



## Commission Streamlining Task Force

### CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

## KEY INFORMATION ON PROPOSITION E PROCESS AND TIMELINE

---

In November 2024, voters approved Proposition E, which created the Commission Streamlining Task Force (“Task Force”). This group is responsible for making recommendations to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors about ways to modify, eliminate, or combine the City’s appointive boards and commissions (“public bodies”) to make the government run better.

### **Task Force Recommendation Process**

The Task Force will discuss and vote on initial recommendations in public meetings from **August through November 2025**. Approximately 1.5 weeks before each meeting, staff will post informational memos online that include criteria-based proposals for which bodies to keep, eliminate, or modify. The Task Force can clarify or modify any of its decisions at any time until **February 1, 2026**.

**Task Force recommendations on bodies in the Charter or approved by voters can only be implemented by putting a Charter amendment on the ballot.** The City Attorney will draft a Charter amendment based on the Task Force’s recommendations. The Board of Supervisors then must decide if they want to modify the Task Force’s proposed amendment and if they want to put the amendment on the ballot. Any changes to bodies in the Charter will only be final if the Board of Supervisors votes to place a measure on the ballot and the voters approve the measure on November 3, 2026.

**Task Force recommendations on bodies in the Municipal Codes can be implemented by ordinance, without going to the ballot.** The Task Force may direct the City Attorney to draft ordinances based on the Task Force’s recommendations that the Task Force can introduce at the Board of Supervisors at any time. These ordinances shall go into effect within 90 days unless rejected by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors (8 of 11 members).

### **Key Dates**

- **Public meetings** where the Task Force will discuss public bodies by policy area:
  - **Sep 3:** Public Safety
  - **Sep 17:** Infrastructure, Climate, and Mobility
  - **Oct 1:** Housing and Economic Development
  - **Oct 15:** Public Health and Wellbeing
  - **Nov 5:** General Administration and Finance
- **By February 1, 2026:** Task Force will finalize recommendations and vote to approve its final report.
- **By March 1, 2026:** City Attorney’s Office will draft a Charter amendment based on the Task Force’s recommendations.
- **By April 1, 2026:** Board of Supervisors will hold a hearing on the Task Force’s final report and recommendations.
- **By July 2026:** Board of Supervisors will decide whether to place a Charter amendment on the November 2026 ballot.

Task Force can introduce ordinances at the Board of Supervisors at any time, but likely not until **early 2026**



# Commission Streamlining Task Force

## CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

### MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Chair Ed Harrington and Members, Commission Streamlining Task Force

**FROM:** Rachel Alonso, Project Director, City Administrator's Office  
Hannah Kohanzadeh, Principal Project Analyst, City Administrator's Office  
Joanna Bell, Senior Performance Analyst, Controller's Office  
Henry O'Connell, Senior Performance Analyst, Controller's Office

**DATE:** September 2, 2025

**SUBJECT:** Recommended Actions for Public Safety Bodies

---

Per Proposition E, approved by voters in November 2024, the Commission Streamlining Task Force ("Task Force") is responsible for making recommendations to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors about ways to modify, eliminate, or combine the City's appointive boards and commissions ("policy bodies") to improve the administration of government.

The Task Force will discuss 10 public safety bodies at its September 3 meeting. This memo provides information the Task Force may use to inform the recommendations for these policy bodies.

Staff applied a set of evaluation criteria to each body and also provided an overview, a summary of relevant information and analysis, and the application of a template<sup>1</sup> where applicable. City departments, commissioners, and members of the public provided some contextual information that informs these sections.

After reviewing each body, the application of evaluation criteria results in the following recommendations:.

- Keep or consider keeping 7 bodies
- Consider eliminating 1 body
- Consider combining or eliminating 1 body
- No recommendation for 1 body

---

<sup>1</sup> The Task Force created templates for Advisory Committees, Governance Commissions, and Appeals Boards with the goal of providing standards for each type of body. These templates may inform recommended changes to current bodies and the Task Force will determine how to memorialize these templates so that they may inform the creation of future bodies. The templates are available on the Task Force's website <https://www.sf.gov/commission-streamlining-task-force> under "Resources."

**Simplified Evaluation Criteria:**

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Outcome if Yes
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does state or federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	Keep
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	Go to 1C
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	Consider consolidating or eliminating
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	Consider eliminating
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	Consider consolidating or modifying
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	Consider eliminating or consolidating
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	Consider modifying
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Go to 4B and 4C
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Consider combining or eliminating
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	Keep and consider expanding scope
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Go to 5B
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Consider consolidating or eliminating
<i>If the answer is "no" to all criteria, consider keeping the body.</i>		

At its September 3 meeting, the Task Force may vote to recommend eliminating any or all of these bodies from the charter or code. If the Task Force recommends eliminating a body at the September 3 meeting, the City Attorney will prepare draft legislation removing it from the charter or code. The Task Force will then review the draft legislation at a future meeting and vote on whether to forward it to the Board of Supervisors. The Task Force may amend its decisions at any time before the final legislation is approved.

Comments pertaining to a specific body or bodies will be shared with Task Force members if emailed to [commission.streamlining@sfgov.org](mailto:commission.streamlining@sfgov.org) 24 hours prior to the Task Force meeting.

Decisions made by the Task Force will be memorialized in an updated “Decision Log” available in the “Resources” section of the Task Force’s website (<https://www.sf.gov/commission-streamlining-task-force>).

