



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 19, 2025

SUBJECT: Criteria-Based Outcomes and Associated Analysis for Housing and Economic Development 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 31 housing and economic development bodies at its October 1st 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 16 bodies and combine or eliminate 15 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."

3 | Summary of Recommended Actions for Housing and Economic Development Bodies

Category	Evaluation Criteria ²	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 eliminating or combining
	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?	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?	Go to 5B
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Consider eliminating
If the answer is “no” to all criteria, consider keeping the body.		

At its October 1, 2025 meeting, the Task Force may vote to eliminate any or all of these bodies from the charter or code. If the Task Force recommends eliminating a body at the October 1st meeting, the City Attorney will prepare draft legislation removing it from the charter or code. The Task Force will then review the draft legislation at a future meeting and vote on whether to forward it to the Board of Supervisors. The Task Force may amend its decisions at any time before the final legislation is approved.

Comments pertaining to a specific body or bodies will be shared with Task Force members if emailed to commissionstreamlining@sfgov.org 24 hours prior to the Task Force meeting.

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

² Full evaluation criteria document is available @ https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/Evaluation_Criteria_-_amended_9.12.25.pdf

Version History

Version	Date	Description
1	09/19/2025	Original
2	09/22/2025	Updated two department assignments in the Summary of Recommended Actions table. Clarified language in the staff discussion for the SoMa Community Stabilization Fund Community Advisory Committee.
3	09/26/2025	Corrected count of bodies by recommendation on page 2. Added information about the Arts Commission's duties and future options for engagement around street artist licensing. Added split appointment details for Small Business Commission template alignment table. Aligned lifespan of the Citizens Committee on Community Development staff discussion to the summary table. Clarified membership figures and department size for the Rent Board Commission. Added details about future revenue projections for the SoMa Community Stabilization Fund Community Advisory Committee. Adjusted proposed Historic Preservation term limit to match template. Adjusted proposed Historic Preservation Commission term limit to match limit. Added detail about the Art Commission's activities and responsibilities. Clarified that eliminating the Streets Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Advisory Committee would not impact the Art Vendor license program.
4	10/01/2025	Clarified appointment practice and possible minimum number of seats for the Workforce Investment Board

Summary of Recommended Actions for Housing and Economic Development Bodies

Department		Name of Body	Criteria-Based Outcome	Notes	Recommended Type
Arts and Culture					
ART	Arts Commission	Arts Commission	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining with other arts-related commissions, allowing the newly formed Arts Agency to absorb functions, or eliminating May consider deferring decision pending guidance on the new agency structure 	N/A
AAM	Asian Art Commission	Asian Art Commission	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legally required to exist 	Governance
ECN	Office of Economic and Workforce Development	Film Commission	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating or combining with the newly formed Arts Agency May consider deferring decision pending guidance on the new agency structure 	N/A
FAM	Fine Arts Museums	Fine Arts Museums Board of Trustees	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legally required to exist 	Governance
LIB	Library	Library Commission	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate 	No recommendation
ART	Arts Commission	Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Advisory Committee	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating or combining with new formed Arts Agency 	N/A
WAR	War Memorial	War Memorial Board of Trustees	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legally required to exist 	Governance
Building and Permitting					
DBI	Department of Building Inspection	Abatement Appeals Board	Combine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining with the Board of Appeals 	N/A
DBI	Department of Building Inspection	Access Appeals Commission	Combine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining with the Board of Appeals 	N/A
BOA	Board of Appeals	Board of Appeals	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest keeping and absorbing other commissions 	Appeals board

6 | Summary of Recommended Actions for Housing and Economic Development Bodies

DBI	Department of Building Inspection	Board of Examiners	Combine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining with the Board of Appeals 	N/A
DBI	Department of Building Inspection	Building Inspection Commission	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate 	No recommendation
DBI	Department of Building Inspection	Code Advisory Committee	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May consider eliminating or combining with the Structural Advisory Committee 	N/A
DBI	Department of Building Inspection	Structural Advisory Committee	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating or combining with other public bodies that focus on building permits 	N/A
Economic Development					
AIR	Airport	Airport Commission	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate 	Governance
ECN	Office of Economic and Workforce Development	Board of Directors of the San Francisco Downtown Revitalization and Economic Recovery Financing District	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate Legally necessary for the City to pursue downtown revitalization activities 	Other
ADM	City Administrator's Office	Cannabis Oversight Committee	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining or eliminating, but the body is already sunseting in 2027 May consider keeping but modifying as this body performs work no other body could perform 	Advisory
ADM	City Administrator's Office	Entertainment Commission	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate Consider assigning appellate functions to Board of Appeals 	No recommendation
ECN	Office of Economic and Workforce Development	Small Business Commission	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate May consider assigning sole responsibility for reviews of Legacy Business Registry applicants 	No recommendation
Housing and Community Development					
MYR	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	Citizens Committee on Community Development	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fulfills a legal requirement, but the City could secure an alternative means of compliance 	N/A

7 | Summary of Recommended Actions for Housing and Economic Development Bodies

CON	Controller's Office	Inclusionary Housing Technical Advisory Committee	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate 	Advisory
RNT	Rent Board	Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate Consider assigning appellate functions to Board of Appeals 	No Recommendation
MYR	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development	SoMa Community Stabilization Fund Community Advisory Committee	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining with the South of Market Community Planning Advisory Committee (CPAC) or eliminating 	N/A
Planning and Land Use					
CPC	City Planning	Bayview Hunters Point Citizens Advisory Committee	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating due to high vacancies and overlap with other public bodies 	N/A
CPC	City Planning	Historic Preservation Commission	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining with the Planning Commission and/or transferring the function to preservation planners within the Planning Department 	N/A
CPC	City Planning	Interagency Planning and Implementation Committee	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate, but it should be. Can be a staff working group passive meeting body and deleted from code to align with current practices 	N/A
CPC	City Planning	Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining with other public bodies focused on planning/land use or eliminating 	N/A
CPC	City Planning	Planning Commission	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest keeping and potentially absorbing other commissions 	Governance
CPC	City Planning	South of Market Community Planning Advisory Committee	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining with the SoMa Community Stabilization Fund Community Advisory Committee (CAC) or eliminating 	N/A

8 | Summary of Recommended Actions for Housing and Economic Development Bodies

Workforce Development					
ECN	Office of Economic and Workforce Development	Committee on City Workforce Alignment	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate Could be a staff working group passive meeting body and deleted from code 	Advisory
ECN	Office of Economic and Workforce Development	Workforce Investment Board	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legally required to exist 	Advisory

Recommended Actions for Housing and Economic Development Bodies

Policy Area: Arts and Culture

1. [Arts Commission](#) (Arts Commission)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or eliminate	
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining with other arts-related commissions, allowing the newly formed Arts Agency to absorb functions, or eliminating May consider deferring decision pending guidance on the new agency structure 	

Primary Department	ART	Established	1932
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	12
Policy Area	Arts and Culture	Members (as of May 2025)	15 seats 2 vacancies (13%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$527,003 ³		

Encourages artistic awareness, participation, and expression; promotes education in the arts; and approves the design of all public structures and any private structures that extend on City property. The Commission also administers the Art Enrichment Ordinance ([Admin. Code § 3.19](#)); approves the design and location of all City works of art; maintains the City's public art collection; promotes neighborhood arts programs and City-owned cultural centers; administers Hotel Tax Allocations for the Cultural Equity Endowment, Cultural Centers, and Arts Impact Endowment; and administers the Street Artists Program ([Charter § 5.103](#)).

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	

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

4	Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ⁴	
		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?	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	

Staff Discussion:

The Arts Commission has an expansive scope and is responsible for overseeing and administering various policies and funds for public art. The body also oversees a City agency, also called the Arts Commission, that has a budget of \$24 million and at least 26 employees (FTEs).

The Charter requires that the Arts Commission approve the designs for all public structures, approve the design and location of all works of art, and administer all Board of Supervisors appropriations for the advancement of the visual, performing or literary arts. To conduct this work, the Arts Commission has a Civic Design Review Subcommittee, comprised of Commissioners that are architects and landscape architects, that reviews and approves the design for all buildings on City land. Other subcommittees review and approve new public art, and recent examples include the addition of murals to the City's slow streets and the acquisition of new art for SFO's exhibits. The Arts Commission also administers several funds, including the Public Artwork Trust Fund, which exclusively funds public art projects, and manages the City's civic art collection, similar to how a museum oversees its collection. The Arts Commission also approves all the Department's grants and contracts, including allocations for Grants for the Arts, Cultural Equity Endowment, Cultural Centers, Cultural Districts, and the Arts Impact Endowment (AIE). In FY25, this amounted to \$15 million awarded to 159 artists or arts nonprofits and 7 cultural centers.

