



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 12, 2025

SUBJECT: Criteria-Based Outcomes and Associated Analysis for Infrastructure, Climate, and Mobility 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 20 infrastructure, climate, and mobility bodies at its September 17th 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, which resulted in the "Criteria-Based Outcome" reported at the top of each section. For each body, this memo also provides an overview, a summary of relevant information and analysis, and the application of a template¹ 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 recommendation to keep 12 bodies and combine or eliminate 8 bodies.**

¹ 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 combining 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 combining 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 combining or eliminating
	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 eliminating
<i>If the answer is "no" to all criteria, consider keeping the body.</i>		

At its September 17 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 17 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 in time for the relevant meeting if emailed to commissionstreamlining@sfgov.org 24 hours prior to the Task Force meeting. Comments received later may not be distributed to Task Force members in time for the 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	09/05/2025	Original
2	09/08/2025	Updated ISCOTT's establishment year; added cost for Recreation and Park Commission
3	09/12/2025	Updated to simplify criteria-based outcomes in summary table and in memo body. Added notes section to summary table and memo body summarizing analysis of potential outcomes; added information to the Southeast Community Facility Commission regarding budget and contract authority
4	9/15/2025	Updated the email address on page 3 from "commission.streamlining@sfgov.org" to commissionstreamlining@sfgov.org
5	9/17/2025	Added confirmation process current state for non-City employees appointed to the Treasure Island Board of Directors and updated the Port Commission's establishment date

Summary of Recommended Actions for Infrastructure, Climate, and Mobility Bodies

Department		Name of Body	Criteria-Based Outcome	Notes	Recommended Type
ADM	City Administrator's Office	Treasure Island Development Authority Board of Directors	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legally required to exist 	Governance Commission
DPW	Public Works	Committee for Utility Liaison on Construction and Other Projects	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate 	Other (Staff Working Group)
DPW	Public Works	Public Works Commission	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining with Sanitation and Streets Commission or eliminating 	N/A
DPW	Public Works	Sanitation and Streets Commission	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining with Public Works Commission or eliminating 	N/A
ENV	Environment	Commission on the Environment	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate If kept, consider absorbing Urban Forestry Council functions 	Governance Commission or Advisory Committee
ENV	Environment	Municipal Green Building Task Force	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate 	Other (Staff Working Group)
ENV	Environment	Urban Forestry Council	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing either the Commission on the Environment or City staff to absorb functions. 	N/A

6 | Summary of Recommended Actions for Infrastructure, Climate, and Mobility Bodies

Department		Name of Body	Criteria-Based Outcome	Notes	Recommended Type
MTA	Municipal Transportation Agency	Bicycle Advisory Committee	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing either the MTA Board of Directors or MTA staff to absorb functions. 	N/A
MTA	Municipal Transportation Agency	Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation (ISCOTT)	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate 	Other (Staff Working Group)
MTA	Municipal Transportation Agency	Mission Bay Transportation Improvement Fund Advisory Committee	Eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing MTA staff to absorb functions. 	N/A
MTA	Municipal Transportation Agency	Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate May consider absorbing MTA Citizens Advisory Council or Bicycle Advisory Committee functions 	Governance Commission
MTA	Municipal Transportation Agency	Municipal Transportation Agency Citizens' Advisory Council	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing either MTA Board of Directors or MTA staff to absorb functions. May consider keeping to facilitate public engagement while MTA faces tough budget decisions. 	Advisory Committee

7 | Summary of Recommended Actions for Infrastructure, Climate, and Mobility Bodies

Department		Name of Body	Criteria-Based Outcome	Notes	Recommended Type
PRT	Port	Port Commission	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legally required to exist May absorb functions of the Waterfront Design Advisory Committee 	Governance Commission
PUC	Public Utilities Commission	Public Utilities Citizens' Advisory Committee	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing either the Public Utilities Commission or PUC staff to absorb functions. PUC may also maintain body as a passive meeting body. 	N/A
PUC	Public Utilities Commission	Public Utilities Commission	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate May consider absorbing the functions of the Public Utilities Citizens' Advisory Committee 	Governance Commission
PUC	Public Utilities Commission	Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate 	Advisory Committee
PUC	Public Utilities Commission	Southeast Community Facility Commission	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate 	Advisory Committee
RPD	Recreation and Parks Department	Joint Zoo Committee	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate Required per the binding Management Agreement 	Advisory Committee
RPD	Recreation and Parks Department	Park, Recreation, And Open Space Advisory Committee	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing either the Recreation and Park Commission or City staff to absorb functions 	N/A

8 | Summary of Recommended Actions for Infrastructure, Climate, and Mobility Bodies

Department		Name of Body	Criteria-Based Outcome	Notes	Recommended Type
RPD	Recreation and Parks Department	Recreation and Park Commission	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate Consider absorbing PROSAC functions 	Governance Commission

Recommended Actions for Infrastructure, Climate, and Mobility Bodies

1. [Treasure Island Development Authority Board of Directors](#) (City Administrator's Office)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep			
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Body is legally required to exist 			
Primary Department	ADM	Established	1997
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	9
Policy Area	Planning and Land Use	Members (as of May 2025)	7 total seats 2 vacant seats (29%) ²
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$365k ³		

Governs the Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA), a City agency and non-profit corporation which promotes planning, redevelopment, reconstruction, rehabilitation, reuse and conversion of a former naval station, including Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island, for the public interest, convenience, welfare and common benefit of the inhabitants of the City (Cal. Health & Safety Code § 33492.5; San Francisco Administrative Code § 2A.450).

Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	Yes ⁴	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	
2 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	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	Yes ⁵	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A ⁶	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ⁷	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	Consider keeping

² Since data was collected, a sixth appointment was made, bringing the vacancy rate down to 14%

³ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁴ The TIDA Board of Directors must exist as long as TIDA is incorporated as a nonprofit organization.

⁵ Greater than 25% vacancy rate

⁶ Since gathering membership data, a sixth appointment was made, dropping the vacancy rate to 14%, which means TIDA BOD no longer meets the definition of borderline inactive.

⁷ Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island Citizen's Advisory Board

		4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5	Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ⁸	
		5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	Consider keeping

Staff Discussion:

The Treasure Island Development Authority Board of Directors (TIDA BOD) is legally required to exist as long as the Treasure Island Development Authority is incorporated as a nonprofit organization. It cannot be combined with another body. Staff recommend keeping it for this reason.

Furthermore, since gathering membership data, a sixth appointment was made, dropping the vacancy rate to 14%, which means TIDA BOD no longer meets the definition of borderline inactive.

⁸ Single neighborhood: Treasure Island

Possible Application of Governance Commission Template:

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	7 ⁹	5-7	Yes	
Appointing authority	Mayor ¹⁰	Mayor	Yes	
Appointment confirmations ¹¹	City employees: Effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors (BOS) within 30 days. Non-City employees: Approval by BOS majority required	None ¹²	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	4 years	4 years	Yes	
Term limits	None	3 terms	No	Align to template; add limit of 3 terms
Qualifications	Expertise in the areas of real estate development, urban planning, environmental protection and resource conservation, homeless assistance, financing and other disciplines relevant to the reuse of the naval station	None required ¹³	Yes	

⁹ Section 4 of the bylaws reference the Articles of Incorporation and require the TIDA BOD to pass a resolution fixing the number of seats between 5 and 7

¹⁰ Additionally, the member of the Board of Supervisors who represents District 6 sits as an ex-officio, non-voting member

¹¹ Per Article V, Section 7 of TIDA BOD bylaws

¹² Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

¹³ 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
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	TBD	TBD	
Sunset date	None	None	Yes	
Hiring and Firing Authority	Yes. Historically, the City Administrator has provided TIDA staff, including the director, under an MOU.	Consultative responsibilities only	No	Align to template by removing hiring and firing authority.
Contract approval authority	Yes	Retain status quo	Yes	
Budget approval authority	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Employee discipline authority	No	No role	Yes	

Historically, TIDA and its BOD have been codified in state law and the body's by-laws. However, on August 1, 2025, the Mayor signed Ordinance 128-25 which formalized TIDA's status as a City department subject to Articles III and IV of the Charter.

While the Task Force has not yet decided whether governance bodies, such as TIDA BOD, should be memorialized in the Charter or Administrative Code, regardless of any overarching template decisions, TIDA BOD should not be added to the Charter because it must exist only as long as TIDA is incorporated as a nonprofit. If and when the nonprofit dissolves, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should have discretion to decide whether to keep it.

The information in the table above is written to reflect the recent adoption of Ordinance 128-25, which will go into effect on September 1, 2025

2. [Committee for Utility Liaison on Construction and Other Projects](#) (DPW)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate May consider removing the body from the Administrative Code

Primary Department	DPW	Established	1974
Current Type	Staff Working Group	Meetings (CY24)	11
Policy Area	Capital Projects and Infrastructure	Members (as of May 2025)	11 seats (vacancies unknown)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$4k ¹⁴		

As a subcommittee of the inactive Street Utilities Coordinating Committee, coordinates street excavation, utility work, paving and other construction projects in the public right of way in order to minimize the impact of construction on San Francisco's streets and in its neighborhoods ([Administrative Code § 5.63\(a\)](#)).

Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 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	
2 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	
3 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	
4 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	
5 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	

¹⁴ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

Because the answer to all criteria is "no," the outcome is: consider keeping.

Staff Discussion:

The Task Force should consider keeping CULCOP because it brings together City departments, public utilities, and private utility providers to coordinate infrastructure work across San Francisco. The Department of Public Works finds it useful, and the body met for 11 of its 12 code-required monthly meetings in 2024. If CULCOP did not exist, the partner agencies, especially from external private utilities, may not coordinate work. Coordinating project timelines reduces conflicts, duplicative work, and disruptions to residents and businesses. It also minimizes repeated street openings, reduces construction delays, and saves taxpayer money while lessening the impact on neighborhoods.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	11	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Department of Public Works - Bureau of Engineering; San Francisco Department of Telecommunications and Information Services; San Francisco Water Department; Hetch Hetchy Water and Power System; Municipal Railway; San Francisco Fire Department; San Francisco Department of Electricity; San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. Private utility providers: Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Gas Division; Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Electric Division; Pacific Telephone Company; Western Union and the Television Signal Corporation.	N/A	N/A	Update
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	N/A	At will	N/A	
Term length	N/A	3 years maximum	N/A	
Term limits	N/A	Case-by-case ¹⁵	N/A	
Qualifications	None, other than being an employee of one of the named agencies	None required ¹⁶	N/A	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	

¹⁵ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹⁶ 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.

The Task Force should not propose changes to align the Committee for Utility Liaison on Construction and Other Projects (CULCOP) to a template, since there is no Staff Working Group template.

Removing CULCOP from code could have a negative effect on the City because the external agencies may be less willing to participate, which would make the utility coordination less effective. On the other hand, based on its [website](#), CULCOP does not appear to be adhering to public meeting laws. Changing departmental practices to comply with public meeting laws may not be worth the effort for a group intended for staff (as opposed to members of the public); an alternative is for the Board of Supervisors to adopt an ordinance requiring coordination without creating a public meeting body.

Assuming CULCOP remains codified, outdated appointing authority language should be updated, such as references to the Municipal Railway, which is now the Municipal Transportation Authority; the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, which has been dissolved and replaced by the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, the Pacific Telephone Company, and Television Signal Corporation. Additional utilities and agencies that perform work in the right-of-way could be added, including Caltrans, Caltrain, SamTrans, Transbay Joint Powers Authority, and Xfinity/Comcast. DPW should work with the City Attorney's Office over the next three months on desired changes to this 25-year-old code section for inclusion in the Task Force's proposed ordinance. This is also an opportunity to validate and strengthen CULCOP's functions and activities based on current practices.

3. [Public Works Commission](#) (DPW)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or eliminate			
Notes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining with Sanitation and Streets Commission or eliminating 			
Primary Department	DPW	Established	2022
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	17
Policy Area	Public Works	Members (as of May 2025)	5 total seats 0 vacant seats (0%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$716k ¹⁷		

Sets policy directives for the Department of Public Works, which is responsible for the design, building, repair, and improvement of the City's infrastructure, including City-owned buildings and facilities and the public right of way; maintenance of the public right of way, including street sweeping, and litter abatement; the provision and maintenance of City trash receptacles and removal of illegal dumping and graffiti in the public right of way; and planting and maintenance of street trees. Reviews and evaluates department performance regarding all these areas—except sanitation standards and protocols, and maintenance of the public right of way, which are within the jurisdiction of the Sanitation and Streets Commission ([Charter § 4.141](#)).

Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 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	
2 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	
3 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	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ¹⁸	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes	Consider eliminating or combining
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	No	

¹⁷ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁸ Sanitation and Streets Commission, Urban Forestry Council, Graffiti Advisory Board, client agency commissions

5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	N/A
--	-----

Staff Discussion:

The Public Works Commission (PWC) was created by Proposition B (2020) to oversee the Department of Public Works after the planned spin-off of its Operations Division into the Department of Sanitation and Streets. Proposition B (2022) ended the spin-off, combining all Public Works contract and budget approvals under the Public Works Commission. DPW has a budget of \$427 million and over 1,000 employees (FTEs) for FY26.

Public participation has significantly waned over time. In the first two years, 107 and 54 comments were made, respectively. In the most recent year, only a handful of comments have been made, largely from the same two individuals. This suggests limited community reliance on this forum. It also indicates that public trust has been restored since the corruption scandal that led to the creation of the commission.

The PWC approves an average of 12–13 contracts per meeting (10 of which are on the consent calendar). The commission review and approval process adds at least six weeks to the department's contract execution. Within the last year, the PWC updated its contract approval delegation policy to empower the Department director to approve more routine and low-dollar contracts while keeping the commission informed. DPW notes that its commission could be even more effective if more of its contract approval power could be delegated to the Department director, which would require code amendments related to as-needed and job order contracting, which make up the bulk of the commission's routine matters on the consent calendar and already undergo significant checks and balances before commission approval.

The PWC has some overlap with other City commissions overseeing departments that rely on DPW's services. These commissions frequently approve the actual capital project and PWC approves the contract(s) to deliver the project. The commission strives to adhere to its mandate by avoiding topics such as design, site choice, funding, and programming, which fall under the purview of other commissions.

After months of discussion with DPW staff, the commission heard the inaugural department performance report, publicly outlining how DPW measures success. Additionally, PWC now receives regular updates on larger capital projects after contract approval. Examples of the commission's other recent activities include the department's vacancy and hiring challenges, the creation and implementation of the Love Our Neighborhood permit, capital funding for the paving program, and clarifying procurement processes.

The PWC was formed in response to a corruption scandal in the department which included poor contracting practices. Without the PWC, millions of dollars of construction contracts annually would be approved by the DPW Director, with no public visibility. However, commissioners do not know if winning bidders engaged in bribery, and the long-standing existing protest process provides losing bidders adequate recourse if they object to the procurement process. Furthermore, contracting procedures were strengthened citywide, in response to the same scandal, making one of the PWC's core reasons for being less relevant. Finally, if there is still a desire for transparency in DPW's

contracts, the City could establish a process wherein professional staff periodically hear reports about recently awarded contracts. Similarly, regular capital project progress reports could be absorbed into an existing body, such as the Capital Planning Committee, which already hears updates about projects funded by general obligation bonds.

Another risk of elimination is a decrease in transparency for an otherwise opaque part of the City and County of San Francisco. DPW provides some of the services furthest from the daily lives of people not involved in government – capital project design and delivery, contract management, materials testing, etc. Although public comment is limited, the PWC allows DPW to demonstrate the value it provides to the public. However, there are other avenues to address transparency besides the PWC. The department's monthly administrative hearings could be expanded so members of the public could raise other issues, or language could be added to the Administrative Code requiring DPW to host department-wide periodic (semi-annual or quarterly) community hearings or town halls.

Possible Application of Governance Commission or Advisory Committee Templates:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?
Number of Members	5	15 maximum	5-7	Yes – Both
Appointing authority	Mayor (2 seats), Board of Supervisors (2 seats), Controller (1 seat)	N/A	Mayor	No
Appointment confirmations	When the Mayor or Controller makes a nomination, BOS has 60 days to hold a hearing and vote. If the Board doesn't act in that time, the nominee is automatically approved.	None	None ¹⁹	No
Member removal	At will	At will	At will	Yes
Term length	4 years	3 years maximum	4 years	Yes – Governance
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ²⁰	3 terms	No
Qualifications	Desirable, but not required: a background or experience in cleaning and maintaining public spaces, urban forestry, urban design, construction, skilled crafts and trades, finance and audits, architecture, landscape architecture, engineering, or	None required ²¹	None ²¹	Yes

¹⁹ 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)

²⁰ 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).

²¹ Neither Advisory Committees nor Governance Commissions are required to have specific qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?
	performance measurement and management			
Establishing authority	Charter	Administrative Code	TBD	No
Sunset date	None	3 years	None	Yes – Governance
Hiring and firing authority	Yes	N/A	Consultative responsibilities only	No
Contract approval authority	Yes. An average of 10 contracts on the consent calendar and 2–3 discussed individually	N/A	Retain status quo	Yes
Budget approval authority	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes
Employee discipline authority	No	N/A	No role	Yes

If the Task Force elects to retain the Public Works Commission as a decision-making body, it should align the body to the governance commission template by removing the Board and Controller as appointing authorities, updating the confirmation process, instituting a limit of 3 terms, and limiting hiring/firing authority to consultative responsibilities only.

If the Task Force elects to retain the Public Works Commission but modify it into an advisory body, it should align the body to the advisory committee template by removing appointment confirmations, modifying term lengths, and instituting term limits. The Commission should also have a 3-year sunset date and be renamed and moved into the Administrative Code.

4. [Sanitation and Streets Commission](#) (DPW)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or eliminate			
Notes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining with Public Works Commission or eliminating 			
Primary Department	DPW	Established	2022
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	8
Policy Area	Public Works	Members (as of May 2025)	5 total seats 1 vacant seat (20%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$252k ²²		

Oversees the Operations Division of San Francisco Public Works. Sets policy directives and oversees the division's performance, reviewing the designation and filling of staff positions, establishing minimum standards of cleanliness for the public right of way and baselines for services to maintain cleanliness of the public rights of way ([Charter § 4.139](#)).

Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 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	
2 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	
3 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	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ²³	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes	Consider combining or eliminating
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ²⁴	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes	Consider eliminating

²² Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

²³ Public Works Commission, Urban Forestry Council, Graffiti Advisory Board

²⁴ Street cleanliness

Staff Discussion:

The Sanitation and Streets (SAS) Commission was established through Proposition B in November 2020. At that time, voters approved the creation of a separate Sanitation and Streets Department to be overseen by a new oversight body.

In November 2022, a subsequent Proposition B was passed, which eliminated the separate Sanitation and Streets Department but retained the commission. This resulted in the commission serving as an oversight body for a division within the Department of Public Works, rather than for a standalone department. Commissions are typically structured to oversee entire departments, not individual divisions; the current arrangement does not align with this standard practice.

While the commission originally had authority to approve contracts, conduct cost analyses, and set cleanliness standards, the second ballot measure eliminated its powers over budget and contract approval, as well as cost analyses, leaving only general oversight duties and the responsibility for setting cleanliness standards.

Meetings focus mainly on performance reports from Public Works' Operations Division. In October 2024, after 26 months of hearings and discussions, the commission approved the department's standards of cleanliness, fulfilling a key mandate under the Charter. There is very low public participation, with one or fewer public commenters per meeting.

Oversight often overlaps with the Public Works Commission, which already covers the full department (including the Operations Division). There is also topic overlap with the Urban Forestry Council and the Graffiti Advisory Board

Possible Application of Governance Commission or Advisory Committee Templates:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?
Number of Members	5	15 maximum	5-7	Yes – Both
Appointing authority	Mayor (2 seats), Board of Supervisors (2 seats), Controller (1 seat)	N/A	Mayor	No
Appointment confirmations	When the Mayor or Controller makes a nomination, the Board of Supervisors has 60 days to hold a hearing and vote. If the Board doesn't act in that time, the nominee is automatically approved.	None	None ²⁵	No
Member removal	At will	At will	At will	Yes
Term length	4 years	3 years maximum	4 years	Yes - Governance
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ²⁶	3 terms	No
Qualifications	Desirable, but not required: a background or experience in cleaning and maintaining public spaces, urban forestry, urban design, construction, skilled crafts and trades, finance and audits, architecture, landscape	None required ²⁷	None ²⁷	Yes

²⁵ 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)

²⁶ 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).

²⁷ Neither Advisory Committees nor Governance Commissions are required to have specific qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?
	architecture, engineering, or performance measurement and management			
Establishing authority	Charter	Administrative Code	TBD	No
Sunset date	None	3 years	None	Yes – Governance
Hiring and firing authority	No	N/A	Consultative responsibilities only	Yes
Contract approval authority	No	N/A	Retain status quo	Yes
Budget approval authority	No	N/A	Yes	No
Employee discipline authority	No	N/A	No role	Yes

If the Task Force chooses to keep the body, it may consider aligning SAS to either the Governance Commission or Advisory Committee template

If the Task Force elects to retain the Sanitation and Streets Commission as a decision-making body, it should align the body to the governance commission template by removing the Board and Controller as appointing authorities, updating the confirmation process, and instituting a limit of 3 terms.

If the Task Force elects to retain the Sanitation and Streets Commission but modify it into an advisory body (which is more appropriate given its current functions), it should align the body to the advisory committee template by removing appointment confirmations, modifying term lengths and instituting term limits. The Commission should also have a 3-year sunset date and be renamed and moved into the Administrative Code.

5. [Commission on the Environment](#) (Environment Department)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate If kept, may consider absorbing Urban Forestry Council functions

Primary Department	ENV	Established	1996
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	8
Policy Area	Parks and Environment	Members (as of May 2025)	7 seats 0 vacancies
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$181k ²⁸		

Sets policy for the Environment Department and advises the mayor and Board of Supervisors on environmental matters. Develops policies and programs in recycling, toxics reduction, environmental justice, energy efficiency, commute alternatives, climate change, and the city's urban forest. The Environment Commission has a Policy Committee and an Operations Committee ([Charter § 4.118](#)).

Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 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	
2 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	
3 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	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ²⁹	
	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?	Yes	Consider keeping and expanding scope
5 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	

²⁸ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

²⁹ Municipal Green Building Task Force, Urban Forestry Council

Staff Discussion:

The Commission on the Environment (CoE) is the body tasked with overseeing the Environment Department and providing Citywide policy recommendations that support the City's long-term sustainability efforts.

The evaluation criteria support potentially combining this body with other public bodies that focus on environmental issues. Because CoE has a broader mandate than the bodies it overlaps with, there may be potential for combining bodies. The criteria suggest potentially eliminating the Urban Forestry Council, however CoE could take on some urban canopy advisory functions should UFC be eliminated and CoE kept. There is also overlap with the Municipal Green Building Task Force, however this is a staff working group with a specific mandate that does not make sense to combine with CoE.

Regardless of decisions related to the Urban Forestry Council, the Task Force may consider modifying the CoE to be an advisory body. CoE oversees the Environment Department, which is a small department that employs fewer than 100 FTEs and has a budget of approximately \$40 million, less than \$1m of which comes from the general fund. CoE could either remain a decision-making body with oversight of the department or the Task Force could modify this into being an advisory committee that continues to provide input and recommendations on Citywide environmental policies but no longer oversees the Department. Because the body's current primary role is to advise the department and support environmental efforts that require Citywide implementation, this modification may not have significant impacts on the actual day-to-day functioning of the body or the department.

The Task Force could also decide to eliminate this body altogether. The Environment Department conducts public outreach and engagement as part of normal department operations, gathering feedback on specific topics or projects, so there are other pathways for public input outside of the commission structure.

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
Appointment confirmations	None; appointments are effective immediately unless rejected 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)	None	None ³⁰	Yes – Governance
Member removal	At will	At will	At will	Yes – Both
Term length	4 years	3 years maximum	4 years	Yes – Governance
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ³¹	3 terms	No
Qualifications	None	None required ³²	None required ³²	Yes
Establishing authority	Charter	Administrative Code	TBD	TBD
Sunset date	None	3 years	None	Yes – Governance
Hiring and firing authority	Department Head: Nominate for hiring. Sole authority in firing	N/A	Consultative responsibilities only	No
Contract approval authority	Yes. Number of approvals depend on Department activities and pipeline. In FY25, approved 5 grants/contracts.	N/A	Retain status quo	Yes
Budget approval authority	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes
Employee discipline authority	None	N/A	No role	Yes

³⁰ 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)

³¹ 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).

³² 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.

If the Task Force elects to retain the Commission on the Environment as a decision-making body, it could align the body to the governance commission template by instituting a limit of 3 terms and limiting hiring/firing authority to consultative responsibilities only.

If the Task Force elects to retain the Commission on the Environment but modify it into an advisory body, it could align the body to the advisory committee template by removing budget approval, contract approval, and hiring/firing authorities. The Commission should also have a 3-year sunset date and be moved into the Administrative Code.

6. Municipal Green Building Task Force (Environment Department)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate

Primary Department	ENV	Established	2004
Current Type	Staff Working Group	Meetings (CY24)	8
Policy Area	Building and Permitting; Parks and Environment	Members (as of May 2025)	21 seats 0 vacancies
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$80k ³³		

Oversees and assists in enhancing the environmental performance of municipal construction projects pursuant to Chapter 7 of the San Francisco Environment Code, which outlines municipal green building requirements. Advises the Department of the Environment on policy matters, facilitates interdepartmental communication and cooperation, and acts as an educational forum to increase staff knowledge of green building practices and share project-related successes and lessons learned ([Environment Code § 702](#)).

Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 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	
2 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	
3 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	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ³⁴	
	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
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ³⁵	

³³ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

³⁴ Commission on the Environment

³⁵ Municipal green building requirements

5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	Consider keeping
--	----	------------------

Staff Discussion:

The Municipal Green Building Task Force (MGBTF) is primarily a Staff Working Group, with 20 employees from 12 departments and 1 member of the public. This enables information sharing across departments and supports the effective implementation of the City's green building requirements (per Chapter 7 of the Environment Code). MGBTF is a valuable forum for coordination and supports staff in building knowledge in a topic area that spans multiple departments. In addition, MGBTF makes recommendations to the head of the Environment Department on requests for waivers for Chapter 7 requirements. Appropriately assessing waivers requires gathering input and knowledge from staff representing the different departments on the MGBTF, so staff within the Environment Department do not have all the required expertise to easily make those assessments. This means that the Task Force increases government efficiency by providing a forum to systematically evaluate waivers and share information that can inform the work that different departments are responsible for when following green building requirements.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	21	15 maximum	No	Remove public member, otherwise retain current membership. ³⁶
Appointing authority	Split appointments: MYR, ENV, DPW, PUC, RPD, MTA, ADM, DBI, CPC, PRT, AIR, LIB, FIR, DPH ³⁷	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	3 years (public members only)	3 years maximum	Yes	
Term limits	2 consecutive terms (public members only)	Case-by-case ³⁸	Yes	
Qualifications	A representative with building design, construction, and/or finance experience from each of the City Departments and divisions listed as appointing authorities.	None required ³⁹	Yes	

³⁶ This body's work requires having members from all currently represented departments so it would not make sense to reduce the total number to 15. The Task Force should consider recommending removing the public member. However, there is currently proposed legislation that would add a Mayor's Office of Housing & Community Development (MOHCD) member in order to support City-funded affordable housing development project compliance with Chapter 7 requirements. If this seat is added, the total number of seats would remain at 21 even after removing the public member.