## Version History

Version	Date	Description
1	08/15/2025	Original
2	08/29/2025	Added an introductory description of the Task Force process; Adjusted language and added reference to decision log to introduction; Expanded evaluation criteria tables and incorporated new "criteria-based outcome" results to supplement "prior staff recommendations" throughout; Slightly adjusted narrative throughout to align to new "criteria-based outcome"; Provided more detail about Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council qualifications.
3	09/02/2025	Corrected outcome for 5A in the Simplified Evaluation Criteria table on page 3.
4	09/02/2025	Corrected typos on page 40; added a footnote to 5A in the Simplified Evaluation Criteria on page 41.
5	09/05/2025	Completed blank "Appointing Authority Proposal" section on page 46 to align with what was presented in the Task Force meeting
6	09/12/2025	Version 5 should have referred to page 38, rather than page 46.

## Summary of Recommended Actions for Public Safety Bodies

Dept.	Name of Body	Code Citation	Criteria-Based Outcome	<i>Prior Staff Recommendation (reported in 8/15 version of memo)<sup>2</sup></i>
APD	<a href="#">Community Corrections Partnership</a>	<a href="#">CA SB 678 (2009)</a>	Keep	<i>Keep</i>
APD	<a href="#">Reentry Council</a>	<a href="#">Administrative Code § 5.1-1</a>	No recommendation: consider keeping or consider eliminating	<i>Allow to sunset in 2029</i>
DAT	<a href="#">Real Estate Fraud Prosecution Trust Fund Committee</a>	<a href="#">Administrative Code § 8.24-5, California Government Code § 27388</a>	Keep	<i>Keep</i>
DAT	<a href="#">Sentencing Commission</a>	<a href="#">Administrative Code § 5.250</a>	Consider eliminating	<i>Allow to sunset in 2026</i>
DEM	<a href="#">Disaster Council</a>	<a href="#">Administrative Code § 7.3-7.4-1</a>	Consider keeping	<i>Keep</i>
FIR	<a href="#">Fire Commission</a>	<a href="#">Charter § 4.108</a>	Consider keeping	<i>Keep</i>
JUV	<a href="#">Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council</a>	<a href="#">Cal. Welfare and Institutions Code § 749.22-749.27</a>	Keep	<i>Keep</i>
JUV	<a href="#">Juvenile Probation Commission</a>	<a href="#">Charter § 7.102</a>	Consider keeping	<i>Keep</i>
POL	<a href="#">Police Commission</a>	<a href="#">Charter § 4.109</a>	Consider keeping	<i>Keep</i>
SDA	<a href="#">Sheriff's Department Oversight Board</a>	<a href="#">Charter § 4.137</a>	Consider combining or eliminating	<i>Eliminate</i>

---

<sup>2</sup> To ensure transparency and align with the approved evaluation criteria, staff will report the evaluation criteria results directly and the Task Force will make decisions without a staff recommendation. The staff recommendations from version 1 of the memo (published on Friday, 8/15/2025) are retained for transparency and to help readers track changes. Future memos will not include staff recommendations.

## Recommended Actions for Public Safety Bodies

### 1. Community Corrections Partnership (Adult Probation)

<b>Criteria-based outcome:</b> Keep
<b>Prior Staff Recommendation</b> (reported in 8/15 version of memo): Keep

<b>Primary Department</b>	APD	<b>Established</b>	2011
<b>Current Type</b>	Staff Working Group	<b>Meetings (CY24)</b>	2
<b>Policy Area</b>	Justice System	<b>Members (as of May 2025)</b>	14 total seats 2 vacant seats (8%)

Advises the City on the use of evidence-based practices in sentencing and probation for justice-involved adults using state funds. Must submit an annual report to the Administrative Office of the Courts and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation Services evaluating the effectiveness of the community corrections programs operated by the county ([CA SB 678 \(2009\)](#)).

#### Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
<b>1</b> Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	Yes <sup>4</sup>	Keep
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	N/A	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
<b>2</b> Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
<b>3</b> Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
<b>4</b> Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes <sup>5</sup>	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	Consider keeping
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	

<sup>4</sup> The Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) is legally required to exist as long as the County receives state Community Corrections Performance Incentive Funds.

<sup>5</sup> Reentry Council, Sentencing Commission

5	Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes <sup>6</sup>	
		5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	Consider keeping

### Staff Discussion:

The Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) is legally required to exist as long as the County receives state Community Corrections Performance Incentive Funds.

---

<sup>6</sup> Single funding source: State funds



**Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:**

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	14	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Adult Probation Department, Board of Supervisors	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will for the community-based organization positions	At will	Yes	
Term length	None	3 years maximum	<b>No</b>	Add term lengths for public members.
Term limits	None	Case-by-case <sup>7</sup>	<b>No</b>	If there is no sunset date, public members should have a limit of 4 terms.
Qualifications	Yes <sup>8</sup> Specific qualifications by seat	None required <sup>9</sup>	Yes	
Establishing authority	State	Administrative Code	<b>No</b>	Add reference to body in Administrative Code for transparency.
Sunset date	None	3 years	<b>No</b>	This body's work is ongoing, so adding a sunset date does not make sense.

<sup>7</sup> Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

<sup>8</sup> Chief of Adult Probation, Board of Supervisors or their designee, District Attorney, Public Defender, Sheriff, Chief of Police, head of social services at the Human Services Agency, head(s) of mental health services and alcohol and substance abuse programs at the Department of Public Health, head of the Office of Employment and Workforce Development, head of the San Francisco Unified School District, representative from a rehabilitative services community-based organization (CBO), and representative of victims' interests CBO.

<sup>9</sup> Advisory Committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

City staff and members of the public make up the Community Corrections Partnership (CCP), so it is a hybrid of a Staff Working Group and an Advisory Committee. Since there is no Staff Working Group template, CCP conformance to the Advisory Committee template has been considered instead.