The criteria give multiple potential outcomes: the Arts Commission could subsume the Film Commission and/or the Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Advisory Committee, the Arts Commission could be kept as-is, or the Arts Commission could be eliminated entirely while a new Arts Agency public body assumes its responsibilities. Any recommendation from the Task Force should account for the Art Commission's fiduciary responsibilities and create appropriate independent oversight of both the Public Art Trust and the City's civic art collection. Recommendations should also account for the Commission's civic design review responsibilities, which require expertise that Arts Commission staff do not have. One potential option is to explore having the Planning Department's City Design Team assume these responsibilities.

In the Fiscal Year 2025-2026 budget cycle, the Mayor combined the Arts Commission, the Film Commission (a division in the Office of Economic and Workforce Development), and Grants for the Arts (a division in the City Administrator's Office) into one Arts Agency. The consolidation will

⁴ Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Advisory Committee, Film Commission, Fine Arts Museums Board of Trustees, Asian Art Commission, War Memorial Board of Trustees.

significantly change how the City oversees arts functions, however, the proposal did not specify how the merger between the three departments/offices and two commissions should happen. As a result, the Task Force should consider the future of the Arts Commissions as part of a larger conversation about implementing the new Arts Agency.

Given these uncertainties, the Task Force could consider creating flexibility to facilitate restructuring. It may choose to defer decision-making, issue no recommendation, or direct staff and the City Attorney's Office to request an update from the Mayor's Office and Arts Commission leadership on restructuring and potentially revisit any recommendation for the Arts Commission further along in its process.

Possible Application of Governance Commission or Advisory Committee Templates:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?
Number of Members	15	15 maximum	5-7	Yes – Advisory
Appointing authority	Mayor	N/A	Mayor	Yes – both
Appointment confirmations	None, BOS may reject with 2/3 majority within 30 days.	None	None ⁵	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 ⁶	3 terms	No
Qualifications	11 members have specific arts qualifications, 4 do not. ⁷	None required ⁸	None required	Yes
Establishing authority	Charter	Administrative Code	TBD	No
Sunset date	None	3 years	None	Yes – Governance
Hiring and firing authority	Sole authority to appoint and remove	N/A	Consultative responsibilities only	No
Contract approval authority	Yes	N/A	Retain status quo	Yes – Governance
Budget approval authority	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes – Governance
Employee discipline authority	No role	N/A	No role	Yes - both

Because the future of the Arts Commission is uncertain given the creation of the new Arts Agency, it may not make sense for the Task Force to align the body to any template at this time. Alternatively, the Task Force may consider aligning the Arts Commission to either the governance commission or advisory committee template. Regardless of which template the Task Force chooses to apply, it may be appropriate to move the Arts Commission from the Charter to the Administrative Code to allow for future flexibility.

⁵ 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)

⁶ 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).

⁷ Eleven members shall be practicing arts professionals including two architects, a landscape architect, and representatives of the performing, visual, literary and media arts; and four members shall be lay members.

⁸ 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.

2. [Asian Art Commission](#) (Asian Art Museum)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legally required to exist

Primary Department	AAM	Established	1959
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	4
Policy Area	Arts and Culture	Members (as of May 2025)	27 seats 4 vacancies (15%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$177,402 ⁹		

Develops and administers the Asian Art Museum of San Francisco. Includes controlling and managing the City and County's Asian art with the Avery Brundage Collection as the core collection, maintaining a charitable foundation for the purpose of developing the Asian Art Museum, managing an acquisition fund for Asian art objects, and establishing the Asian Art Museum as the outstanding center of Asian art and culture in the western world ([Charter §§ 5.102, 5.104](#)).

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 ¹⁰	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 ¹¹	
	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	

⁹ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁰ This body must exist with members serving as fiduciaries of the trust (Requirement to oversee trust (Restatement (Third) of Trusts §2 (2003))).

¹¹ Fine Arts Museums Board of Trustees, War Memorial Board of Trustees, Arts Commission.

5	Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ¹²	
		5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	Consider keeping
	Because the answer to all criteria is "no," the outcome is: consider keeping.			

Staff Discussion:

The Asian Art Museum of San Francisco, The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, and the War Memorial and Performing Arts Center are referred to in the Charter as the "charitable trust departments." Each of the public bodies overseeing those departments serves as a Board of Trustees for the trust associated with each charitable trust department. This means the Asian Art Commission has special fiduciary responsibilities for the Asian Art Museum. Staff consulted the City Attorney's Office around the possibility of combining the bodies overseeing these departments or creating distinct subcommittees for each department under the Arts Commission. However, the City Attorney's Office advised against this given the specific obligations each body has to its own trust and museum(s).

¹² Single funding source: Asian Art Museum trust. Narrow topic: Asian Art Museum.

Possible Application of Governance Commission Template:

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	27	5-7	No	No change
Appointing authority	Mayor ¹³	Mayor	Yes	
Appointment confirmations	No confirmations ¹⁴	No confirmations ¹⁵	Yes	
Member removal	For cause	At will	No	Align to template; allow commissioners to be removed at will.
Term length	3 years	4 years	No	No change; 3-year term lengths aligned to museum nonprofit industry norms.
Term limits	None ¹⁶	3 terms	No	Partially align to template. Give Commission authority to determine term limits; give recommendation of a maximum of 12 years.
Qualifications	Knowledgeable about or experienced or interested in Asian art and culture	None required ¹⁷	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter	TBD	TBD	No change
Sunset date	None	None	Yes	
Hiring and Firing Authority	Power to appoint and remove the Asian Art Museum director	Consultative responsibilities only	No	No change

¹³ Charter specifies that the Mayor shall solicit nominations from the Commission to fill vacancies.

¹⁴ Because it is not otherwise stated, appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18).

¹⁵ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

¹⁶ While the Charter does not mention term limits, the Asian Art Museum website notes that "Commissioners serve a three-year term which may be renewed for a second consecutive term. Exceptional circumstances permit renewal for a third term." <https://about.asianart.org/about-the-asian-art-museum/governance/governance-boards/>, accessed 9/4/2025.

¹⁷ Governance commissions not 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	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Contract approval authority	Has authority to approve contracts but rarely does (last contract was the café contract in 2023).	Retain status quo	Yes	
Budget approval authority	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Employee discipline authority	No role	No role ¹⁸	Yes	

San Francisco’s Asian Arts Museum (AAM) and Fine Arts Museums (FAM) are unusual compared to other City departments in that the City owns the art collections and land while a nonprofit partner runs day-to-day operations are run by a nonprofit partner. Compared to the museum industry, this independence makes sense: in the U.S. the overwhelming majority of museums are managed by private nonprofit boards that oversee exhibitions, fundraising, and operations, while cities or counties, if they are involved at all, typically provide land, buildings, or funding for security and maintenance. What is rare is for a city to retain ownership of the collections themselves—a practice more common in the early 20th century among cities like Cleveland, St. Louis, Kansas City, and Chicago. San Francisco was an early adopter on the West Coast, with Los Angeles not establishing its municipal art museum until the 1960s. Today, the City’s financial support is focused entirely on caring for the museum buildings and art collections, covering costs such as security guards, building engineers, a portion of the Museum Director’s salary and supporting administrative roles, utilities, insurance, and capital infrastructure. The nonprofit, by contrast, funds the core mission-driven activities of a modern museum—curatorial staff, conservation, education, exhibitions, custodial services, and art handling. This division of responsibilities helps explain San Francisco’s distinctive governance model: the City provides land, buildings, collections, and core infrastructure, while the nonprofit partner manages programming and fundraising in line with national museum practice, avoiding the politicization of curatorial and operational decisions.

The Asian Art Commission must remain a governance body in order to provide oversight of the trust. However, given the unique fiduciary responsibilities and unique nature of both the body and the department, the Task Force should allow for exceptions to the governance commission template while still recommending a few changes.

1. The Task Force should **consider aligning member removal to the governance commission template** by allowing member removal at will by the Commission.

¹⁸ Exceptions if this is currently required by law

2. The Task Force should **consider partially aligning term limits to the governance commission template** by specifying that the Commission should set term limits but giving the Commission itself authority to determine appropriate term limits based on need.
3. **Some components should not conform to the template** due to the unique nature of the Asian Arts Museum and Commission.
 - a. The Task Force should recommend retaining 3-year term lengths, aligning with museum and nonprofit industry norms.
 - b. This Commission has 27 members while the template sets a limit of 5-7 members. Unlike other commissions, one of the primary roles of an Asian Art Commissioner is to support fundraising efforts. The Commission's website notes that "Commissioners and Trustees are requested to provide leadership support in raising and contributing funds. Commissioners and Trustees make personal financial commitments that are seen to be at or near the top of their capacity to give." Therefore, reducing the total number of Commissioners could significantly impact the Museum's fundraising efforts. Given that the body does not appear to struggle to meet quorum and meets at least quarterly (no meetings were cancelled in 2024), it does not make sense to reduce the number of members in order to align to the template.
 - c. Because the Asian Art commission has special fiduciary responsibilities, there may need to be **exceptions to the template** in order to insulate the body's operations from politics. This means the appointing process could remain as is, where the Commissioners nominate members for Mayoral appointments.
 - d. For similar reasons, the Commission should also retain hiring and firing authority over the director.