³⁷ Mayor's Office, Department of the Environment; San Francisco Public Works: Building Design and Construction, Design and Engineering, Landscape Architecture, Building Repair, and Project Management; San Francisco Public Utilities Commission: Power Enterprise, Water Enterprise, Wastewater Enterprise, and Infrastructure; Capital and Planning Division within Recreation and Park; Capital Programs and Construction Division within San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency; Office of Resilience and Capital Planning and Real Estate Division within Office of City Administrator; Building Inspection; Citywide Planning Division within Planning Department; Port of San Francisco; San Francisco International Airport; Facilities Division within San Francisco Public Library; Fire; Public Health

³⁸ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

³⁹ 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.

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Establishing authority	Environment Code	Administrative Code	No	Add to Administrative Code
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	This body's work is ongoing, so adding a sunset date does not make sense.

City staff and one member of the public make up the Municipal Green Building Task Force (MGBTF), 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.

It is appropriate for the MGBTF to exceed the 15-member Advisory Committee maximum given that the body is primarily a Staff Working Group. The Task Force should recommend removing the one member of the public to transform the body into a Staff Working Group comprised of only staff.

Because sustainability is a topic that is often layered onto existing topics (e.g. DPW's primary role is public works, and the sustainability impact of public works is a secondary consideration), there is concern that this body would not be as effective or functional if it were not in code. For this reason, staff recommend keeping this body in code but incorporating it into the Administrative Code for transparency and consistency purposes. There may be a cross-reference between the Environment Code and Administrative Code.

7. [Urban Forestry Council](#) (Environment Department)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or eliminate
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing either the Commission on the Environment, the Bureau of Urban Forestry, or StreetTreeSF to absorb functions.

Primary Department	ENV	Established	2003
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	6
Policy Area	Parks and Environment	Members (as of May 2025)	15 seats 1 vacancy (7%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$109k ⁴⁰		

Advises city departments, including the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor, on urban forestry issues. Guides the stewardship of San Francisco's trees by promoting a healthy and sustainable urban forest that benefits all San Franciscans while ensuring public health and safety. ([Environment Code Chapter 12](#))

Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 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	
2 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	
3 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	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ⁴¹	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes	Consider combining or eliminating
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ⁴²	

⁴⁰ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁴¹ Commission on the Environment, Public Works Commission, Sanitation and Streets Commission

⁴² Narrow topic: urban forestry

5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?

Yes

Consider eliminating

Staff Discussion:

The Urban Forestry Council (UFC) is an advisory committee that includes both members of the public and staff in the departments that touch tree maintenance. The council supports long-term planning and cross-departmental strategy for the City's urban forest, while City agencies provide day-to-day oversight and maintenance. Many departments touch this work, most notably the Department of Public Works' Bureau of Urban Forestry (BUF). However, BUF is not responsible for all of the City's trees; for instance, Rec and Park is responsible for trees in parks.

When the UFC was initially established, the mandate included developing and supporting implementation of an Urban Forest Plan. Because this is a long-term plan that the City has since adopted, the group has successfully met one of the primary drivers of the creation of the Urban Forestry Council. Furthermore, a 2016 proposition passed and created [StreetTreeSF](#), a DPW-run program to systematically maintain and care for all street trees. This program further brings responsibility for the urban canopy into everyday department operations. Advisory Committees should bring outside expertise that would otherwise be missing from government or create pathways for public involvement on an issue. Given the current scope of the work UFC is doing, the Bureau of Urban Forestry and other City departments employ staff with the specialized knowledge needed to maintain the urban canopy. While the group does provide a forum for additional cross-departmental coordination, City staff should be able to perform the functions of the Urban Forestry Council without needing a formal advisory body; a passive meeting body would be suitable instead. Furthermore, should the Task Force opt to keep the Commission on the Environment, that Commission would be able to adopt some oversight functions for the urban canopy and provide a forum for public input on the issue.

Advisory Committees

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	15	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	BOS, MYR, DPW, CPC, RPD, PUC ⁴³	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 ⁴⁴	Yes	
Qualifications	BOS and MYR appointees have specific qualifications. ⁴⁵ Department heads or their designees are required to fill the other seats.	None required ⁴⁶	Yes	
Establishing authority	Environment Code	Administrative Code	No	Add to Administrative Code
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Add sunset date

The evaluation criteria suggests that the Task Force should consider eliminating the Urban Forestry Council. However, should the Task Force choose to keep the Urban Forestry Council, it may align the body to the advisory committee template by moving the body to the Administrative Code (a brief cross-reference in the Environment Code may remain) and adding a 3-year sunset date.

⁴³ Board of Supervisors, Mayor, Public Works, City Planning, Rec Park, and Public Utilities

⁴⁴ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

⁴⁵ 1 member from an educational organization involved with tree management, 2 members certified by a professional tree management organization, 2 members of non-profit organizations involved in urban forestry or other environmentally-related issues, 2 community members, 1 member from the tree care industry.

⁴⁶ 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.

8. [Bicycle Advisory Committee](#) (Municipal Transportation Agency)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or eliminate
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing either the MTA Board of Directors or MTA staff to absorb functions.

Primary Department	MTA	Established	1990
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	12
Policy Area	Transportation	Members (as of May 2025)	17 (11 voting members) 3 vacant seats ⁴⁷ (18% vacancy)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$1k ⁴⁸		

Advises the SFMTA, Board of Supervisors, and other city agencies on how to make bicycling safer and more accessible ([Administrative Code § 5.130](#)).

Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 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	
2 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	
3 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	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ⁴⁹	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes	Consider combining or eliminating
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ⁵⁰	

⁴⁷ As of May 16, 2025, there were no vacancies among voting members

⁴⁸ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁴⁹ Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors, Municipal Transportation Agency Citizens' Advisory Council

⁵⁰ Bicycling

5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?

Yes

Consider eliminating

Staff Discussion:

The Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) meets regularly and has all voting-member seats filled. Its main functions are hearing reports from various City departments, providing feedback, and taking votes on non-binding resolutions of support for bicycle-related policies, programs, and infrastructure projects.

The Administrative Code tasks the BAC with developing plans for bicycle-related improvements and bicycle education. While the BAC may have done this at some stage, it has not in the last several years, and these planning efforts are now duplicative with the work done by full-time City employees.

The City's bicycle safety planning and implementation is primarily handled by the Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) and occurs independently of the BAC. The MTA has jurisdiction over most bicycle safety issues—bike lanes, street design, speed limits, traffic signals, etc.—and employs full-time staff to plan for improvements and manage these assets and operations.

When the BAC was formed in 1990, the MTA did not yet exist. The Department of Parking and Traffic (DPT) or the Department of Public Works (DPW) may not have planned extensively for bicycle infrastructure. However, the MTA now has a Sustainable Streets Division with teams focused on active transportation, employs full-time bike planners and engineers, and integrates biking into multimodal planning. While the BAC may have been essential in the 1990s, transportation planning looks very different thirty-five years later, and the BAC may no longer be necessary.

Advisory Committees should bring outside expertise that would otherwise be missing from government or create pathways for public involvement on an issue. MTA's bicycle planners routinely create opportunities for public input on bicycle-related projects. For example, in March 2025 the MTA Board of Directors approved the [San Francisco Biking and Rolling Plan](#), which directs bicycle-related investments, policies, and actions for the next 10+ years. The plan was developed over the course of two years by MTA staff who conducted extensive community engagement, including 250+ tabling events, 10 open houses, and 1000+ survey responses. The BAC was consulted as part of this broader engagement, along with 80+ other organizations. By contrast, the BAC typically has two public commenters or less per meeting. While the BAC is one venue for public input regarding bicycling in San Francisco, it's clearly not the only one.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	11 voting members	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Each member of the Board of Supervisors may nominate one person	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	Nominations must be approved by the full Board of Supervisors	No confirmations	No	Remove appointment confirmations
Member removal	At will removal by nominating Supervisor	At will	Yes	
Term length	2 years	3 years maximum	Yes	
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ⁵¹	Yes	
Qualifications	None	None required ⁵²	No	Add requirement that appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Add 3-year sunset date

The criteria result in a recommendation that Task Force consider eliminating the Bicycle Advisory Committee. However, should the Task Force choose to keep the BAC, it should align the body to the advisory committee template by removing appointment confirmations, requiring a written statement specifying why an appointee is qualified, incorporating six term limits, and adding a 3-year sunset date.

⁵¹ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

⁵² 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.

9. [Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation](#) (ISCOTT)
(Municipal Transportation Agency)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep			
Notes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate 			
Primary Department	MTA	Established	1958
Current Type	Staff Working Group	Meetings (CY24)	23
Policy Area	Transportation; Building and Permitting	Members (as of May 2025)	7 total seats 0 vacancies
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$10k ⁵³		

Holds hearings and reviews temporary street closure permits for special events including neighborhood block parties, street fairs, and road races ([Transportation Code § 6.1](#)).

Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 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	
2 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	
3 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	
4 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	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ⁵⁴	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	Consider keeping

⁵³ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁵⁴ Temporary street closure permits

Staff Discussion:

ISCOTT is a low-overhead staff working group that is decades old; on August 14, 2025, it held its 1,598th meeting. It regularly meets twice a month and is required to hear, review and approve special event road closure permits. In the past year, ISCOTT approved over 450 permits for neighborhood block parties, street fairs, athletic events, shared spaces, and other types of community events. By bringing together staff from various City departments, ISCOTT helps the City efficiently coordinate around major events and resolve scheduling resource constraints.

While ISCOTT is narrowly focused on temporary street closure permits, there are no other bodies that could reasonably review these permits and ensure interdepartmental coordination among the many departments with jurisdiction over the public right-of-way.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	7	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	MTA, CPC, DPW, POL, FIR, and Entertainment Commission	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	None	3 years maximum	No	Not applicable to a Staff Working Group
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ⁵⁵	Yes	
Qualifications	Employees of the appointing departments	None required ⁵⁶	Yes	
Establishing authority	Transportation Code	Administrative Code	No	Add to Administrative Code
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Not applicable to a Staff Working Group

There is no template for staff working groups. However, the Task Force may consider adopting several elements from the Advisory Committee template and applying them to ISCOTT.

The Task Force should not remove ISCOTT from code. It has delegated decision authority from the Board of Supervisors on issuing permits in conformance with [California Vehicle Code 21101\(e\)](#). ISCOTT should be incorporated into the Administrative Code for transparency and consistency purposes. There may be a brief cross-reference between the Transportation Code and Administrative Code.

Transportation Code section 6.1 references the City's "Director of Administrative Services" as being responsible for reviewing recycling plans. This should be updated to reflect the current reality of the City Administrator's Office.

⁵⁵ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

⁵⁶ 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.

10. Mission Bay Transportation Improvement Fund Advisory Committee (San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency)

Criteria-based outcome: Eliminate			
Notes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing MTA staff to absorb functions. 			
Primary Department	MTA	Established	2015
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	5 meetings
Policy Area	Transportation	Members (as of May 2025)	5 total seats 1 vacancy (20%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$80k ⁵⁷		

Advises the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), Department of Public Works, and Police Department on the allocation of funds to support transportation services and infrastructure improvements related to events at the Chase Center ([Administrative Code § 10.100-364](#), Administrative Code [Chapter 5, Article XXIII](#)).

Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 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	
2 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	
3 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	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ⁵⁸	
	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	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ⁵⁹	

⁵⁷ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁵⁸ MTA Board of Directors, MTA Citizens Advisory Council

⁵⁹ Mission Bay, Mission Bay Transportation Improvement Fund

5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes ⁶⁰	Consider eliminating
--	-------------------	----------------------

Staff discussion:

The Mission Bay Transportation Improvement Fund Advisory Committee (MBTIFAC) was established to oversee the use of transportation funds associated with the development of the Chase Center and broader Mission Bay South area. It played a key role in guiding early planning and coordination around traffic mitigation, transit investments, and infrastructure improvements linked to the opening of the arena and the rapid growth of the Mission Bay neighborhood. The committee provided oversight during the most intense period of change, when transportation systems were being redesigned to handle Chase Center crowds and increased neighborhood traffic. Now that the Chase Center has been open for six years and most of the development is built out or nearing completion, the need for a standing advisory committee has significantly diminished.

When the Chase Center first opened in 2019, the committee's influence on operations was likely much more pronounced than it currently is, as the committee helped work through the new issues posed by service demand in the area. As initial issues were resolved and operations have settled, recent influence on policy or operations has been limited. Event-day operations are now routinely managed by SFMTA with refined traffic, transit, and pedestrian control strategies. Transportation investments funded through the Mission Bay Transportation Improvement Fund (e.g., better signal timing, T-Third light rail upgrades, bikeway adjustments) are complete or in place. Mission Bay South is largely built out, and the pace of new construction—and related transportation impacts—has slowed.

Furthermore, the Mission Bay Transportation Improvement Fund was zeroed out in the FY2025-26 & FY2026-27 budget, and the SFMTA has expended all funding allocations, leaving little for the committee to advise on.

⁶⁰ Transportation planning could be carried out by MTA staff, and infrastructure improvements by Public Works. Budget decisions are already made by MTA, the Police Department, and the Department of Public Works and their respective governance bodies

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	5 members	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Chase Center owner, UCSF Chancellor, Mayor, and District 6 Supervisor	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None; appointments are effective immediately	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will by appointing authority	At will	Yes	
Term length	None	3 years maximum	No	Align to template; 3-year term length
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ⁶¹	N/A	If re-authorized, adhere to 12-year (4 term) limit
Qualifications	Various employment or residence requirements	None required ⁶²	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; 3-year sunset

The criteria result in a recommendation that Task Force consider eliminating the Mission Bay Transportation Improvement Fund Advisory Committee. However, should the Task Force choose to keep the MBTIFAC, it should align the body to the advisory committee template by adding 3-year term lengths, four term limits, and a 3-year sunset date.

⁶¹ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

⁶² 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.

11. Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors (Municipal Transportation Agency)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate May consider absorbing MTA Citizens Advisory Council functions

Primary Department	MTA	Established	1999
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	24
Policy Area	Transportation	Members (as of May 2025)	7 total seats 0 vacancies
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$1.2M ⁶³		

Oversees the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA), which operates the City's public transit service and is responsible for taxi-related functions, traffic engineering, and parking enforcement. The Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors (MTAB) has exclusive authority over the acquisition, construction, and management of its property; the legislative adoption and enforcement of parking and traffic regulations; the adoption of fares, fines, and fees; and contracting, leasing, and purchasing for the agency ([Charter § 8A.102](#)).

Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 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	
2 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	
3 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	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ⁶⁴	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	

⁶³ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁶⁴ MTA Citizens Advisory Council

		4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	Yes ⁶⁵	Consider keeping and expanding scope
5	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:

The evaluation criteria do not provide any reason to eliminate MTAB.

MTAB provides policy oversight for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods in San Francisco. This includes the Municipal Railway (Muni) public transit, as well as bicycling, paratransit, parking, traffic, walking, and taxis. It oversees the Municipal Transportation Agency, which has a budget of over \$1.5 Billion and employs over 6,400 employees for FY26.

⁶⁵ MTAB already hears many of the same items that are brought to MTA CAC meetings, including project proposals, plans, strategies, budget documents, etc. Consider combining these two bodies by expanding the scope of MTAB.

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	Mayor	Yes	
Appointment confirmations	Public hearing and confirmation by the Board of Supervisors	None ⁶⁶	No	Align to template; allow appointments to become effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)
Member removal	For cause	At will	No	Align to template; at will removal
Term length	4 years	4 years	Yes	
Term limits	3 terms	3 terms	Yes	
Qualifications	At least four directors must be regular Muni riders. Must have knowledge or experience in government, finance, labor relations, or public transportation.	None required ⁶⁷	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter	TBD	TBD	Remain in Charter
Sunset date	None	None	Yes	
Hiring and Firing Authority	Sole authority to fire the Director of Transportation	Consultative responsibilities only	No	Align to template; consultative responsibilities only
Contract approval authority	Yes	Retain status quo	Yes	
Budget approval authority	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Employee discipline authority	No	No role	Yes	

⁶⁶ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

⁶⁷ 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.

While the Task Force has not decided whether governance commissions should be established in the charter or the code, when the SFMTA and MTAB were created in 1999, they were purposefully granted special charter authority to insulate transportation decisions from political interference. Thus, it seems reasonable to keep MTAB in the Charter.

Similarly, the Task Force may wish to partially deviate from the Governance Commission template for member removal or department head hiring/firing. In its August 6 meeting, the Task Force expressed interest in insulating some public bodies from political influence when a body has oversight of assets or funds requiring long-term outlook to manage appropriately. MTAB meets these criteria and could be insulated from political pressures if members cannot be removed at will.

12. Municipal Transportation Agency Citizens' Advisory Council (Municipal Transportation Agency)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or eliminate
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing either MTA Board of Directors or MTA staff to absorb functions. May consider keeping the body to facilitate public engagement while MTA faces tough budget decisions.

Primary Department	MTA	Established	Unknown
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	11
Policy Area	Transportation	Members (as of May 2025)	15 total seats 3 vacant (20% vacancy rate)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$178k ⁶⁸		

Provides recommendations to the Municipal Transportation Agency regarding any matter within the jurisdiction of the Agency ([Charter § 8A.111](#)).

Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 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	
2 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	
3 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	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ⁶⁹	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes ⁷⁰	Consider combining or eliminating
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	

⁶⁸ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁶⁹ MTA Board of Directors (MTAB)

⁷⁰ MTAB hears all major items that are brought before the MTA CAC. Consider whether the MTA CAC's advisory function could be eliminated or absorbed by the MTAB.

5	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:

The Municipal Transportation Agency Citizens' Advisory Council (MTA CAC) is an advisory body that reviews major items—such as project proposals, planning documents, and budget documents—before they are presented to the Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors (MTAB). After reviewing each item, the CAC may issue formal written recommendations to MTAB, and the Chair/Vice Chair of the CAC will attend the relevant MTAB meeting to speak to the CAC's recommendations. These two bodies overlap substantially in terms of the topics that they review, but they play different roles, with the CAC providing initial community input/feedback and the MTAB acting as the MTA's governing body.