Three elements should be aligned with the Advisory Committee template: term length and term limits for public members, to ensure a rotating and broad representation of community interests, and establishing authority, since the CCP is currently not included in local code. While the Task Force may decide to remove most Staff Working Groups from code, CCP should be added for visibility and because it is legally required to exist.

## 2. Reentry Council (Adult Probation)

**Criteria-based outcome:** No recommendation: consider keeping or consider eliminating

**Prior Staff Recommendation** (reported in 8/15 version of memo): Allow to sunset in 2029

<b>Primary Department</b>	APD	<b>Established</b>	2008
<b>Current Type</b>	Staff Working Group	<b>Meetings (CY24)</b>	12
<b>Policy Area</b>	Justice System	<b>Members (as of May 2025)</b>	25 total members 1 vacant seat (4%)

Coordinates local efforts to support adults exiting San Francisco County Jail, San Francisco juvenile justice system out-of-home placements, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation facilities, and the United States Federal Bureau of Prison facilities ([Administrative Code § 5.1-1](#)).

### Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
<b>1</b> Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
<b>2</b> Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
<b>3</b> Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
<b>4</b> Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes <sup>10</sup>	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	Consider keeping
<b>5</b> Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes <sup>11</sup>	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes	Consider eliminating

<sup>10</sup> Community Corrections Partnership, Sentencing Commission

<sup>11</sup> Narrow topic: reentry

**Staff Discussion:**

The Reentry Council meets regularly, has all but one seat filled, and is set to sunset in June 2029, within three years of the potential enactment of an ordinance based on Commission Streamlining Task Force recommendations.

The Task Force should consider eliminating the Reentry Council; since many members are department heads, this group can continue to collaborate and meet with community members without needing this body explicitly established in the Administrative Code.

Consolidation of the Reentry Council and Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) was investigated. While the two bodies hold similar focuses on reentry, recidivism, and best practices for probation, Reentry Council includes a focus on juveniles while CCP currently does not.

**Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:**

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	24	15 maximum	<b>No</b>	Align to template by reducing number of members to 15
Appointing authority	Mayor; Public Defender's Office; District Attorney's Office; Sheriff's Department; Adult Probation Department; Police Department; Office of Economic and Workforce Development; Human Services Agency; Department of Children, Youth and their Families; Department of Public Health; Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing; Superior Court; Department of Child Support Services; CA Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation Division of Adult Parole Operations; U.S. Probation and Pretrial Services System	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	2 years	3 years maximum	Yes	
Term limits	None	Case-by-case <sup>14</sup>	<b>No</b>	Add 4 term limits to public seats.

---

<sup>14</sup> Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Qualifications	Seven formerly incarcerated members (three Mayoral <sup>15</sup> and four Board of Supervisors <sup>16</sup> appointees)	None required <sup>17</sup>	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	June 2, 2029	3 years	Yes	

City staff and members of the public make up the Reentry Council, so it is a hybrid of a Staff Working Group and an Advisory Committee. Since there is no Staff Working Group template, staff assessed whether conformance to the Advisory Committee template is appropriate.

If the Task Force keeps the Reentry Council, it should recommend adding term limits to the public seats and reducing the body from 24 seats to 15 seats. Ten public seats could remain, and the City's membership could be reduced from 15 to the five co-chair departments (Adult Probation, Public Defender's Office, District Attorney's Office, Sheriff, and the Mayor's designee). The other named departments could be required to provide information and input as needed without having an official seat on the body (Police; Office of Economic and Workforce Development; Human Services Agency; Children, Youth and their Families; Public Health; and Homelessness and Supportive Housing).

---

<sup>15</sup> Mayoral appointees must include an appointee between 18 to 35 years old who was incarcerated before the age of 24 years old, and an appointee with expertise in providing services to individuals exiting the criminal justice system

<sup>16</sup> BOS appointees must include an appointee with expertise in providing services to individuals exiting the criminal justice system, an appointee released from custody within the last three years, an appointee with multiple terms of incarceration, and an appointee who self-identifies as a survivor of violent crime.

<sup>17</sup> Advisory Committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

### 3. Real Estate Fraud Prosecution Trust Fund Committee (District Attorney)

<b>Criteria-based outcome:</b> Keep
<b>Prior Staff Recommendation</b> (reported in 8/15 version of memo): Keep

<b>Primary Department</b>	DAT	<b>Established</b>	1997
<b>Current Type</b>	Staff Working Group	<b>Meetings (CY24)</b>	0
<b>Policy Area</b>	Public Protection	<b>Members (as of May 2025)</b>	3 total seats

Aims to distribute dedicated funds for the investigation and prosecution of real estate fraud within San Francisco to eligible law enforcement agencies. ([Administrative Code § 8.24-5](#), [California Government Code § 27388](#))

#### Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
<b>1</b> Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	Yes <sup>18</sup>	Keep
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	N/A	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
<b>2</b> Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	N/A <sup>19</sup>	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
<b>3</b> Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	N/A	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
<b>4</b> Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	No	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
<b>5</b> Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes <sup>20</sup>	Consider keeping
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	

<sup>18</sup> The Real Estate Fraud Prosecution Trust Fund Committee is legally required to exist as long as the County receives state funds.

<sup>19</sup> This is a periodic meeting body that is only required to meet under certain conditions, so the definitions of inactive and borderline inactive do not apply.

<sup>20</sup> Single funding source: Real Estate Fraud Prosecution Trust Fund; narrow topic: real estate fraud protection

**Staff Discussion:**

This body is legally required so should be retained despite not having met since March 2009. Neither state nor local law require that the committee meet on a scheduled basis. The Committee was established to award funds for the purpose of deterring real estate fraud using the procedures and criteria required by Section 27388 of the California Government Code. The allocation of the fund has been established and remains at 10% for the Assessor/Recorder, 54% for the District Attorney, and 36% for the Police Department. There are no pending items requiring the Committee to meet.