Given its unique fiduciary responsibilities, the Asian Art Commission should remain in the Charter rather than moving to the Administrative Code.

3. [Film Commission](#) (Office of Economic and Workforce Development)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or Eliminate
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating or combining with the newly formed Arts Agency May consider deferring decision pending guidance on the new agency structure

Primary Department	ECN	Established	1989
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	8
Policy Area	Arts and Culture	Members (as of May 2025)	11 seats 0 vacancies (0%)

Promotes filmmaking in San Francisco and supports a wide range of productions, from student films to feature films and TV series. Handles permitting for all projects, ensures successful shoots, and supports productions of all budget sizes ([Administrative Code Chapter 57](#)).

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?	Yes ¹⁹	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 ²⁰	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes ²¹	Consider combining or eliminating

¹⁹ Arts Commission

²⁰ Filmmaking in SF

²¹ The FilmSF office itself

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria suggest that the Task Force should consider combining or eliminating the Film Commission. Its functions are narrow and largely advisory. Its primary activities involve advocacy, networking, and attending film festivals to represent the City's film industry. These functions supplement, but are not central to, the work of Film SF staff, who focus on permitting, incentives, and industry engagement. In practice, the Commission's work is limited: it approves only one recurring grant (the Film Space grant) and otherwise spends most of its time receiving updates on film statistics, festivals, and incentive programs. Public engagement is minimal, with just one to three commenters at meetings, usually from union representatives or local industry groups. While commissioners sometimes make introductions or attend festivals, these are largely ambassadorial functions. Staff have noted that commissioners act as "backup spokespeople" for the department, but this role is not necessary to the functioning of Film SF.

There are arguments for maintaining the Film Commission as a separate body. Film SF staff see value in their commission, noting that commissioners bring personal networks, union representation, and industry connections that can support the department's goals and advance San Francisco's economic development agenda. Commissioners have been active in advocating for changes to tax credit programs, in promoting the City at major festivals, and in advancing workforce development through their union affiliations. In this sense, the Commission provides a level of industry credibility and advocacy that complement Film SF's small staff. However, these contributions are largely informal and advisory, and the question remains whether they require a formal commission structure or could be achieved through an advisory committees or roles within a combined body.

In the Fiscal Year 2025-2026 budget cycle, the Mayor combined the Arts Commission, the Film Commission (a division in the Office of Economic and Workforce Development), and Grants for the Arts (a division in the City Administrator's Office) into one Arts Agency. However, the proposal did not specify how the merger between the three departments/offices and two commissions should be carried out. As a result, the future of the Film Commission must be considered as part of a larger conversation about implementing the new Arts Agency.

The consolidation will significantly change how commissions oversee arts functions. Several outcomes are possible: the Arts Commission could subsume the Film Commission and/or the Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Advisory Committee, or the Arts and Film Commissions could be eliminated entirely while the new Arts Agency assumes their responsibilities—potentially with a new governance commission or advisory body. Given these uncertainties, the Task Force could consider creating flexibility to facilitate restructuring. It may direct staff and the City Attorney's Office to request an update from the Mayor's Office and Arts Commission leadership on restructuring and potentially revisit any recommendation for the Film Commission further along in its process.

Possible Application of Governance Commission or Advisory Committee Templates:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?
Number of Members	11	15 maximum	5-7	Yes – Advisory
Appointing authority	Mayor	N/A	Mayor	Yes - Both
Appointment confirmations	None	None	None ²²	Yes – Both
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 ²³	3 terms	No
Qualifications	Professional experience in film, arts, media, or related fields ²⁴	None required ²⁵	None required ²⁴	Yes
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	TBD	Yes – Advisory
Sunset date	None	3 years	None	Yes – Governance
Hiring and firing authority	Firing authority ²⁶	N/A	Consultative responsibilities only	No
Contract approval authority	Limited ²⁷	N/A	Retain status quo	Yes – Governance
Budget approval authority	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes – Governance
Employee discipline authority	No	N/A	No role	Yes - Both

²² 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)

²³ 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).

²⁴ At least six shall be San Francisco residents. All shall be “outstanding members of the community.” Commissioners may have experience in areas such as: Performing and Creative Arts, Production, Film or Sound Technology, Services and Facilities, Education, Presentation and Producing, or Interactive Multimedia

²⁵ 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.

²⁶ Administrative Code § 57.2(f) references Charter § 4.102(6), which states “the Mayor may recommend removal of a department head to the commission, and it shall be the commission's duty to act on the Mayor's recommendation by removing or retaining the department head within 30 days”

²⁷ The Film Commission only reviews one recurring grant: the San Francisco Film Commission Film Space (SFFCFS) grant. This grant supports nonprofit media organizations like SFFILM and BAVC Media that provide workspace and professional development for local filmmakers. According to Administrative Code § 57.5(a), the Executive Director (not the Commission) has authority to enter into use contracts with film companies for their productions.

The criteria-based outcome is to potentially combine or eliminate the Film Commission. However, if the Task Force chooses to keep the body, it may consider aligning it to either the governance commission or advisory committee template. The Commission is currently designated as a governance commission, but it may be more appropriate as an advisory committee given its narrow focus and current functions.

4. Fine Arts Museums Board of Trustees (Fine Arts Museums)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legally required to exist

Primary Department	FAM	Established	1972
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	5
Policy Area	Arts and Culture	Members (as of May 2025)	7 seats 0 vacancies (0%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$18,347 ²⁸		

Oversees the Fine Arts Museums in San Francisco (the Legion of Honor and the DeYoung). Responsibilities include the protection and conservation of the assets of the Fine Arts Museums and setting the public course the Museums will follow. Assures that the Museums are open, accessible and vital contributors to the cultural life of the City and County, and that the Museums' programs bring art appreciation and education to all the people of the City and County ([Charter §§ 5.102, 5.105](#)).

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 ²⁹	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 ³⁰	Consider keeping
	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	

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

²⁹ This body must exist with members serving as fiduciaries of the trust (Requirement to oversee trust (Restatement (Third) of Trusts §2 (2003))).

³⁰ Asian Art Commission, War Memorial Board of Trustees, Arts Commission.

5	Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ³¹	
		5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	Consider keeping
	Because the answer to all criteria is "no," the outcome is: consider keeping.			

Staff Discussion:

The Asian Art Museum of San Francisco, The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco and the War Memorial and Performing Arts Center are referred to in the Charter as the "charitable trust departments." Each of the public bodies overseeing those departments serves as a Board of Trustees for the trust associated with each charitable trust department. This means the Fine Arts Museums Board of Trustees has special fiduciary responsibilities. Staff consulted the City Attorney's Office around the possibility of combining the bodies overseeing these departments or creating distinct subcommittees for each museum under the Arts Commission. However, the City Attorney's Office advised against this given the specific obligations each body has to its own trust and museum(s).

³¹ Single funding source: Fine Arts Museums trust. Narrow topic: Fine Arts Museums.

Possible Application of Governance Commission Template:

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	7 ³² (62 maximum)	5-7	No	Partially align to template; reduce total number of seats.
Appointing authority	The Board of Trustees appoints its own members	Mayor	No	Partially align to template; Board of Trustees should nominate members and Mayor should appoint.
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations ³³	Yes	
Member removal	For cause	At will	No	Align to template; allow commissioners to be removed at will by Mayor
Term length	3 years	4 years	No	No change; 3-year term lengths aligned to museum nonprofit industry norms.
Term limits	None	3 terms	No	Partially align to template. Give Board of Trustees authority to determine term limits; give recommendation of a maximum of 12 years.
Qualifications	None required ³⁴	None required ³⁵	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter	TBD	TBD	No change
Sunset date	None	None	Yes	

³² The Charter sets a maximum number of 62 members. The Board of Trustees may vote to set a different number of trustees at any time. Currently there are 7 seats.

³³ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

³⁴ Charter states that the Board shall “give due consideration to nominees who are broadly representative of the diverse communities of the City and County and knowledgeable in the fields of art and culture, as demonstrated by their experience, training, interest or philanthropic activity.”

