in writing.

- Kate Favetti, Civil Service Commission President, expressed appreciation for the Task Force's methodical and thoughtful approach. She clarified how the Civil Service Commission considers appeals following the dismissal of an individual. She noted the Commission cannot overturn the dismissal but determines the minimum qualifications required for the individual to return to the City, if at all.

Task Force members voted on the following items:

- Confirmation for governance bodies - proposal: the Board may veto a mayoral appointment with 2/3 majority within 30 days.
  - Chair Harrington noted that the proposed confirmation process for governance bodies aligns with the 1995 Charter process.
  - Sophie Hayward noted that the governance body template calls for the Mayor to make all governance body appointments.
  - Andrea Bruss proceeded with a motion to approve the proposal. The motion was seconded by Natasha Mihal, passed by Chair Harrington, Andrea Bruss, Sophie Hayward, and Natasha Mihal, and opposed by Vice Chair Fraser. The motion passed 4-1 by voice vote.
- Commissioner removal process for governance bodies: should the Mayor be able to remove their appointees independently, or should the Board of Supervisors have the authority to veto the removal with a 2/3 majority within 30 days of the Mayor's action?
  - Vice Chair Fraser motioned that the Board of Supervisors be unable to veto the Mayor's removal of a commissioner.
  - Chair Harrington voiced concern with the occurrences at the federal government and noted that was the logic behind this proposal.
  - Task Force members voted on having no BOS oversight of Mayor's appointees (i.e. prohibiting BOS veto power). The motion passed by Vice Chair Fraser, Andrea Bruss, Sophie Hayward, and Natasha Mihal and was opposed by Chair Harrington. The motion passed 4-1 by voice vote.
- Commissioner removal process for appeals bodies - proposal: commissioner removal should be restricted to for-cause removals.
  - Vice Chair Fraser generally supported for-cause removals since appeals board commissioners are performing a quasi-judicial function. Acknowledging commissioners can also go rogue, she proposed the Task Force develop a modified definition of "for cause" removals.
  - Natasha Mihal reflected on the definition of "for cause," stating that if the definition is too narrow then it limits the ability to remove a commissioner who is using too much discretion in applying the rules.

- Chair Harrington recommended the Task Force define “for cause” at a later date and proceed with the vote. Task Force members discussed whether postponing settling on a definition was appropriate.
- Vice Chair Fraser recommended the template state that appeals body commissioners are removeable but the Task Force will defer the defining the threshold removal until a later date. Task Force members agreed, and no vote was held.
- The Task Force deferred voting on policy setting authority and contract approval authority for governance bodies to hear the rest of the staff’s presentation and questions on criteria which are critical for future staff recommendations.

The **fourth part of the presentation covered criteria for decision-making bodies**. Joanna Bell noted that the presentation applied to 37 bodies and that legally required bodies and appeals bodies with legally required functions were not relevant. She reviewed five criteria options for when decision-making bodies should exist: (1) enterprise departments (Airport, Public Utilities, SFMTA, and the Port), (2) if a body oversees a department or administers a law or policy that should be protected from political influence, (3) if a body oversees a department with more than 500 FTEs, (4) if a body sets rates/fees or issues permits and the work should be done outside of normal City staff operations, and (5) a body should not oversee a department whose head is elected or appointed (Controller, City Administrator, Assessor-Recorder, City Attorney, District Attorney, Public Defender, Sheriff, Superior Court, Treasurer); Sophie Hayward clarified that “appointed with Board of Supervisor confirmation” was more accurate. Ms. Bell flagged these criteria should not trigger the creation of new bodies.

Sophie Hayward observed that criteria three should focus more on the work product rather than the number of staff in a department. Andrea Bruss also affirmed that a criterion based on FTE count did not resonate with her. She also noted that criteria four should include overseeing a department whose primary job is to issue permits and to apply administrative regulations or code. Task Force members discussed and questioned the general need for criteria and criteria three, four, and five.

Public comment was received from 4 speakers:

- David Pilpel supported reducing Sophie Hayward’s proposal that the staff recommendation publication time be reduced from two weeks in advance to one-and-a-half weeks in advance. He noted that all the functions discussed should exist but conceded they may not need to operate as a body or even be enshrined in the Charter. He requested the Task Force vote on governance bodies’ ability to set policy and approve contracts.
- Christin Evans advocated for the Homeless Oversight Commission to be considered in the governance body discussion as the budget is sizable. She suggested that the five criteria proposed by staff are too narrow and should be broadened, especially to include budget. She commented that investments made by the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing could be thought of as long-term capital investments because they involve significant investments in real estate. She also commented that homelessness has been politicized in the City and should be shielded from political influence.
- Obava Afuhaamango, commissioner on the Sheriff’s Oversight Board, supported Chair Harrington’s comments related to the methodology of the process (that Proposition E did not intend to significantly reduce the number of commissions). She noted that San Francisco voters approved the Sheriff’s Oversight Board in 2020. She supports the Task Force reviewing each body individually.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:



It's very disturbing a Streamlining Task Force member just noted that today's 53-page document was distributed to Task Force members only last night, the night before today's meetings. This is completely unacceptable and doesn't give members of the public time to read, understand, and formulate comments regarding the 53 pages of information. This must stop! More alarming was Chair Harrington's remarks a few minutes ago suggesting that decisions being made today seemed to be violating your mandates under "Prop. E", and that this Task Force was instead making decisions based on "Prop. D" that was rejected by the will of the voters. It's not clear specifically what Chair Harrington was referring to.

It's not clear why the additional there may be additional criteria questions about decision-making bodies separate from governance bodies, since some governance bodies are concurrently decision-making bodies. Developments of templates was scheduled to stop today. This is ridiculous.

**7. Legally Required Bodies and Staff Working Groups (Discussion Item)**

Item 7 was not called.

**8. Future Agenda Topics (Discussion Item)**

Item 8 was not needed, as item 4 did not exceed 15 minutes.

**9. General Public Comment – Continued from item 4 if necessary**

Members of the public who were not able to address the Task Force during item 5 may comment generally for up to three minutes on matters within the Task Force's purview but not on today's agenda.

**10. Adjournment**

Chair Harrington adjourned the meeting at 3:37 pm.

--

Minutes prepared by Hannah Kohanzadeh, Principal Administrative Analyst.