**No Application of Template:**

Template component	Current State
Number of Members	3
Appointing authority	District Attorney, City Attorney, City Administrator
Appointment confirmations	None
Member removal	None
Term length	None
Term limits	None
Qualifications	Must be the District Attorney, City Administrator, City Attorney, or designees.
Establishing authority	Administrative Code
Sunset date	None

The Real Estate Fraud Prosecution Trust Fund Committee is a Staff Working Group, which does not have a template. No other changes are needed to the body's components.

The Commission Streamlining Task Force may consider removing Staff Working Groups from code completely. However, because this Committee is legally required, the body should remain in code.

The District Attorney and City Attorney's Offices requested that the Task Force propose amending the Administrative Code to expressly state that the body only needs to meet if the District Attorney calls a meeting to reevaluate the funding allocations.

#### 4. Sentencing Commission (District Attorney)

**Criteria-based outcome:** Consider eliminating

**Prior Staff Recommendation** (reported in 8/15 version of memo): Allow to sunset in 2026

<b>Primary Department</b>	DAT	<b>Established</b>	2012
<b>Current Type</b>	Staff Working Group	<b>Meetings (CY24)</b>	4
<b>Policy Area</b>	Justice System	<b>Members (as of May 2025)</b>	13 total members 1 vacant seat (8%)

Encourages the development of criminal sentencing strategies that reduce recidivism, prioritize public safety and victim protection, emphasize fairness, employ evidence-based best practices, and efficiently utilize San Francisco's criminal justice resources ([Administrative Code § 5.250](#)).

#### Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
<b>1</b> Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	N/A	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
<b>2</b> Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
<b>3</b> Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
<b>4</b> Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes <sup>22</sup>	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
<b>5</b> Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes <sup>23</sup>	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes <sup>24</sup>	Consider eliminating

<sup>22</sup> Reentry Council, Community Corrections Partnership

<sup>23</sup> Narrow topic: sentencing

<sup>24</sup> This is a staff working group with a narrow focus, so the work this body does may be accomplished through normal City operations.

### **Staff Discussion:**

The Sentencing Commission meets regularly and provides an active forum for coordination across the many public safety agencies, nonprofits, and experts. It focuses on developing recommendations around sentencing reform by facilitating expert conversations between City departments and nonprofit representatives. The Commission submits recommendations to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor via written reports.

There is some overlap in focus, activities, and members with the Reentry Council. The Sentencing Commission's activities include some work around reentry, the establishing code explicitly tasks them with coordinating with the Reentry Council and Community Corrections Partnership, and a Reentry Council representative sits on the Sentencing Commission. However, the bodies should not be combined because the Sentencing Commission and Reentry Council are focused on different components of the justice system. Those components have different purposes: sentencing focuses on determining appropriate consequences for a crime, while reentry focuses on re-integrating a person back into their community. The choice of which departments chair the bodies also reflects these different purposes: the District Attorney or designee chairs the Sentencing Commission while five public safety department heads or designees co-chair the Reentry Council.

The narrow focus and the fact that the majority of members are department heads means that The Sentencing Commission can continue to collaborate and meet with both nonprofits and community members without needing this body explicitly established in the Administrative Code.

The Sentencing Commission is set to sunset in less than a year, at the end of June 2026, which is likely to align with the effective date of the Task Force's ordinance.

**Application of Advisory Committee Template:**

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	13	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Split appointments between DAT, PDR, APD, SHF, POL, JPD, DPH, CRT, MYR, BOS, Reentry Council, and Family Violence Council	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	None	3 years maximum	<b>No</b>	If re-authorized, add 3-year term lengths to public seats.
Term limits	None	Case-by-case <sup>25</sup>	<b>No</b>	If re-authorized, add 4 term limits to public seats.
Qualifications	Either the head of the City departments or their designee can sit on this body. The 4 public members have specific seat-level qualifications. <sup>26</sup>	None required <sup>27</sup>	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	June 30, 2026	3 years	Yes	

The criteria recommend considering eliminating the Sentencing Commission. The Task Force may accomplish this by allowing the body to sunset in 2026.

<sup>25</sup> Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

<sup>26</sup> 1) a member of a nonprofit organization that works with victims; 2) a member of a nonprofit organization that works with ex-offenders; 3) a sentencing expert; 4) an academic researcher with expertise in data analysis

<sup>27</sup> Advisory Committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

Both City staff and members of the public make up the Sentencing Commission, so it is a hybrid of a Staff Working Group and an Advisory Committee. Since there is no Staff Working Group template, staff assessed whether conformance to the Advisory Committee template is appropriate.

If the Task Force chooses to keep the body for longer, it may consider aligning it the to the Advisory Committee template – though given the imminent sunset date, that is not advisable. The Task Force could recommend that if this body is reauthorized by the Board of Supervisors (BOS), the BOS should incorporate the standard term lengths and term limits for the public seats.

## 5. Disaster Council (Emergency Management)

**Criteria-based outcome:** Consider keeping

**Prior Staff Recommendation** (reported in 8/15 version of memo): Keep

<b>Primary Department</b>	DEM	<b>Established</b>	1972
<b>Current Type</b>	Staff Working Group	<b>Meetings (CY24)</b>	1
<b>Policy Area</b>	Public Protection	<b>Members (as of May 2025)</b>	13 total seats 0 vacant seats (0%)

Develops and approves plans for disaster response requiring the mobilization of public and private resources and advises the Board of Supervisors on regulations needed to implement these plans ([Administrative Code § 7.3-7.4-1](#)).

### Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
<b>1</b> Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	N/A	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
<b>2</b> Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
<b>3</b> Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	Yes <sup>28</sup>	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
<b>4</b> Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	No	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	N/A	
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	N/A	
<b>5</b> Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes <sup>29</sup>	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	Consider keeping

<sup>28</sup> Fewer than 4 meetings in CY24

<sup>29</sup> Narrow topic: disaster preparedness

**Staff Discussion:**

The Disaster Council is a staff working group that keeps San Francisco safe and prepared for crises. The Council meets only as frequently as necessary to revise plans.

**Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:**

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	13	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Mayor and President of the Board of Supervisors	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	Not specified	3 years maximum	<b>No</b>	Aligning this component to the template does not make sense for a staff working group.
Term limits	None	Case-by-case <sup>30</sup>	<b>No</b>	Aligning this component to the template does not make sense for a staff working group.
Qualifications	TBD <sup>31</sup>	None required <sup>32</sup>	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	None	3 years	<b>No</b>	Aligning this component to the template does not make sense for a staff working group.

<sup>30</sup> Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

<sup>31</sup> Qualifications have been listed as “TBD” because DEM has proposed updating the nearly thirty-year-old code section. DEM should work with the City Attorney’s Office over the next three months on desired changes for inclusion in the Task Force’s proposed ordinance. Current qualifications per section 7.3 of the Administrative Code are: “(a) The Mayor, who shall be the chair; (b) The Vice-Chair, who shall be appointed by the Mayor... (c) Such officers in charge of emergency services as are provided for in the current emergency plan of this City and County; (d) Such other representatives of civic, business, labor, veterans, professional, or other organizations having an official emergency responsibility, as may be appointed by the Mayor; (e) Three members of the Board of Supervisors, to be appointed by the President of the Board; (f) Controller; (g) The Director of Emergency Services who shall be the Executive Secretary.”

<sup>32</sup> Advisory Committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.



City staff and members of the public make up the Disaster Council, so it is a hybrid of a Staff Working Group and an Advisory Committee. Since there is no Staff Working Group template, staff assessed whether conformance to the Advisory Committee template is appropriate.

The Task Force should permit exceptions for three elements: term length and term limits, given the purpose of this body is more about coordination than public input, and sunset date, given the ongoing nature of disaster preparedness.

The Task Force may consider removing Staff Working Groups from code completely in a future meeting, which could apply to the Disaster Council. The Department of Emergency Management (DEM) described public comment as minimal, so removing the body from code would have little impact on the public.

**6. Fire Commission** (Fire Department)**Criteria-based outcome:** Consider Keeping**Prior Staff Recommendation (reported in 8/15 version of memo):** *Keep*

<b>Primary Department</b>	FIR	<b>Established</b>	1866
<b>Current Type</b>	Governance	<b>Meetings (CY24)</b>	21
<b>Policy Area</b>	Public Protection	<b>Members (as of May 2025)</b>	5 seats, all filled

Prescribes and enforces rules and regulations to provide for the efficiency of the Fire Department. The Department's mission includes protecting the lives and property of the people of San Francisco from fires, natural disasters, and hazardous materials incidents; saving lives by providing emergency medical services; and preventing fires through prevention and education programs. Reviews Fire Department personnel matters ([Charter § 4.108](#)).

**Evaluation Criteria:**

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
<b>1</b> Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
<b>2</b> Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
<b>3</b> Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
<b>4</b> Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	No	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
<b>5</b> Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	No	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	N/A	
<i>Because the answer to all criteria is "no," the outcome is: consider keeping.</i>			

**Staff Discussion:**

The Fire Commission is a mechanism of oversight and accountability for San Francisco's Fire Department, which has a budget of over \$550 million and employs over 1,850 FTEs for FY26. The Fire

Commission meets regularly and oversees a large department providing public protection services. The evaluation criteria do not provide any reason to eliminate the Fire Commission. Combining it with another of the City's public bodies is also not practical because there is no other body with overlapping functions.

**Possible Application of Governance Commission Template:**

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	5	5-7	Yes	
Appointing authority	Mayor	Mayor	Yes	
Appointment confirmations	None; appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)	None <sup>35</sup>	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	4 years	4 years	Yes	
Term limits	None	3 terms	<b>No</b>	Align to template; limit of 3 terms.
Qualifications	None; the Notice of Appointment shall include the appointee's qualifications to serve and a statement of how the appointment represents the City's communities of interest, neighborhoods and diverse populations (per Charter § 3.100.18)	None required <sup>36</sup>	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter	TBD	TBD	TBD
Sunset date	None	None	Yes	
Hiring and Firing Authority	The Mayor shall appoint based on a short list of three qualified candidates from the commission.	Consultative responsibilities only	<b>No</b>	Align to template; Consultative responsibilities only
Contract approval authority	3-6 contracts approved per year	Retain status quo	Yes	

<sup>35</sup> Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

<sup>36</sup> Governance Commissions not required to have specific qualifications. However, if there are If no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Budget approval authority	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Employee discipline authority	Yes, the Fire Commission holds hearings to decide matters involving discipline or termination of uniformed employees of the Fire Department.	No role <sup>37</sup>	<b>No</b>	Place authority to impose all disciplinary action with the Fire Chief. The Commission should serve as the appellate body to satisfy the state's appeal requirement.

The Task Force should align two elements of the Fire Commission to the Governance Commission template: the addition of term limits and removal of hiring and firing authority.

There is no template decision for governance commissions' establishing authority. The Task Force should decide whether to keep the Fire Commission in the charter or move it to the Administrative Code.