³⁵ Governance commissions not 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	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Hiring and Firing Authority	Power to appoint and remove a director and such other executive and administrative positions as may be necessary.	Consultative responsibilities only	No	No change
Contract approval authority	None	Retain status quo	Yes	
Budget approval authority	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Employee discipline authority	None	No role ³⁶	Yes	

San Francisco’s Asian Arts Museum (AAM) and Fine Arts Museums (FAM) are unusual compared to other City departments in that the City owns the art collections and land while day-to-day operations are run by a nonprofit partner. Compared to the museum industry writ large, this independence makes sense: in the U.S. the overwhelming majority of museums are managed by private nonprofit boards that oversee exhibitions, fundraising, and operations, while cities or counties, if they are involved at all, typically provide land, buildings, or funding for security and maintenance. What is rare is for a city to retain ownership of the collections themselves—a practice more common in the early 20th century among cities like Cleveland, St. Louis, Kansas City, and Chicago. San Francisco was an early adopter on the West Coast, with Los Angeles not establishing its municipal art museum until the 1960s. Today, the City’s financial support is focused entirely on caring for the museum buildings and art collections, covering costs such as security guards, building engineers, a portion of the Museum Director’s salary and supporting administrative roles, utilities, insurance, and capital infrastructure. The nonprofit, by contrast, funds the core mission-driven activities of a modern museum—curatorial staff, conservation, education, exhibitions, custodial services, and art handling. This division of responsibilities helps explain San Francisco’s distinctive governance model: the City provides land, buildings, collections, and core infrastructure, while the nonprofit partner manages programming and fundraising in line with national museum practice, avoiding the politicization of curatorial and operational decisions.

The Fine Arts Museums Board of Trustees must remain a governance body in order to provide oversight of the trust. However, given the unique fiduciary responsibilities and unique nature of both the body and the department, the Task Force should allow for exceptions to the governance commission template while still recommending a few changes.

³⁶ Exceptions if this is currently required by law

1. The Task Force should consider **aligning** the FAM Board of Trustees to the governance commission template by allowing **members to be removed at will** by the appointing authority.
2. The Task Force should consider **partially aligning** the FAM Board of Trustees to the governance commission template by:
 - a. Specifying that the Board of Trustees should set **term limits** but giving the Board of Trustees itself authority to determine appropriate term limits based on need.
 - b. **Change appointing authority process** by having the Mayor be the appointing authority but asking the Board of Trustees to nominate members for the Mayor to appoint. This partially aligns to the template and aligns with the Asian Art Museum's process. It makes sense for the Board of Trustees to nominate members for the Mayor to appoint because the role and purpose of museum boards differ from that of governance commissions. The Fine Arts Museums require board members to be a mix of experts, fundraisers, and collectors, and the existing Board members have the knowledge, connections, and expertise to nominate new members with these qualities.
3. **Some components should not conform to the template** due to the unique nature of the Fine Arts Museum.
 - a. The Task Force should recommend retaining 3-year term lengths, aligning with museum and nonprofit industry norms.
 - b. The Board of Trustees has 7 current members, as set by the Board itself, but the Charter specifies it may have a maximum of 62 members. Unlike other commissions, one of the primary roles of a Fine Arts Museum board member is to support fundraising efforts. Currently, the Fine Arts Museums also has two nonprofit organizations to manage the endowment fund and support fundraising for the museums, both of which have more expansive Boards. The Task Force should recommend reducing the number of trustees in the Charter, but direct staff to work with the Fine Arts Museums department and City Attorney to determine an appropriate cap.
 - c. The Task Force may choose to allow the Board of Trustees to retain hiring and firing authority over their director and executives. Having the Board retain this power may help insulate the body's operations from political pressures so that it may retain independent long-term oversight of the trust, collections, and buildings. Additionally, only a portion of the FAM Director's salary is paid by the City, while the remainder comes from the associated nonprofits, whose boards also manage the search process when hiring a new director. Having Mayor-appointed Board of Trustee members making hiring and firing decisions may be a balanced approach to protecting the interests of the Museums and the City.

Given its unique fiduciary responsibilities, the Asian Art Commission should remain in the Charter rather than moving to the Administrative Code.

Finally, the Task Force should recommend changing some Charter language beyond aligning the Board of Trustees to the template. The charter specifies that "a quorum of the Board shall consist of one-third of the number of trustees in office at the time." The Task Force should recommend removing this section in order to align quorum to other Boards and Commissions per Charter § 4.104b which defines quorum as "the presence of a majority of the members."

5. [Library Commission](#) (Library)

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

Primary Department	LIB	Established	1878
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	12 meetings
Policy Area	Arts and Culture	Members (as of May 2025)	7 seats 0 vacancies
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$326,576 ³⁷		

Oversees the San Francisco Public Library system, which includes the Main Library, 27 neighborhood branch libraries, and a bookmobile service. Sets policy, provides strategic direction for the department, and approves the Library's budget ([Charter § 8.102](#)).

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?	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	
<i>Because the answer to all criteria is "no," the outcome is: consider keeping.</i>			

³⁷ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria do not provide any reason to eliminate the Library Commission. The commission oversees the Library Department, which has a budget of \$194 million and over 700 employees (FTEs) for FY26. Typically, 4-5 public commenters speak at each meeting. The Commission tracks performance metrics, such as resident satisfaction with library services, and provides feedback on major initiatives like the racial equity action plan. Other cultural institutions (e.g., Arts Commission, Recreation & Park Commission) also have commissions, and keeping the Library Commission ensures that the public continues to have a venue for engagement on other civic amenities.

Possible Application of Governance Commission or Advisory Committee Templates:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?
Number of Members	7	15 maximum	5-7	Yes – Both
Appointing authority	Mayor	N/A	Mayor	Yes – Governance
Appointment confirmations	None	None	None ³⁸	Yes - Both
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 ³⁹	3 terms	No
Qualifications	None	None required ⁴⁰	None required ³⁹	Yes - Both
Establishing authority	Charter	Administrative Code	TBD	No
Sunset date	None	3 years	None	Yes - Governance
Hiring and firing authority	The Commission may nominate qualified candidates for the role of City Librarian. The Commission may remove the City Librarian on its own initiative. ⁴¹	N/A	Consultative responsibilities only	No
Contract approval authority	No ⁴²	N/A	Retain status quo	Yes - Both
Budget approval authority	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes – Governance
Employee discipline authority	No role	No role ⁴³	No role	Yes - Both

The Task Force may consider aligning the Library Commission to either the governance commission or advisory committee template. The Library Commission currently acts as a governance body overseeing the Library Department and approving its \$194 million budget. The

³⁸ 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)

³⁹ 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).

⁴⁰ 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.

⁴¹ The Library Commission does not evaluate the performance of the City Librarian. The Mayor's Office handles the City Librarian's performance management.

⁴² The commission does not approve contracts but does approve sole source grants, typically one per year

⁴³ Exceptions if this is currently required by law

Commission also plays an advisory role, hearing informational updates from staff and providing feedback and direction. A review of recent (CY25) meeting agendas shows that, apart from approving the department's budget, the Commission mostly hears informational updates. This limited governing role suggests it may be more appropriate to designate the Library Commission as an advisory committee rather than a governance body, since most of its activities involve receiving reports, tracking outcomes, and advising staff.

6. [Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Advisory Committee](#) (Arts Commission)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or Eliminate
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating or combining with newly formed Arts Agency

Primary Department	ART	Established	1983
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	4
Policy Area	Arts and Culture	Members (as of May 2025)	5 seats 0 vacancies (0%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$16,119 ⁴⁴		

Advises the Arts Commission on the certification of artists to sell their work in designated spaces, including street vending locations throughout San Francisco ([Police Code § 2400](#)).

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 ⁴⁵	
	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 ⁴⁶	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes	Consider combining or eliminating

⁴⁴ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁴⁵ Arts Commission

⁴⁶ Street art vending

Staff Discussion:

The legislation establishing the Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Advisory Committee was a response to a hostile relationship between police and street artists in the 1970s. The legislation's original intent was to move licensing for street artists out of the Police Department and included the creation of the Advisory Committee to review and approve these new Art Vendor license applications. However, recent changes in State and local law have rendered this license obsolete. In 2018, California's Safe Sidewalk Vending Act invalidated some provisions of the Street Artist License, making it inconsistent with state law. In 2020, the City also created a new street vending license program that the Department of Public Works (DPW) administers. As a result, the Art Vendor license now directly conflicts with the City's updated DPW street vending license program. The Arts Commission has already begun working with the City Attorney's Office to draft legislation to bring the authorizing legislation into compliance with State law.

This information suggests that the Advisory Committee has outlived its useful purpose. While the Arts Commission and City Attorney's Office revise the license program, the City may continue to issue these licenses or the future iterations of these licenses through a process that does not include the approval of the Advisory Committee. If the City would like to continue public engagement around administering street vending licenses, either DPW, the new Arts Agency, or the new Arts Agency potential public body can conduct this engagement.

Despite these upcoming changes to the licensing program, the City has not yet eliminated the Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Advisory Committee. Because its creation was voter-approved, a new ballot measure is required to amend or remove it. The Commission Streamlining work provides an opportunity to remove this body that now has limited use and The Task Force should recommend eliminating it.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	5	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Mayor; Arts Commission provides nominees.	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	2 years	3 years maximum	No	
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ⁴⁷	No	
Qualifications	4 artists and 1 art educator	None required ⁴⁸	Yes	
Establishing authority	Police Code	Administrative Code	No	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	

Because the Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Advisory Committee should be eliminated, and the Arts Commission is working to develop legislation to remove the body from Code, staff do not propose any changes to the body based on the application of the advisory committee template.