This overlap creates an extra layer of review that slows down MTA actions and decision-making. Major items must be heard by two separate bodies with different meeting cadences, which result in months-long review and approval timelines.

However, this extra layer of public review may bolster trust in the MTA, which is especially critical as the Agency faces a looming fiscal crisis. The MTA faces an approximately \$320 million deficit beginning in Fiscal Year 2026–2027 (FY27) and plans to ask voters to approve one or more new tax measures in 2026 to help close this gap. Should these ballot measures fail, the MTA would likely need to close the gap through deep cuts to transit service and increases in parking fees, which would significantly affect the City's broader economic recovery.⁷¹ The possibility of asking the public to support new revenue measures, particularly in a time of economic uncertainty, should not be taken lightly. The MTA CAC provides an added layer of public engagement, transparency, and oversight at a time when the MTA needs to draw upon public trust and support to fund its ongoing operations.

⁷¹ San Francisco Controller's Office. (2025). Muni Funding Working Group: Solving for Muni's Funding Needs. https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/Muni_Funding_Working_Group_Final_Report_9n2cEn7.pdf

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	15	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	One person appointed by each member of the Board of Supervisors and four people appointed by the Mayor	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	4 years	3 years maximum	No	Align to template; reduce to 3 years
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ⁷²	N/A	If re-authorized, adhere to 12-year (4 term) limit
Qualifications	At least ten regular Muni riders, 2 paratransit riders, 3 members aged 60+	None required ⁷³	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter	Administrative Code	No	Align to template; move to Administrative Code
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; 3-year sunset

⁷² Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

⁷³ 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.

13. [Port Commission](#) (Port)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legally required to exist May absorb functions of the Waterfront Design Advisory Committee

Primary Department	PRT	Established	1968
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	13 meetings
Policy Area	Port	Members (as of May 2025)	5 total seats 0 vacancies
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$470k ⁷⁴		

Oversees the Port, which is an enterprise department of the City that has the power and duty to use, conduct, operate, maintain, manage, regulate, and control the port area of San Francisco. The Port consists of property along the Bay waterfront transferred by the State and held by the City in trust for the people of the State, subject to the Burton Act (Ch. 1333, Stats. 1968, as amended), the Transfer Agreement between the State and the City, and the Charter, per [Charter § B3.581](#). ([Charter § 4.114](#))

Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 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?	N/A	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 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	
3 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	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ⁷⁵	
	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?	Yes ⁷⁶	Consider keeping and expanding scope

⁷⁴ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁷⁵ Waterfront Design Advisory Committee

⁷⁶ The Port Commission is responsible for issuing most permits for development projects on Port property and could reasonably take on the responsibilities of the Waterfront Design Advisory Committee, which was recommended for elimination at the August 20, 2025, Commission Streamlining Task Force meeting.

5	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:

The Port Commission is a governance body responsible for the seven and one-half miles of waterfront adjacent to the San Francisco Bay, which the Port develops, markets, leases, administers, manages, and maintains. It is legally required to exist under Section 12 of the Burton Act and its functions cannot be transferred to another body.

Possible Application of Governance Commission Template:

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	5 members	5-7	Yes	
Appointing authority	Mayor	Mayor	Yes	
Appointment confirmations	Subject to confirmation by a majority of the Board of Supervisors	None ⁷⁷	No	No change ⁷⁸
Member removal	For cause, or by recall election	At will	No	Align to template; Allow members to be removed at will by the Mayor; remove Charter provision allowing members to be recalled by the voters
Term length	4 years	4 years	Yes	
Term limits	None	3 terms	No	Align to template; 3 terms
Qualifications	No special qualifications	None required ⁷⁹	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter	TBD	TBD	Remain in Charter ⁷⁸
Sunset date	None	None	Yes	
Hiring and Firing Authority	Under Charter Section B3.581(h), the Commission nominates and the Mayor appoints the Port's Executive Director, who serves at the pleasure of the Commission.	Consultative responsibilities only	No	Align to template; consultative responsibilities only
Contract approval authority	Yes	Retain status quo	Yes	
Budget approval authority	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Employee discipline authority	No	No role	Yes	

⁷⁷ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

⁷⁸ Cannot be changed, subject to Section 12 of the Burton Act

⁷⁹ 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.

Several aspects of the Port Commission cannot be modified, according to the terms of the Burton Act. The Act provides at Section 12 that the Port must be under the control of a Harbor Commission established by Charter, with five members, each serving a term of four years. The Act also required that the members be appointed by the Mayor, subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

The Task Force may wish to partially deviate from the Governance Commission template for member removal or department head hiring/firing. In its August 6 meeting, the Task Force expressed interest in insulating some public bodies from political influence when a body has oversight of assets or funds requiring long-term outlook to manage appropriately. The Port Commission meets these criteria and could be insulated from political pressures if members cannot be removed at will. However, the Task Force should eliminate the ability for members of the Port Commission to be removed via recall election, which would further insulate them from political pressure.

14. Public Utilities Citizens' Advisory Committee (Public Utilities Commission)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or eliminate			
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing either the Public Utilities Commission or PUC staff to absorb functions. PUC may also maintain body as a passive meeting body 			
Primary Department	SFPUC	Established	2004
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	4
Policy Area	Public Utilities	Members (as of May 2025)	17 total seats 2 seats vacancies (12%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$58k ⁸⁰		

Provides recommendations to the General Manager of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, the Public Utilities Commission, and the Board of Supervisors on the success of the Department in achieving the goals and objectives set related to water and clean water. The Public Utilities Citizens' Advisory Committee reviews and provides recommendations on the Public Utilities Commission's long-term strategic, financial, and capital improvement plans ([Administrative Code §5.140](#)).

Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 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	
2 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	
3 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	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ⁸¹	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes ⁸²	Consider combining or eliminating
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	

⁸⁰ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁸¹ Public Utilities Commission

⁸² The Public Utilities Citizens' Advisory Committee advises the Public Utilities Commission on strategic, financial, and capital plans and issues. Consider whether this advisory function is necessary, given its duplication with the Public Utilities Commission.

5	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:

The Public Utilities Citizens' Advisory Committee's scope of recommendations is limited to the long-term strategic, financial and capital improvement plans of the SFPUC. Whereas the Public Utilities Citizens' Advisory Committee may only provide recommendations, the SFPUC Commission oversees the same topics and more and holds approval authority for various departmental functions, such as budget and contracts. The public may continue to engage with the SFPUC department via the SFPUC Commission on such topics. Should the Public Utilities Citizens' Advisory Committee seek to meet, their functions could be appropriately handled by a passive meeting body, which is not established in law or subject to the same public meeting requirements as an official policy body.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	17	15 maximum	No	Align to template; reduce number of members to at most 15
Appointing authority	Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Present of the Board of Supervisors	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	4 years	3 years maximum	No	Align to template; reduce term length to 3 years.
Term limits	2 terms	Case-by-case ⁸³	Yes	
Qualifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>BOS</u>: 1 rep. from each district: community, business, environmental, or environmental justice organization, or has experience in a field related to public utilities, environmental justice or environmental science. • <u>Mayor</u>: regional water customer; large water user; resident with knowledge of engineering or financial management; regional or statewide environmental organization rep. • <u>BOS President</u>: small business; environmental justice organization 	None required ⁸⁴	Yes	

⁸³ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

⁸⁴ 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.

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; 3 year sunset

The Task Force should consider eliminating the PUC Citizens' Advisory Committee. However, should the Task Force choose to keep the Public Utilities Citizens' Advisory Committee, it should align the body to the advisory committee template by reducing membership by two seats, incorporating three term limits, and adding a three-year sunset date.

15. Public Utilities Commission (Public Utilities Commission)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep			
Notes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate May consider absorbing the functions of the Public Utilities Citizens' Advisory Committee 			
Primary Department	SFPUC	Established	1932
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	19
Policy Area	Public Utilities	Members (as of May 2025)	5 total seats 0 vacant seats (0%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$2.3M ⁸⁵		

Oversees the department of the same name. Has exclusive charge of the construction, management, supervision, maintenance, extension, expansion, operation, use and control of all water, clean water, and energy supplies and utilities of the City, as well as the real, personal, and financial assets under the Commission's jurisdiction ([Charter § 4.112](#)).

Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 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	
2 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	
3 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	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ⁸⁶	
	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?	Yes ⁸⁷	Consider keeping and expanding scope
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	No	

⁸⁵ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁸⁶ Public Utilities Citizens' Advisory Committee

⁸⁷ Hears many of the same items as the Public Utilities Citizens' Advisory Committee. Consider whether this advisory function is necessary or could be absorbed by the Public Utilities Commission.

5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	N/A
--	-----

Staff Discussion:

The Public Utilities Commission (body) ensures that the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) department meets its strategic goals and priorities, provides the public with sufficient and thoughtful data, and serves as a service delivery advocate for the public. The department has a budget of \$2.1 billion and over 1,700 employees (FTEs) for FY26.

No other body can perform the work of the Public Utilities Commission. Since its inception, the body has evolved to meet the needs of the City and the SFPUC, maintaining relevance and necessity. The body provides input on the SFPUC's organizational policies, strategic plans, and budgets. The body approves various contracts, emergency declaration remediation work, and emergency declaration commodities for the SFPUC. If the Task Force eliminates the Public Utilities Citizen's Advisory Committee, it may want to recommend incorporating body's subcommittees for water and wastewater systems into the PUC governance commission to continue the public oversight and discussion of the management of those systems.