The Task Force may recommend a change to the employee discipline process to create citywide consistency. The current process wherein the Fire Commission renders disciplinary decisions for anything more than ten days is inconsistent with other commissions' employee discipline powers and is not required by state law. Furthermore, commissions are not supposed to interfere in the day-to-day operations of a department.

---

<sup>37</sup> Exceptions if this is currently required by law

## 7. Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (Juvenile Probation)

**Criteria-based outcome:** Keep

**Prior Staff Recommendation (reported in 8/15 version of memo):** Keep

<b>Primary Department</b>	JPD	<b>Established</b>	1999
<b>Current Type</b>	Staff Working Group	<b>Meetings (CY24)</b>	6
<b>Policy Area</b>	Justice System	<b>Members (as of May 2025)</b>	20 current members <sup>38</sup> 0 vacant seats (0%)

As mandated by state law to receive state funds, develops and implements a continuum of county-based responses to juvenile crime and submits the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act Plan to the state ([Cal. Welfare and Institutions Code §§ 749.22-749.27](#)).

### Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
<b>1</b> Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	Yes	Keep
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
<b>2</b> Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	N/A
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
<b>3</b> Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	N/A
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
<b>4</b> Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	No	No
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
<b>5</b> Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	No	N/A
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	N/A	

### Staff Discussion:

The Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) is legally required to exist as long as the County receives state funds from the Juvenile Crime Enforcement and Accountability Challenge Grant

<sup>38</sup> State law requires a minimum of 11 members

Program. JJCC meets once per year by design to complete the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act Plan. The possibility of merging the JJCC with the Juvenile Probation Commission was explored, but it was concluded that their differences did not justify a combination. The JJCC acts as a Staff Working Group bringing together various departments to contribute to a definitive product whereas the Juvenile Probation Commission acts as an oversight body for the Juvenile Probation Department and holds space for public engagement with the department.

**Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:**

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	20	15 maximum	<b>No</b>	Align to template; remove 5 seats
Appointing authority	Chief Probation Officer of Juvenile Probation Department	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	None	3 years maximum	<b>No</b>	Align to template for public members by adding term lengths
Term limits	None	Case-by-case <sup>40</sup>	<b>No</b>	Align to template for public members by adding term limits
Qualifications	Chief probation officer; representatives from the District Attorney, Public Defender, Sheriff, Board of Supervisors, Human Services Agency, Public Health (mental health specialty), Police, San Francisco Unified School District/ County Office of Education; a community-based drug and alcohol program; a nonprofit community-based organization providing services to minors; and an at-large representative.	None required <sup>41</sup>	Yes	
Establishing authority	State Welfare and Institutions Code	Administrative Code	<b>No</b>	Align to template by incorporating into the Administrative Code
Sunset date	None	3 years	<b>No</b>	None

---

<sup>40</sup> Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

<sup>41</sup> Advisory Committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.



Given it is composed of both City staff and members of the public, the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) is a hybrid of a Staff Working Group and an Advisory Committee. Since there is no Staff Working Group template, staff assessed whether conformance to the Advisory Committee template is appropriate.

The Task Force should align four elements to the Advisory Committee template. Term lengths and term limits should be added to ensure a rotating and broad representation of community interests. The establishing authority should be the Administrative Code; while the Task Force may decide to remove most Staff Working Groups from code, JJCC should be added for visibility and because it is legally required to exist. Finally, membership should be reduced by five seats. The JJCC goes beyond the state's membership requirements with nearly double the required individuals in the body

The Task Force should permit an exception for sunset date because the body is legally required.

**8. Juvenile Probation Commission** (Juvenile Probation)**Criteria-based outcome:** Consider keeping**Prior Staff Recommendation (reported in 8/15 version of memo):** *Keep*

<b>Primary Department</b>	JPD	<b>Established</b>	1989
<b>Current Type</b>	Governance	<b>Meetings (CY24)</b>	11
<b>Policy Area</b>	Justice System	<b>Members (as of May 2025)</b>	7 seats 1 seat vacant (14%)

Oversees the Juvenile Probation Department, including review of current policies and procedures to ensure that the Department promotes the safety and welfare of juveniles entering the juvenile justice system and follows state and court mandates for protection of juveniles in the justice system. The Commission also serves as a resource for positive change in the lives of youth and their families, accountability to victims, and the protection of the public ([Charter § 7.102](#)).

**Evaluation Criteria:**

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
<b>1</b> Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
<b>2</b> Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
<b>3</b> Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
<b>4</b> Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes <sup>43</sup>	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	Consider keeping
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
<b>5</b> Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	No	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	N/A	

**Staff Discussion:**


---

<sup>43</sup> Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council

The Juvenile Probation Commission (JPC) serves as a bridge between community stakeholders and the Juvenile Probation Department, as well as the Mayor's Office. This body contributes to transparency, accountability, and youth-centered justice reform in San Francisco. The establishment of the JPC was central to a larger effort to reform the City's dysfunctional and ineffective youth justice system, which also included shifting the Juvenile Probation Department from the authority of the SF Superior Court to the mayor as an independent city department with clear lines of administrative authority and oversight. The body's original purpose was to ensure that the department's policies and practices aligned with the best interests of justice-involved youth, their families, and the broader community and has evolved to include more active engagement in equity-driven reforms, strategic planning, and youth-centered policy development.

The Task Force may consider keeping the Juvenile Probation Commission since it assists the Juvenile Probation Department with transparency and accountability efforts, meets regularly, and acts as a positive forum for public engagement. However, the Task Force may want to modify the body from a governance commission to an advisory committee given the department's size and responsibilities; the department employs 178 people and has a budget of \$53 million for FY26.