⁴⁷ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

⁴⁸ 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.

7. [War Memorial Board of Trustees](#) (War Memorial)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legally required to exist

Primary Department	WAR	Established	1921
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	11
Policy Area	Arts and Culture	Members (as of May 2025)	11 seats 0 vacancies (0%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$256,903 ⁴⁹		

Oversees the construction, administration, management, superintendence, and operation of the San Francisco War Memorial and Performing Arts Center. The War Memorial Board of Trustees has jurisdiction over the War Memorial Opera House, War Memorial Veterans Building, the Louise M. Davies Symphony Hall, and Harold L. Zellerbach Rehearsal Hall ([Charter §§ 5.106](#)).

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 ⁵⁰	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 ⁵¹	Consider keeping
	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 ⁵²	

⁴⁹ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁵⁰ This body must exist with members serving as fiduciaries of the trust (Requirement to oversee trust (Restatement (Third) of Trusts §2 (2003))).

⁵¹ Asian Art Commission, Fine Arts Museums Board of Trustees, Arts Commission.

⁵² Single funding source: War Memorial trust. Narrow topic: War Memorial and associated buildings.

5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	Consider keeping
<i>Because the answer to all criteria is "no," the outcome is: consider keeping.</i>		

Staff Discussion:

The Asian Art Museum of San Francisco, The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco and the War Memorial and Performing Arts Center are referred to in the Charter as the "charitable trust departments." Each of the public bodies overseeing those departments serves as a Board of Trustees for the trust associated with each charitable trust department. This means that the War Memorial Board of Trustees oversees the trust associated with the War Memorial and Performing Arts Center and has special fiduciary responsibilities as a result. Staff consulted the City Attorney's Office around the possibility of combining the bodies overseeing these departments or creating distinct subcommittees for each entity under the Arts Commission. However, the City Attorney's Office advised against this given the specific obligations each body has to its own trust.

Possible Application of Governance Commission Template:

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	11	5-7	No	No change
Appointing authority	Mayor	Mayor	Yes	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations ⁵³	Yes	
Member removal	For cause	At will	No	Align to template; allow commissioners to be removed at will.
Term length	4 years	4 years	Yes	
Term limits	None	3 terms	No	Partially align to template. Give Board of Trustees authority to determine term limits; give recommendation of a maximum of 12 years.
Qualifications	None required ⁵⁴	None required ⁵⁵	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter	TBD	No	None
Sunset date	None	None	Yes	
Hiring and Firing Authority	Power to appoint and remove a director	Consultative responsibilities only	No	Align to template; remove hiring and firing authority.
Contract approval authority	Board approves "large contracts" ⁵⁶	Retain status quo	Yes	
Budget approval authority	Yes	Yes	Yes	

⁵³ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

⁵⁴ Charter states that the Mayor shall give due consideration to veterans and others who have a special interest in the purposes for which the Center exists.

⁵⁵ Governance commissions not 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.

⁵⁶ No specifics provided on thresholds for contracts. Examples include the Memorandum of Understanding with the Foundation; the exclusive concessionaire agreement for the campus, and booking of the Green Room and the Herbst Theatre to the War Memorial.

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Employee discipline authority	None	No role ⁵⁷	Yes	

The War Memorial Board of Trustees must remain a governance body in order to provide oversight of the trust. However, given the unique fiduciary responsibilities and unique nature of both the body and the department, the Task Force should allow for exceptions to the governance commission template while still recommending a few changes.

1. The Task Force should **consider aligning member removal to the governance commission template** in two ways. First, by making members removable at-will rather than only for cause. Second, since the War Memorial is primarily responsible for managing facilities rather than collections, it operates more like other City departments, making it appropriate for the Mayor—not the Board of Trustees—to appoint the department head. In this respect, WAR should be aligned to the standard governance commission template, unlike Fine Arts and Asian Art museums, which warrant exceptions due to their nonprofit-led collections management and fundraising roles.
2. The Task Force should **consider partially aligning term limits to the governance commission template** by specifying that the Board of Trustees should set term limits but giving the Board of Trustees itself the authority to determine appropriate term limits based on need.
3. **Some components should not conform to the template** due to the unique nature of the War Memorial.
 - a. The Board has 11 members while the template sets a limit of 5-7 members. Unlike other commissions, one of the primary roles of the Board of Trustees is to support fundraising efforts. Therefore, reducing the total number of members could significantly impact the War Memorial’s fundraising efforts. Given that the body does not appear to struggle to meet quorum and met 11 times in calendar year 2024, it does not make sense to reduce the number of members in order to align to the template.

⁵⁷ Exceptions if this is currently required by law

Policy Area: Building and Permitting

8. Abatement Appeals Board (Department of Building Inspection)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Criteria suggest combining with the Board of Appeals

Primary Department	DBI	Established	1994
Current Type	Regulatory	Meetings (CY24)	12
Policy Area	Building and Permitting	Members (as of May 2025)	7 seats 1 vacancy (14%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$61,393 ⁵⁸		

Hears and decides appeals when property owners challenge Department of Building Inspection (DBI) actions, such as orders to fix unresolved building code violations or disputed final assessment bills ([Charter § D3.750-5](#), [Building Code § 105A.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?	Yes ⁵⁹	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	Yes ⁶⁰	Consider combining or eliminating
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 ⁶¹	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes ⁶²	Consider combining or eliminating

⁵⁸ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁵⁹ Cal. Building Code Section 1.8.8.3 and Health & Safety Code Section 17920.5; May be combined with another body, or the Board of Supervisors may handle appeals.

⁶⁰ Board of Appeals if scope expands.

⁶¹ Building Inspection Commission, Structural Advisory Committee, Code Advisory Committee, Access Appeals Board, and Board of Examiners.

⁶² Board of Appeals if scope expands.

		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 ⁶³	
		5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes ⁶⁴	Consider combining or eliminating

Staff Discussion:

The Abatement Appeals Board (AAB)'s primary role is to hear appeals of abatement orders issued by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) after a public hearing. It may uphold, modify, or reverse DBI's orders, and in certain circumstances, grant moratoria to property owners based on financial hardship or risk of displacement. The Building Inspection Commission (BIC), DBI's governing body, sits as the AAB. The Task Force has previously emphasized that appeals bodies should be independent from the City departments whose decisions they review. In the case of the Abatement Appeals Board, this separation is important because DBI both issues permits and enforces code compliance, and allowing DBI-related appeals to be heard by a body tied too closely to the department risks blurring the lines between enforcement and adjudication.

The evaluation criteria support potentially combining the AAB with the Board of Appeals (BOA), which also focuses on building and permitting appeals. In practice, there is overlap between the work of the AAB and the BOA. Property owners often must obtain permits from DBI and/or the Planning Department in order to address building code violations. As a result, similar or related issues may be appealed to different bodies depending only on which department issued the notice of violation: DBI abatement appeals issues go to the AAB, while Planning abatement appeals issues go to the BOA.

This creates an inefficient, duplicative system where two different boards review the same types of matters. The BOA already has the expertise and legal authority to consider complex building, housing, and permitting appeals. By consolidating these functions, the City could simplify the appeals process for property owners, reduce administrative burdens, and ensure greater consistency in outcomes. For these reasons, the Task Force should recommend creating a single forum for such appeals by combining the AAB with the BOA.

The AAB has unique authority to grant moratoria in limited circumstances, including cases of financial hardship for owner-occupants (Building Code § 105A.2.8.3) and situations where strict enforcement could displace low- and moderate-income tenants (Building Code § 105A.2.8.4). These powers reflect important policy goals of protecting vulnerable homeowners and preserving affordable housing. If the AAB's functions are consolidated into the BOA, it will be essential to ensure that these protections are preserved and carried forward, so that efficiency and consistency in the appeals process are achieved without sacrificing equity and housing stability.

⁶³ Narrow topic: Orders of abatement (building code violations).

⁶⁴ Board of Appeals if scope expands.

Possible Application of Appeals Boards Template:

Template component	Current State	Appeals Board Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	7	3-7	Yes	
Appointing authority	Building Inspection Commission	N/A ⁶⁵	N/A	N/A
Appointment confirmations	None	N/A ⁶³	N/A	N/A
Member removal	For cause ⁶⁶	Members are “removable” - removal is not at will but is at a lower threshold than for cause removals. Details TBD.	No	Align to template; removal requires cause but specific threshold TBD by Task Force
Term length	2 years	4 years	No	No changes
Term limits	None	3 terms	No	No changes
Qualifications	Members of the Building Inspection Commission	Qualifications required; determined by authorizing legislation	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter and Building Code	TBD	No	None
Sunset date	None	None Evaluate workload/purpose every 5 years.	Yes	
Policymaking	None	No authority to set policy. May provide recommendations.	Yes	

If the Task Force decides to keep the Abatement Appeals Board (AAB) as a separate body rather than combining it with the Board of Appeals, no changes should be made to its term lengths or limits. Because the Building Inspection Commission also serves as the AAB, the commissioners’ existing terms and limits should continue to apply, and the AAB should follow those rules.