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	BOS majority confirmation	None ⁸⁸	No	Align to template; appointments are effective immediately unless rejected 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days
Member removal	For cause	At will	No	Align to template; change member removal rules pursuant to Charter sec. 15.105 to at will
Term length	4 years	4 years	Yes	
Term limits	None	3 terms	No	Align to template; enforce 3 term limits
Qualifications	By seat. Seat 1: experience in environmental policy and environmental justice issues; Seat 2: experience in ratepayer or consumer advocacy; Seat 3: experience in project finance; Seat 4: expertise in water systems, power systems, or public utility management; and Seat 5: member at-large	None required ⁸⁹	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter	TBD	TBD	Remain in Charter
Sunset date	None	None	Yes	

⁸⁸ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

⁸⁹ 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	Hiring authority – Nominate General Manager or enter into an individual contract with a General Manager ⁹⁰ ; Firing authority – Sole authority	Consultative responsibilities only	No	Align to template; change authority to consultative responsibilities only
Contract approval authority	Yes	Retain status quo	Yes	
Budget approval authority	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Employee discipline authority	N/A	No role	Yes	

The Task Force may wish to partially deviate from the Governance Commission template for member removal or department head hiring/firing. In its August 6 meeting, the Task Force expressed interest in insulating some public bodies from political influence when a body has oversight of assets or funds requiring long-term outlook to manage appropriately. The Public Utilities Commission meets these criteria and could be insulated from political pressures if members cannot be removed at will. Similarly, while the Task Force has not decided whether governance commissions should be established in the charter or the code, it seems reasonable to keep the PUC Commission in the Charter for protection and continuity purposes, given the department's large infrastructure portfolio and role as a utility provider.

⁹⁰ Standard Charter § 4.102 rules apply and Charter § 8B.126 grants the Commission authority to enter into an individual contract with the General Manager

16. Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board (Public Utilities Commission)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep			
Notes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate 			
Primary Department	SFPUC	Established	2002
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	5
Policy Area	Public Utilities	Members (as of May 2025)	7 total seats 1 vacant seat (14%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$10k ⁹¹		

Reviews and advises the SFPUC on water, power, and sewer rates matters ([Charter § 8B.125](#)).

Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 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	
2 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	
3 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	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ⁹²	
	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	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ⁹³	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	Consider keeping

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria do not provide any reason to eliminate Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board. The body assists the SFPUC with maintaining transparency and accountability on utility rates set, impacting all San Franciscans. It brings together residential customers, retail customers of various sizes, and City staff from the City Administrator's Office and Controller's Office to ensure various opinions and concerns are considered. No other body can perform this work. The Rate Fairness

⁹¹ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁹² MTA Board of Directors (MTAB)

⁹³ Water, power, and sewer rates

Board helps increase public engagement and understanding of rate approvals by the SFPUC and the Board of Supervisors.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	7	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	City Administrator, Controller, Mayor, BOS	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	None	3 years maximum	No	Align to template; 3-year term length for public members
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ⁹⁴	N/A	Align to template; 4 term maximum for public members
Qualifications	City Administrator designee; Controller designee; Office of Public Finance designee; BOS: 1 residential retail customer, 1 small business retail customer; MYR: 1 residential retail customer, 1 large business retail customer	None required ⁹⁵	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter	Administrative Code	No	Align to template; move establishing authority to Administrative Code
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; add a sunset date of 3 years

⁹⁴ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

⁹⁵ 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.

17. Southeast Community Facility Commission (Public Utilities Commission)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate May consider aligning to Advisory Committee template

Primary Department	SFPUC	Established	1987
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	6
Policy Area	Community development	Members (as of May 2025)	7 total seats 1 vacant seat (14%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$219k ⁹⁶		

Reviews and provides guidance on strategic, financial and capital improvement plans, as well as programming and operations for the Southeast Community Facility, which was constructed by the City to mitigate the Southeast Treatment Plant expansion projects' adverse environmental and social impacts to the Bayview–Hunters Point community in the 1970s and 1980s ([Administrative Code § 54.2](#)).

Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 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	
2 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	
3 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	
4 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	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ⁹⁷	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	Consider keeping

⁹⁶ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁹⁷ Bayview–Hunters Point

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria do not provide any reason to eliminate the Southeast Community Facility Commission (SECFC). The Task Force may consider modifying the body by converting it to an advisory committee.

The Commission currently operates as an advisory committee with the singular governance body authority over the facility director. SECFC advises the SFPUC on numerous issues but does not set policy, approve contracts, or approve the budget. The SECFC advises SFPUC regarding the operations of the facility, including educational and job skills centers, childcare, a senior activities center, budget matters, and proposed leases with qualified tenants. Through providing this guidance to the SFPUC, the SECFC fosters the full and gainful employment of residents of chronically economically depressed areas of the City; the progressive development of marketable job skills for untrained and under-trained City residents; the creation and expansion of opportunities for residents to participate in day and evening education programs; the creation and expansion of opportunities for providing day care services at a low and reasonable cost to parents; the expansion of opportunities for special community services for senior citizens; and the overall improvement of the general economic prosperity, health, safety, and welfare of residents of chronically economically depressed areas of the City.

In 1979, the City's southeast communities won a community center located at 1800 Oakdale Avenue as part of an agreement to offset the effects of the Southeast Wastewater Treatment Plant on surrounding communities. The SFPUC engaged with the community in 2015 to build a new state-of-the-art center rather than repair the original facility. In 2020, the SFPUC along with nonprofits performed outreach to the community to learn what programs and amenities to include at the reenvisioned facility and have been implementing these requests.

The communities surrounding the Southeast Treatment Plant still experience the cumulative impacts of historic disinvestment, environmental burdens, and economic disparities. The facility at 1550 Evans Avenue was developed as a form of mitigation for those longstanding inequities. Retaining the SECFC but aligning it to the Advisory Committee template would ensure that the voices of historically impacted neighborhoods continue to shape public programming and investments, while streamlining governance consistent with current practice.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	7	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Mayor	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will; Any member who misses 3 regularly scheduled commission meetings in any 12-month period without the express approval of the Commission given at a regularly scheduled meeting will be deemed to have resigned from the Commission	At will	Yes	
Term length	4 years	3 years maximum	No	Align to template; 3-year terms
Term limits	None; President of the commission may serve two 2-year terms maximum	Case-by-case ⁹⁸	N/A	If re-authorized, adhere to 12-year (4 term) limit
Qualifications	Reside or work in the Bayview-Hunters Point community	None required ⁹⁹	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; 3-year sunset
Hiring and Firing Authority	Director of the facility	None	No	Align to template; no hiring and firing authority

The Southeast Community Facility Commission reviews and provides guidance on budgets affecting the greenhouse, job training, child care, senior activities, and other programs at the facility. It also reviews and advises on proposed leases and agreements with private, community,

⁹⁸ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

⁹⁹ 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.

and public organizations. In addition, the Commission may allocate surplus funds (proceeds from leasing the facility that exceed operating costs) for scholarships, child care, job training, and community agency support. It must also maintain a reserve fund equal to 10% of each year's surplus for facility maintenance. If the Task Force converts the SECFC to an advisory body, the budget and lease reviews can continue, but the authority to allocate surplus funds would likely need to be modified. It is currently unknown whether proceeds from leasing the facility exceed the cost to operate and administer the facility, or whether there are any surplus funds available to be allocated.

18. Joint Zoo Committee (Recreation and Park Department)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep			
Notes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate Required per the binding Management Agreement 			
Primary Department	RPD	Established	1982
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	11
Policy Area	Parks and Environment	Members (as of May 2025)	8 total seats ¹⁰⁰ 0 vacancies
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$2,000 ¹⁰¹		

The San Francisco Zoo operates on City-owned property and is managed by the San Francisco Zoological Society. The relationship between the City and the Zoological Society is governed by the Joint Zoo Management Agreement, which specifies that a Joint Zoo Committee be maintained throughout the term of the agreement. The Committee hears public testimony regarding major policies affecting the Zoo, including the setting of fees, new animal exhibits, animal acquisition and disposition, land use, and capital and operating budgets.

Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 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	
2 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	
3 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	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ¹⁰²	
	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	

¹⁰⁰ Six voting seats and two non-voting advisory seats. The six voting seats are appointed by the Recreation and Park Commission and the San Francisco Zoological Society. The advisory seats are appointed by the Animal Welfare Commission and serve in a mostly volunteer advisory role.

¹⁰¹ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁰² Recreation and Park Commission; Park, Recreation, and Open Space Advisory Committee

5	Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ¹⁰³	
		5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	Consider keeping

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria do not provide any reason to eliminate the Joint Zoo Committee, and it is required per the binding Management Agreement.

The Joint Zoo Committee provides the only public forum for residents to share input on San Francisco Zoo policy and budget decisions.

Further, this body is established in the Management Agreement between the City and County of San Francisco and the San Francisco Zoological Society, which the Commission Streamlining Task Force does not have the authority to amend. However, the Task Force may recommend that the City negotiate several changes to the Management Agreement to clarify the scope of this body and improve its functioning.