**Possible Application of Governance Commission or Advisory Committee Templates:**

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?
Number of Members	7	15 maximum	5-7	Yes – Both
Appointing authority	Mayor	N/A	Mayor	Yes – Governance
Appointment confirmations	None; appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)	None	None <sup>44</sup>	Yes – Both
Member removal	With cause (per Charter § 15.105)	At will	At will	<b>No</b>
Term length	4 years	3 years maximum	4 years	Yes -Governance
Term limits	None	Case-by-case <sup>45</sup>	3 terms	<b>No</b>
Qualifications	2 of the 7 members appointed should be from lists of eligible members submitted to the Mayor by the Superior Court	None required <sup>46</sup>	None required <sup>46</sup>	Yes – Both
Establishing authority	Charter	Administrative Code	TBD	TBD
Sunset date	None	3 years	None	Yes – Governance
Hiring and firing authority	The Mayor shall appoint based on a short list of three qualified candidates from the commission (per Charter § 3.100.18).	N/A	Consultative responsibilities only	<b>No</b>
Contract approval authority	Yes, approves approx. 8-10 contracts or grants per quarter	N/A	Retain status quo	Yes – Governance
Budget approval authority	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes – Governance
Employee discipline authority	No	N/A	No role	Yes - Governance

<sup>44</sup> For Governance Commissions, appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

<sup>45</sup> For Advisory Committees, term limits are handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

<sup>46</sup> Neither Advisory Committees nor Governance Commissions are required to have specific qualifications. However, if there are If no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

**9. Police Commission** (Police Department)**Criteria-based outcome:** Consider keeping**Prior Staff Recommendation (reported in 8/15 version of memo):** *Keep*

<b>Primary Department</b>	Police	<b>Established</b>	1878
<b>Current Type</b>	Governance	<b>Members (as of May 2025)</b>	7 total seats 0 vacant seats
<b>Policy Area</b>	Public Protection	<b>Meetings (CY24)</b>	26

Oversees and sets policy for the Police Department and the Department of Police Accountability (DPA). Adjudicates discipline cases involving sworn members of the Police Department. ([Charter § 4.109](#))

**Evaluation Criteria:**

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
<b>1</b> Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
<b>2</b> Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
<b>3</b> Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
<b>4</b> Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	No	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
<b>5</b> Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	No	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	N/A	
<i>Because the answer to all criteria is "no," the outcome is: consider keeping.</i>			

**Staff Discussion:**

The evaluation criteria do not provide any reason to eliminate the Police Commission, as oversight of law enforcement is of paramount importance. Merging the Police Commission with another one of the City's public bodies is not practical because there is no other body with overlapping functions. In FY26, the Police Department employs 2,904 people and has a budget of \$849 million.

**Possible Application of Governance Commission Template:**

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	7	5-7	Yes	
Appointing authority	Mayor (4 seats), BOS (3 seats)	Mayor	<b>No</b>	Align to template; Mayoral appointees only
Appointment confirmations	<u>Mayoral appointees</u> : BOS confirmation required within 60 days (after a public hearing); if BOS takes no action within that time, the nominee is automatically deemed confirmed.	None <sup>48</sup>	<b>No</b>	<u>Mayoral appointees</u> : align to template by taking effect immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of BOS within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)
	<u>BOS appointees</u> : Nominees from the Rules Committee must be confirmed by the full BOS		<b>No</b>	N/A, if split appointments are removed. Otherwise, no change; retain current process. The Task Force should consider standardizing or clarifying BOS appointment processes in a future meeting.
Member removal	<u>Mayoral appointees</u> : BOS consent required	At will	<b>No</b>	<u>Mayoral appointees</u> : Align to template; remove BOS consent
	<u>BOS appointees</u> : BOS may remove.		Yes	
Term length	4 years	4 years	Yes	
Term limits	None	3 terms	<b>No</b>	Align to template; 3 term limit
Qualifications	At least one of the Mayoral appointees must be a retired judge or an attorney with trial experience.	None required <sup>49</sup>	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter	TBD	TBD	
Sunset date	None	None	Yes	

<sup>48</sup> Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

<sup>49</sup> Governance Commissions not required to have specific qualifications. However, if there are If no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Hiring and Firing Authority	<u>Police Chief hiring</u> : the Mayor shall appoint based on a short list of three qualified candidates from the commission.	Consultative responsibilities only	<b>No</b>	<u>Police Chief hiring</u> : align to template by removing the commission's authority to create a short-list for hiring and having to take action to fire the department head
	<u>Police Chief firing</u> : The Mayor may recommend removal to the commission, which shall take action within 30 days <u>Department of Police Accountability (DPA) hiring</u> : The Mayor shall appoint a nominee of the Police Commission as the Director of DPA, subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors. <sup>50</sup>			<u>Department of Police Accountability (DPA) hiring</u> : align to template by removing the commission's authority to nominate a candidate for hiring and having to take action to fire the department head
Contract approval authority	8-10 grants to SFPD approved per year for various law enforcement tools	Retain status quo	Yes	
Budget approval authority	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Employee discipline authority	The Chief of Police may only impose discipline of 10 days or fewer; more serious actions must be referred by the Chief to the Police Commission. <sup>51</sup> All California peace officers are entitled to an administrative appeal; in San Francisco, because the Police Commission is rendering the disciplinary decision, appeals are referred to an external Administrative Law Judge (ALJ).	No role <sup>52</sup>	<b>No</b>	Place authority to impose all disciplinary action with the Chief of Police. The Commission should serve as the appellate body to satisfy the state's appeal requirement. This would eliminate the need for an outside ALJ, thereby speeding up accountability and resulting in a more efficient allocation of resources.