⁶⁵ Task Force Members determined that no changes should be made to current bodies around appointing authority and appointment confirmations. They deferred decision-making on whether they would recommend an appointing authority and appointment confirmation approach for future bodies.

⁶⁶ The members of the Building Inspection Commission serve as members of the Abatement Appeals Board. BIC commissioners can only be removed for cause.

9. [Access Appeals Commission](#) (Department of Building Inspection)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining with the Board of Appeals

Primary Department	DBI	Established	1995
Current Type	Regulatory	Meetings (CY24)	5
Policy Area	Building and Permitting	Members (as of May 2025)	5 seats 0 vacancies (0%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$24,057 ⁶⁷		

Conducts hearings on the Department of Building Inspection's (DBI) interpretations of disability access regulations and enforcement ([Charter Sec. D3.750-5](#), [Building Code § 105A.3](#)).

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	Consider combining or eliminating
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	Yes ⁶⁸	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	Yes ⁶⁹	
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 ⁷⁰	Consider combining or eliminating
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes ⁷¹	
	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 ⁷²	

⁶⁷ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁶⁸ Cal. Health and Safety Code section 19957.5.

⁶⁹ May be combined with another body, but membership qualifications are constrained (two members must have disabilities, two members must be experienced in construction, and one member must be a member of the public).

⁷⁰ Building Inspection Commission, Structural Advisory Committee, Code Advisory Committee, and Board of Examiners.

⁷¹ See prior note

⁷² Narrow topic: Disability access regulations and enforcement.

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

Yes⁷³

Consider combining or eliminating

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria support potentially combining the Access Appeals Commission with the Board of Appeals, which also focuses on building and permitting appeals. The Task Force has previously emphasized that appeals bodies should be independent from the City departments whose decisions they review. This is especially important for the Access Appeals Commission, since it hears appeals of DBI's enforcement of disability access and adaptability requirements. Keeping the appeals function separate from DBI helps ensure neutrality in decisions that directly affect accessibility rights and compliance with state law.

The Access Appeals Commission (AAC) has a distinct role under state law (California Health and Safety Code § 19957.5) to hear appeals related to disability access requirements and to make determinations on issues such as equivalent facilitation, technical infeasibility, and hardship extensions. The AAC's membership requirements are specialized and required under state statute: two members must be persons with physical disabilities, two must have construction expertise, and one must be a public member.

In practice, the AAC has not functioned as an active or effective forum. It was expected to play a role in the Accessible Business Entrance (ABE) Program, which required property owners to bring primary entrances into compliance with disability access standards. That program, however, sunset earlier this year, leaving the AAC with little substantive work. Furthermore, although the AAC is scheduled to meet twice a month, its meetings are often cancelled; between January 2024 and August 2025, the Commission met only five times.⁷⁴ Given this limited activity, the AAC's existence as a separate body may no longer be justified.

Consolidating its functions into the Board of Appeals (BOA) would streamline the City's appeals system, reduce administrative overhead, and place disability access appeals in a forum that already handles a wide range of complex code enforcement issues. The BOA has demonstrated capacity to handle diverse appeals, and consolidation could create a more consistent process for property owners and the public while also creating greater consistency in appeals outcomes.

If accessibility appeals are transferred to the BOA, the BOA would need to meet state membership requirements, which adds complexity given the small number of such cases. Rather than changing the BOA's membership, the most effective solution is to establish a standing Access Appeals Subcommittee under the BOA, composed of separate individuals who meet the state's membership requirements and convene only as needed to hear accessibility challenges. While this still means a separate body, being associated with the BOA rather than DBI would create separation between the appeals function and the department being appealed.

⁷³ Board of Appeals if scope expands.

⁷⁴ Access Appeals Commission Regular Meetings and Submittal Dates, Dept. of Building Inspection, <https://www.sf.gov/file/access-appeals-commission-2025-calendar>, Accessed Sept. 4, 2025.

Access Appeals Commission Past Events, <https://www.sf.gov/departments--access-appeals-commission/events/past>, Accessed Sept. 4, 2025.

Possible Application of Appeals Boards Template:

Template component	Current State	Appeals Board Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	5	3-7	Yes	
Appointing authority	Building Inspection Commission	N/A ⁷⁵	N/A	N/A
Appointment confirmations	None	N/A ⁷²	N/A	N/A
Member removal	At will	Members are “removeable” - removal is not at will but is at a lower threshold than for cause removals. Details TBD.	No	Align to template; removal requires cause but specific threshold TBD by Task Force
Term length	4 years	4 years	Yes	
Term limits	None	3 terms	No	Align to template; 3 terms
Qualifications	Two people with a physical disability, two people with experience in construction, and one member of the public ⁷⁶	Qualifications required; determined by authorizing legislation	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter and Building Code	TBD	No	None
Sunset date	None	None Evaluate workload/purpose every 5 years.	Yes	
Policymaking	None	No authority to set policy. May provide recommendations.	Yes	

To align with the appeals board template, the Access Appeals Commission’s (AAC) term lengths and term limits should be modified. If the AAC is retained and associated with the Board of Appeals rather than DBI, the Task Force could consider requiring the one public seat to be filled by a member of the BOA itself, rather than another individual.

⁷⁵ Task Force Members determined that no changes should be made to current bodies around appointing authority and appointment confirmations. They deferred decision-making on whether they would recommend an appointing authority and appointment confirmation approach for future bodies.

⁷⁶ Cal. Health and Safety Code section 19957.5.

Regardless of the consolidation decision, Building Code § 105A.3.10, *Notice to Mayor's Office of Disability*, should be updated to reflect that on April 1, 2025, the Mayor's Office on Disability (MOD) moved to the SF Human Services Agency (HSA)'s Department of Disability and Aging Services and was renamed the San Francisco Office on Disability and Accessibility (ODA).⁷⁷

⁷⁷ <https://www.sfhhsa.org/office-disability-and-accessibility>

10. [Board of Appeals](#) (Board of Appeals)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest keeping and absorbing other commissions

Primary Department	BOA	Established	1932
Current Type	Regulatory	Meetings (CY24)	26
Policy Area	Building and Permitting	Members (as of May 2025)	5 seats 0 vacancies (0%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$915,396 ⁷⁸		

Hears and decides appeals of departmental decisions involving the grant, denial, suspension, or revocation of permits, licenses, variances, zoning administrator determinations, and other use entitlements by various commissions, departments, bureaus, agencies, and officers of the City ([Charter § 4.106](#)).

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?	Yes ⁷⁹	Keep
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	Yes ⁸⁰	Consider combining or eliminating
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

⁷⁸ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁷⁹ California Health & Safety Code §§ 17920.5, 17920.6, 17925

⁸⁰ The Board of Supervisors or another body could fulfill the State Housing Law required function of a local appeals board or housing appeals board in the City.

⁸¹ Abatement Appeals Board, Access Appeals Commission, Board of Examiners, and Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board

⁸² See prior note

		4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	Yes ⁸³	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?	No	
		5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	

Staff Discussion:

The Board of Appeals (BOA) is a long-standing City body that fulfills state requirements and functions as a general-purpose appeals forum that allows members of the public to seek review of administrative decisions made by various City departments. The Board of Appeals provides a single point of access for appeals across multiple subject areas and has procedures in place for conducting hearings and issuing final determinations.

The evaluation criteria support a potential consideration of whether the Board of Appeals' scope could be expanded to include other specialized bodies that also hear appeals. These include the Abatement Appeals Board, which hears appeals of building code abatement orders; the Access Appeals Commission, which hears appeals on disability access and adaptability issues as required by state law; and the Board of Examiners, which evaluates whether new construction methods, materials, or systems meet safety standards under the City's construction codes. Each of these bodies addresses appeals related to housing, building, or permitting, and their subject matter often overlaps with issues already reviewed by the Board of Appeals.

Maintaining the Board of Appeals while consolidating these other functions could result in a single appeals body for a broad range of housing, building, and permitting matters. This approach could reduce the number of separate appeals tracks, simplify the process for appellants, and bring greater consistency to decisions. At the same time, any consolidation would need to account for existing legal and policy requirements. For example, the Access Appeals Commission has specific membership requirements under state law to ensure representation of people with disabilities and construction experts. If its functions were transferred, the Board of Appeals would need to find a way to comply with these requirements. Similarly, the unique powers of the Abatement Appeals Board, such as granting moratoria in certain circumstances, would need to be preserved if its functions were subsumed.

The Task Force may therefore consider the Board of Appeals as a candidate for serving as the City's primary appeals body while evaluating how best to incorporate the statutory and policy requirements of the other commissions. This option would maintain the Board of Appeals as the City's general forum for administrative appeals and potentially broaden its scope to cover a wider range of cases, while still recognizing the need to preserve specialized expertise and legal compliance in the appeals process. Depending on case volume, this may require the BOA to hire one more legal assistant.