Section 10 of the Management Agreement specifies that any capital expenditure greater than \$50,000 requires approval by the Joint Zoo Committee. While this threshold may have been appropriate in 1982, it's far too low today and requires Committee approval for nearly every capital improvement. The City and Zoological Society should raise this threshold and/or create flexibility for the threshold to change over time.

Under Mayor Gavin Newsom, two seats were added to the Joint Zoo Committee for animal welfare advisors. These seats were established in a memo and, to the best of the Recreation and Park Department's knowledge, are neither codified in the Management Agreement nor in local ordinance. These members serve in an advisory-only capacity and lack clearly defined roles and responsibilities in relation to the voting members. Their term lengths are also undefined. Future legislation or updates to the Management Agreement should codify these members' roles, either establishing them as full voting members of the Committee or clarifying their role as non-voting advisors.

Currently, Joint Zoo Committee meetings are clerked by a Zoo employee. The City should clarify whether a public meeting may be facilitated by a nonprofit entity and, if so, provide training and support to ensure that the Zoo and the Joint Zoo Committee comply with relevant public meeting and public records requirements.

The Management Agreement should also clarify whether the Joint Zoo Committee has a role in enforcing the Management Agreement, should the City or the Zoological Society be found to be out of compliance.

¹⁰³ San Francisco Zoo

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	8	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Recreation and Park Commission, Zoological Society's Board of Directors	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	Not specified	3 years maximum	No	No changes
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹⁰⁴	N/A	
Qualifications	3 members from each appointing body	None required ¹⁰⁵	Yes	
Establishing authority	Management Agreement between the City and County of San Francisco and the San Francisco Zoological Society	Administrative Code	No	Align to template; establish body in Administrative Code
Sunset date	Upon termination of the Management Agreement	3 years	No	No changes
Budget approval authority	Yes; may disapprove the Zoo budget if it determines the management fee or other gross revenues are projected to be expended for purposes inconsistent with the Management Agreement. Also approves Zoo admission fee.	None	No	No changes

The Joint Zoo Committee should be incorporated into the Administrative Code for visibility purposes, though the language may need to be limited due to the involvement of the Zoo Board of Directors. Substantive changes to term lengths, sunset dates, or budget authority should not be made in the Administrative Code. The Committee is and should continue to be governed by the Management Agreement between the City and County of San Francisco and the San Francisco Zoological Society.

¹⁰⁴ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹⁰⁵ 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.

19. Park, Recreation, And Open Space Advisory Committee (Recreation and Park Department)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or eliminate
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing either the Recreation and Park Commission or City staff to absorb functions.

Primary Department	RPD	Established	1988
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	9
Policy Area	Parks and Environment	Members (as of May 2025)	13 total seats 1 vacancy (8% vacancy rate)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$25k ¹⁰⁶		

Acts as a liaison between the Recreation and Park Commission and the residents, neighborhood groups, and organizations dedicated to park and recreational issues in their districts ([Charter § 16.107](#); [Park Code § 13.01](#)).

Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 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	
2 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	
3 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	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ¹⁰⁷	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes ¹⁰⁸	Consider combining or eliminating
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	

¹⁰⁶ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁰⁷ Recreation and Park Commission, Joint Zoo Committee

¹⁰⁸ The Recreation and Park Commission hears all major items that are brought before the PROSAC. Consider whether PROSAC's advisory/community liaison function could be eliminated or absorbed by the Recreation and Park Commission.

5	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:

This body was originally created under 1988's Proposition E "Open Space Program." The 23-member Park and Open Space Citizens Advisory Committee held public hearings September – February of each year for feedback on the use of Open Space funds.

In 2000, the body was renamed as the Park, Recreation and Open Space Advisory Committee (PROSAC), with an expanded scope and monthly meeting cadence. Today, PROSAC provides written comments to the department on its proposed plans (strategic, capital, operational), provides input on departmental acquisitions, conducts two public hearings related to the budget, liaises between the Recreation and Park Commission and residents, and reports quarterly to the Recreation and Park Commission on issues heard at PROSAC. These two bodies overlap substantially in terms of the topics that they review, but they play different roles with PROSAC providing initial community input/feedback and the Recreation and Park Commission acting as the department's governing body.

Advisory Committees should bring outside expertise that would otherwise be missing from government or create pathways for public involvement on an issue. Rec and Park has numerous pathways for the public to get involved in its decision-making. The department conducts extensive engagement around all capital projects and holds 2-3 public budget meetings for San Francisco residents to weigh in on department priorities before the budget goes to the Recreation and Park Commission. Rec and Park is also a field organization with over 1,000 employees working in parks, playgrounds, and open spaces throughout San Francisco. These employees interact with residents each and every day, listening to feedback and implementing changes/improvements on the spot. Most San Franciscans interact with the department through their local gardener, rec center staff, or maintenance worker. By contrast, there are typically few, or no public comments at PROSAC meetings.

PROSAC is established in both the Charter and the Park Code. Should the Task Force recommend eliminating PROSAC, this could only be accomplished through a voter-approved Charter amendment.

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, Board of Supervisors, and President of the Board of Supervisors	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	<u>Mayoral appointee:</u> None	No confirmations	No	Align to template; remove BOS confirmation process
	<u>Board appointees:</u> Appointments by individual members of the Board of Supervisors, including the Board President, are subject to approval by the full Board.			
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	2 years	3 years maximum	Yes	
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹⁰⁹	N/A	If re-authorized, adhere to 12 year (4 term) limit
Qualifications	None	None required ¹¹⁰	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter, Park Code	Administrative Code	No	Align to template; add to Administrative Code
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; add 3-year sunset date

The Task Force should consider eliminating PROSAC. However, should the Task Force choose to keep PROSAC, it should align the body to the advisory committee template by removing appointment confirmations, incorporating six term limits, requiring a written statement specifying why an appointee is qualified, and adding a 3-year sunset date. If the Task Force chooses to keep PROSAC, it should be removed from the Charter and incorporated into the Administrative Code for transparency and consistency purposes. There may be a cross-reference between the Park Code and Administrative Code. The Task Force should also remove a requirement that PROSAC must meet at City Hall (Park Code Sec. 13.01(d)(5)) and instead offer flexibility in meeting locations.

¹⁰⁹ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹¹⁰ 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.

20. Recreation and Park Commission (Recreation and Park Commission)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate Consider absorbing PROSAC functions

Primary Department	RPD	Established	1950 ¹¹¹
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	13
Policy Area	Parks and Environment	Members (as of May 2025)	7 total seats 0 vacancies
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$ 896,614 ¹¹²		

Sets policies and directives for the Recreation and Park Department, which manages and directs all parks, playgrounds, recreation centers and all other recreation facilities, avenues, and grounds under the Commission's control or placed under its jurisdiction. The Commission has the power to lease or rent any stadium or recreation field under its jurisdiction for athletic contests, exhibitions, and other special events, and permit the lessee to charge an admission fee. ([Charter § 4.113.](#))

Evaluation Criteria:

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 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	
2 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	
3 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	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ¹¹³	
	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?	Yes ¹¹⁴	Consider keeping and expanding scope

¹¹¹ The Recreation and Park Commission has existed in various forms since 1870. Prior to 1950, there were two Commissions, the Park Commission and the Playground Commission.

¹¹² Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹¹³ Park, Recreation, and Open Space Advisory Committee; Joint Zoo Committee

¹¹⁴ The Recreation and Park Commission hears all major items that are brought before PROSAC. Consider whether PROSAC's advisory function could be eliminated or absorbed by the Recreation and Park Commission

5	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:

The evaluation criteria do not provide any reason to eliminate the Recreation and Park Commission.

The Recreation and Park Commission is a mechanism of oversight and accountability for San Francisco's Recreation and Park Department, which has a budget of over \$250 million and employs over 1,100 employees (FTEs) for FY26. The Recreation and Park Commission meets regularly and oversees a large department maintaining over 3,400+ acres of recreational and open space throughout San Francisco.¹¹⁵ Combining it with another of the City's public bodies is not practical because there is no other body with overlapping functions.

¹¹⁵ The Board of Supervisors also has authority over Recreation and Park property

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	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 ¹¹⁶	Yes	
Member removal	For cause	At will	No	Align to template; allow the Mayor to remove members at will
Term length	4 years	4 years	Yes	
Term limits	None	3 terms	No	Align to template; institute 3 term limits
Qualifications	None	None required ¹¹⁷	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter	TBD	TBD	No changes; remain in Charter
Sunset date	None	None	Yes	
Hiring and Firing Authority	May nominate candidates for General Manager (GM) of the Recreation and Park Department to the Mayor; may remove the GM of its own initiative	Consultative responsibilities only	No	Align to template; consultative responsibilities only
Contract approval authority	Yes ¹¹⁸	Retain status quo	Yes	
Budget approval authority	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Employee discipline authority	No role	No role	Yes	

¹¹⁶ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

¹¹⁷ 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.

¹¹⁸ Approved twenty contract and grant awards or amendments between August 2024 and July 2025

While the Task Force has not decided whether governance commissions should be established in the charter or the code, Parks and recreation facilities require long-term planning and investment, and the Recreation and Park Commission's placement in the City Charter helps ensure continuity and stability in their governance. As San Francisco's parks are often regarded as a public trust, Charter status reinforces this principle by requiring that any significant changes to how parks are managed be approved by the voters, rather than altered through ordinary legislation.