<sup>50</sup> Charter § 4.136<sup>51</sup> Charter § A8.343<sup>52</sup> Exceptions if this is currently required by law

The Police Commission should align with the governance body template regarding five items: appointing authority, confirmation and removal of Mayoral appointees, term limits for all appointees, and hiring/firing authority.

There is no template decision for governance commissions' establishing authority. The Task Force should decide whether to keep the Police Commission in the charter or move it to the Administrative Code.

The Task Force should recommend a change to the employee discipline process to create citywide consistency. The current process wherein the Police Commission renders disciplinary decisions for anything more than ten days is inconsistent with other commissions' employee discipline powers and is not required by state law. Furthermore, commissions are not supposed to interfere in the day-to-day operations of a department.



**10. Sheriff's Department Oversight Board (Office of Sheriff's Inspector General)****Criteria-based outcome:** Consider combining or eliminating**Prior Staff Recommendation (reported in 8/15 version of memo):** *Eliminate*

<b>Primary Department</b>	SDA	<b>Established</b>	2020
<b>Current Type</b>	Regulatory	<b>Meetings (CY24)</b>	12
<b>Policy Area</b>	Public Protection	<b>Members (as of May 2025)</b>	7 total seats 2 vacant seats (29%)

Appoints, evaluates the work of, and removes the Inspector General from the Sheriff's Department Office of Inspector General (SDOIG). Reviews and recommends best practices for custodial and patrol operations, incorporates community feedback on Sheriff Department activities and jail conditions, and reports findings to the Sheriff. Summarizes and submits this information to the Board of Supervisors on a quarterly and annual basis ([Charter § 4.137](#)).

**Evaluation Criteria**

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
<b>1</b> Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
<b>2</b> Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
<b>3</b> Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	Yes	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	No	Consider eliminating
<b>4</b> Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	No	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
<b>5</b> Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes <sup>54</sup>	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes	Consider combining or eliminating

---

<sup>54</sup> Narrow topic: oversight of the Sheriff's Department.

## **Staff Discussion:**

Since being approved by voters 4.5+ years ago (in November 2020), the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board (SDOB) and Sheriff's Department Office of Inspector General (SDOIG) have struggled to get off the ground. SDOB staff acknowledge that operational challenges such as delayed hiring, lack of funding, successive budget cuts, staffing shortages, and hiring restrictions have significantly impacted SDOIG's ability to establish itself as a fully functional and independent department.

SDOIG has been insufficiently funded, so investigations of Sheriff misconduct have continued to be handled by staff at the Department of Police Accountability (DPA). The SDOB began meeting in summer 2022. The inaugural Inspector General was appointed 1.5 years later and served for thirteen months, with the post remaining vacant for seven months and counting.

The powers of the SDOIG and SDOB will always be limited by California law which prohibits oversight bodies for county Sheriff agencies. The SDOB oversees the SDOIG, not the actual Sheriff's Department. The SDOIG's power is limited to investigating allegations of Sheriff Department misconduct and reporting findings to the Sheriff, who decides what to do with discipline.

The duties completed by the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board Office of Inspector General (SDOIG) could be adopted by the Department of Police Accountability, centralizing the oversight of public safety departments in San Francisco without the need for the SDOB. It is less efficient to have law enforcement investigators work in two different departments (DPA and SDOIG). The Task Force could recommend renaming DPA to the Department of Law Enforcement Accountability (DLEA) to reflect the expanded scope. This is outside of the Task Force's purview, however.

According to SDOB, public engagement varies; some meetings have just a few speakers, while others – especially after high-profile incidents like in-custody deaths – draw significant community turnout. The following outcomes or impacts were reported for the previous year:

- Establishing key infrastructure: a website, online complaint filing system, a complainant portal to track investigations, case management system, digital workflows, newsletters, and a social media presence.
- Conducting jail inspections, gathered public feedback, and developing multiple policy recommendations. A rotation of three SDOB members at a time also make site visits with the SDOIG and meet with Sheriff's staff to provide feedback and discuss and resolve any pressing issues.
- SDOB contributed to increasing public awareness and trust in the oversight process.
- Despite a lack of any investigative staff, OSIG functioned by partnering with the DPA for investigative and operational support. This partnership is through a limited agreement between the Sheriff's Office and DPA. Only SDOB and OSIG have subpoena power.

**Possible Application of Governance Commission or Advisory Committee Templates:**

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?
Number of Members	7	15 maximum	5-7	Yes – Both
Appointing authority	Mayor (3 seats), Board of Supervisors (4 seats)	N/A	Mayor	<b>No</b>
Appointment confirmations	None	None	None <sup>55</sup>	Yes – Both
Member removal	For cause	At will	At will	<b>No</b>
Term length	4 years	3 years maximum	4 years	Yes – Governance
Term limits	3 successive terms	Case-by-case <sup>56</sup>	3 terms	Yes – Both
Qualifications	One of the BOS seats must be held by a person with experience in labor representation	None required <sup>57</sup>	None required <sup>56</sup>	Yes - Both
Establishing authority	Charter	Administrative Code	TBD	TBD
Sunset date	None	3 years	None	Yes – Governance
Hiring and firing authority	Appoints and may remove the Sheriff's Inspector General	N/A	Consultative responsibilities only	<b>No</b>
Contract approval authority	No	N/A	Retain status quo	Yes
Budget approval authority	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes – Governance
Employee discipline authority	None	N/A	No role	Yes - Both

<sup>55</sup> For Governance Commissions, appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

<sup>56</sup> For Advisory Committees, term limits are handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

<sup>57</sup> Neither Advisory Committees nor Governance Commissions are required to have specific qualifications. However, if there are If no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.