⁸³ See prior note

Possible Application of Appeals Boards Template:

Template component	Current State	Appeals Board Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	5	3-7	Yes	
Appointing authority	Mayor (3 seats) and Board of Supervisors President (2 seats)	N/A ⁸⁴	N/A	N/A
Appointment confirmations	Appointments take effect upon Board of Supervisors approval or automatically after 60 days if no action is taken	N/A ⁸¹	N/A	N/A
Member removal	For cause	Members are “removable” - removal is not at will but is at a lower threshold than for cause removals. Details TBD.	No	Align to template; removal requires cause but specific threshold TBD by Task Force
Term length	4 years	4 years	Yes	
Term limits	None	3 terms	No	Align to template; 3 terms
Qualifications	None	Qualifications required; determined by authorizing legislation	No	Align to template; add qualifications
Establishing authority	Charter	TBD	No	No change
Sunset date	None	None Evaluate workload/purpose every 5 years.	Yes	
Policymaking	None	No authority to set policy. May provide recommendations.	Yes	

Three elements of the Board of Appeals should be aligned with the Appeals Body template: member removal, member qualifications, and term limits. Members of appeals boards should not serve at will because their quasi-judicial role requires independence and protection

⁸⁴ Task Force Members determined that no changes should be made to current bodies around appointing authority and appointment confirmations. They deferred decision-making on whether they would recommend an appointing authority and appointment confirmation approach for future bodies.

against arbitrary removal to preserve fairness and neutrality in decision-making; the Task Force will decide on specific thresholds for Appeals Board removals later in its process. Finally, potential qualifications could include general legal and construction expertise.

11. [Board of Examiners](#) (Department of Building Inspection)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining with the Board of Appeals

Primary Department	DBI	Established	Unknown
Current Type	Regulatory	Meetings (CY24)	0
Policy Area	Building and Permitting	Members (as of May 2025)	13 seats 1 vacancy (8%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$6,238 ⁸⁵		

Reviews and approves new construction materials and methods, considers variances from building code requirements, provides code interpretations, and hears appeals of abatement orders involving construction safety or technical code questions ([Charter Sec. D3.750-5](#), [Building Code § 105A.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?	Yes ⁸⁶	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	Yes ⁸⁷	Consider combining or eliminating
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	Yes	Consider eliminating
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	Yes ⁸⁸	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)?	Yes	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	No	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ⁸⁹	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes ⁹⁰	
	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	

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

⁸⁶ Cal. Building Code Section 1.8.8.

⁸⁷ May be combined with another body, or the Board of Supervisors may handle appeals.

⁸⁸ Legally required functions.

⁸⁹ Building Inspection Commission, Structural Advisory Committee, Code Advisory Committee, and Access Appeals Board.

⁹⁰ See prior note

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

Yes

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria support combining the Board of Examiners (BOE) with the Board of Appeals (BOA), which already hears a wide range of building- and permitting-related appeals. The Task Force has previously emphasized that appeals bodies should be independent from the City departments whose decisions they review. In the case of the Board of Examiners, this separation is important because DBI both issues abatement orders and rules on equivalency requests, and allowing DBI-related appeals to be heard by a body tied too closely to the department risks undermining neutrality and public confidence in the appeals process.

The BOE determines whether new construction materials and methods meet the City's safety standards, recommending variances from building code requirements, and hearing appeals of abatement orders when construction safety issues are involved. When a project cannot meet building code requirements, an applicant may propose an alternative approach they believe provides an equivalent level of safety. Department of Building Inspection (DBI) staff may either approve or deny this equivalency. If DBI denies the request and the applicant disagrees, the applicant may appeal the decision to the BOE. In practice, however, the BOE has had little activity; it did not meet at all during FY 2024. This raises questions about whether maintaining it as a separate body is justified.

California Building Code § 1.8.8.1 requires all jurisdictions to provide an independent process for hearing appeals of building code enforcement decisions. While many cities meet this requirement by establishing a Board of Examiners or similar body, the law does not require a separate stand-alone appeals board; jurisdictions may assign this role to an existing commission or, if no such body exists, to the governing body itself. San Francisco has chosen to meet this requirement by maintaining a Board of Examiners, but legally, the City could consolidate these functions into another appeals body such as the Board of Appeals, so long as an independent avenue for review remains available.

Combining the BOE with the BOA would simplify the City's appeals system, reduce administrative overhead, and provide a single forum for resolving construction and building code matters. The BOA already manages a wide range of appeals and could incorporate these additional responsibilities. Unlike the Board of Examiners (BOE), which is composed of licensed engineers, architects, contractors, and other professionals with technical knowledge of building safety standards, the BOA is not designed as a technical body. Its commissioners are generalists—currently a mix of attorneys and business professionals—without specialized training in engineering or construction. This difference has raised concerns about whether the BOA is equipped to resolve highly technical questions about construction methods, materials, or structural safety.

However, the absence of embedded technical expertise does not mean the BOA cannot make fair and informed decisions. The BOA's existing caseload already includes highly technical matters, and its process is designed to ensure that the necessary expertise is brought forward by the involved parties. DBI presents its position, appellants bring their own experts, and permit holders can also present expert testimony. The role of the BOA is not to substitute its own technical judgment, but to evaluate the evidence and testimony presented and decide which interpretation is most persuasive.

and consistent with the code. In this sense, code interpretation is more akin to a legal function than a technical one, and the BOA's composition—with several attorneys—supports that role.

DBI will continue to have a seat at the table in BOA proceedings, as it does in other appeals. If additional technical expertise is needed, subject matter experts can be brought in to advise or testify, just as they are in current appeals. Therefore, while it is important to acknowledge concerns about the BOA's lack of embedded technical expertise, the structure and procedures already in place provide the necessary safeguards. Consolidation would not leave technical issues unaddressed but rather would streamline appeals while preserving opportunities for expert input and ensuring impartial, legally grounded decisions.

Possible Application of Appeals Boards Template:

Template component	Current State	Appeals Board Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	13	3-7	No	Align to template; reduce membership to at most 7 seats
Appointing authority	Building Inspection Commission	N/A ⁹¹	N/A	N/A
Appointment confirmations	None	N/A ⁸⁸	N/A	N/A
Member removal	At will	Members are “removeable” - removal is not at will but is at a lower threshold than for cause removals. Details TBD.	No	Align to template; removal requires cause but specific threshold TBD by Task Force
Term length	3 years	4 years	No	Align to template; 4-year term lengths
Term limits	None	3 terms	No	Align to template; 3 term limits
Qualifications	Yes ⁹²	Qualifications required; determined by authorizing legislation	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter and Administrative Code	TBD	No	None
Sunset date	None	None Evaluate workload/purpose every 5 years.	Yes	
Policymaking	No	No authority to set policy. May provide recommendations.	Yes	

⁹¹ Task Force Members determined that no changes should be made to current bodies around appointing authority and appointment confirmations. They deferred decision-making on whether they would recommend an appointing authority and appointment confirmation approach for future bodies.

⁹²A registered structural engineer, a registered mechanical engineer, a registered electrical engineer, a registered fire protection engineer, a licensed general contractor, a licensed architect, a licensed plumbing contractor, a licensed electrical contractor, a building owner serving as the high rise sprinkler member, three seismic improvement members – a tenant, who is also a licensed architect, civil or structural engineer; a property owner who is also licensed or registered architect who is also a licensed architect, civil or structural engineer; and a registered structural engineer specializing in seismic improvement.

Should the Task Force decide to keep the BOE as a distinct body rather than combining it with the Board of Appeals, four elements should be reviewed and aligned to the appeals board template: number of members, member removal, term lengths, and term limits. The number of members should be reduced to seven at most. Members of appeals boards should not serve at will because their quasi-judicial role requires independence and protection against arbitrary removal to preserve fairness and neutrality in decision-making; the Task Force will decide on specific thresholds for Appeals Board removals later in its process.

12. Building Inspection Commission (Department of Building Inspection)

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

Primary Department	DBI	Established	1994
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	13
Policy Area	Building and Permitting	Members (as of May 2025)	7 seats 1 vacancy (8%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$623,519 ⁹³		

Oversees the Department of Building Inspection, which is responsible for the enforcement, administration, and interpretation of the City's Housing, Building, Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing Codes. Recommends candidates to serve as the Director of Department of Building Inspection (DBI), sets policy, hears various appeals on issues leading up to the issuance of building permits, and sits as the Abatement Appeals Board ([Charter § 4.121](#)).

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 ⁹⁴	
	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?	No	

⁹³ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁹⁴ Code Advisory Committee, Structural Advisory Committee, Abatement Appeals Board, Access Appeals Board, and Board of Examiners.

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

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

Staff Discussion:

While the evaluation criteria, based on current permitting structures, provide no reason to eliminate the Building Inspection Commission (BIC), structural changes may be forthcoming because of a recent Executive Directive.

The BIC oversees the Department of Building Inspection (DBI), which has a budget of \$88 million and nearly 300 employees (FTEs) for FY26. BIC provides input and approval on the department's strategic plans, policies and budgets and serves as a public forum for DBI to engage with the public, especially during budget season. The body also reviews and makes recommendations on proposed amendments to City codes, such as the Building and Fire Codes, providing technical advice to the Board of Supervisors.

DBI and the BIC were created by San Francisco voters in 1994 through Proposition G, which separated the old Bureau of Building Inspection (BBI) from the Department of Public Works (DPW). The ballot measure argued that BBI had become ineffective and too closely tied to DPW, leading to concerns about mismanagement, lack of accountability, and insufficient attention to building safety. To restore public trust, the measure established DBI as an independent department and created the BIC to provide public oversight, ensure accountability, and bring transparency to building code enforcement and permitting. In recent years, however, DBI has faced challenges such as corruption scandals involving senior staff and persistent complaints about slow and unpredictable permitting. Changes were made through Proposition B (June 2022), which shifted DBI leadership appointment powers away from the BIC alone and into a shared system while preserving the BIC's removal power and tightening oversight and seat qualifications.

The Mayor's [Executive Directive 25-01](#), "Permitting Reform," directed staff to "develop and recommend amendments to the City Charter to consider merging key permitting functions into a single department." If carried out, this kind of consolidation could significantly change how commissions oversee permitting and land use, since their roles and responsibilities could shift or be reduced. Given these uncertainties, the Task Force could consider creating flexibility to accommodate restructuring. It may direct staff and the City Attorney's Office to request an update from the Mayor's Office and PermitSF leadership on restructuring and potentially revisit any recommendation for the Building Inspection Commission further along in its process.

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 (4 seats) and Board of Supervisors President (3 seats)	N/A	Mayor	Yes - Advisory
Appointment confirmations	Yes ⁹⁵	None	None ⁹⁶	No
Member removal	For cause	At will	At will	No
Term length	2 years	3 years maximum	4 years	No
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ⁹⁷	3 terms	No
Qualifications	Mayor: 2 seats must be a structural engineer, architect, or residential builder; Board of Supervisors President: 1 seat must be a residential tenant or employee of a non-profit housing organization.	None required ⁹⁸	None required ⁹⁹	Yes - Both
Establishing authority	Charter	Administrative Code	TBD	No
Sunset date	None	3 years	None	Yes – Governance
Hiring and firing authority	Nominate Director of DBI; sole authority to fire Director of DBI	N/A	Consultative responsibilities only	No
Contract approval authority	No	N/A	Retain status quo	Yes – Governance
Budget approval authority	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes – Governance

⁹⁵ Each nomination of the Mayor and the President of the Board of Supervisors is subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors, a public hearing, and vote within 60 days. If the Board fails to act on the nomination within 60 days, the nominee is deemed approved

⁹⁶ 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)

⁹⁷ 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).

⁹⁸ 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.

⁹⁹ See prior note

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?
Employee discipline authority	No	N/A	No role	Yes - Both

Because the future of permitting is uncertain given the recent executive directive, it may not make sense for the Task Force to align the Building Inspection Commission to any template at this time. Alternatively, the Task Force may consider aligning the BIC to either the governance commission or advisory committee template. Regardless, it may be appropriate to move the BIC from the Charter to the Administrative Code to allow for future flexibility.

13. Code Advisory Committee (Department of Building Inspection)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or Eliminate
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> May consider eliminating or combining with the Structural Advisory Committee

Primary Department	DBI	Established	Unknown
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	8 meetings
Policy Area	Building and Permitting	Members (as of May 2025)	17 seats 0 vacancies
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$ 81,100 ¹⁰⁰		

Advises the Building Inspection Commission on building codes, related rules and regulations, and proposed ordinances that may affect construction permits ([Charter § D3.750-5](#), [Charter § 4.121](#), [Building Code § 105A.4](#))

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 ¹⁰¹	
	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 ¹⁰²	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes	Consider eliminating

¹⁰⁰ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁰¹ Building Inspection Commission, Structural Advisory Committee

¹⁰² Building codes

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria support potentially combining the Code Advisory Committee (CAC) with other public bodies that focus on building codes and construction permitting—the Building Inspection Commission (BIC) and Structural Advisory Committee. The Task Force could also decide to eliminate this body altogether. Finally, the Task Force may consider keeping this body, as it provides a level of technical expertise that's currently lacking from BIC. Staff do not issue a recommendation and instead offer considerations for each option.

Option 1: Eliminate

BIC is the governing body for DBI, which is responsible for the enforcement, administration, and interpretation of the City's various building codes.¹⁰³ The CAC exists to advise BIC on these codes, and, by virtue of their seat requirements, CAC members bring a level of expertise that's not currently required for BIC members. The Task Force could consider establishing more detailed membership qualifications for BIC commissioners to reduce the need for a separate advisory body. BIC may also rely more on DBI staff, or engineers working for other City departments, for expertise and advice on proposed ordinances, rules, and regulations related to the City's building codes.

If the Task Force votes to eliminate the CAC from the Charter, BIC or the Chief Building Inspector could convene a passive meeting body in its place.

Option 2: Combine the Code Advisory Committee with the Structural Advisory Committee

The Structural Advisory Committee (SAC) is convened periodically to provide independent expert review on certain proposed construction projects. Potential members are selected from a list of qualified engineers submitted by the Structural Engineers Association of Northern California.

None of the CAC's 17 seats explicitly require structural engineering expertise, however several current members are structural engineers, and the Structural Engineers Association of Northern California may nominate members. It may be possible to combine these two bodies by establishing structural engineering seats on the CAC.

However, the SAC meets infrequently and cost just \$55 to administer last year. Combining these two bodies may be more effort than it's worth.

Option 3: Keep

The CAC includes 17 members of the public who are qualified by training and experience to advise BIC on proposed amendments to building codes, rules and regulations issued by DBI, and proposed ordinances that may have an impact on construction permits.

¹⁰³ San Francisco Building Code, Mechanical Code, Electrical Code, Plumbing Code, Green Building Code and Housing Code

The Board of Supervisors may amend the City's various building codes, and BIC is required to hold public hearings on all proposed amendments. Members of the CAC possess a level of technical expertise in the City's building codes that are not currently required for BIC members or the Board of Supervisors, who are likely to rely on industry experts to provide input on proposed legislation or administrative rules/regulations. The CAC provides a transparent, public forum to gather this input. In the past year, the CAC made 12 recommendations regarding proposed ordinances and 3 recommendations for DBI Administrative Bulletins.¹⁰⁴

Moreover, BIC is a governance body that provides DBI with high-level direction and oversight, and its members may not need to possess highly technical knowledge of building codes in order to govern effectively.

If the Task Force chooses to keep the CAC, it may recommend streamlining operations by eliminating its five subcommittees, which are logistically difficult to manage. The Task Force could either issue a non-binding recommendation in its report or direct the City Attorney to draft an ordinance prohibiting the CAC from establishing subcommittees.

¹⁰⁴ Administrative Bulletins outline rules, guidelines, and procedures to be followed by the DBI staff and other agencies involved in construction permit issuance or building inspection

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; staff to work with DBI to identify 2+ seats for elimination
Appointing authority	Building Inspection Commission	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	3 years	3 years maximum	Yes	
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹⁰⁵	No	Align to template; establish 12-year (4 term) limits if this body is re-authorized
Qualifications	2 licensed architects, 2 civil engineers, 1 mechanical engineer, 1 fire protection engineer, 1 electrical engineer, 3 licensed general contractors, 1 commercial property owner, 1 business representative, 1 historic preservationist, 1 person knowledgeable about disability access regulations, and 3 at-large members	None required ¹⁰⁶	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter, Building Code	Administrative Code	No	Align to template; remove from Charter and Building Code and place in Admin Code. May include a brief cross-reference in Building Code for visibility
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; establish 3-year sunset date

¹⁰⁵ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹⁰⁶ 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 criteria-based outcome is to consider combining or eliminating the Code Advisory Committee. However, if the Task Force chooses to keep the body, it may consider aligning the CAC to the advisory committee template.

In order to align the CAC with the 15-seat maximum for advisory committees, staff can work with DBI to identify at least two seats for elimination. These would likely be at-large seats or other seats that do not require architectural or engineering backgrounds. If the CAC is combined with the Structural Advisory Committee, CAC qualifications should be updated to include structural engineering expertise. Staff may also evaluate how to address potential conflicts of interest wherein CAC members advise on potential legislative changes that may impact their projects.

14. Structural Advisory Committee (Department of Building Inspection)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or Eliminate
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating or combining with other public bodies that focus on building permits

Primary Department	DBI	Established	1995
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	0 – periodic meeting body
Policy Area	Building and Permitting	Members (as of May 2025)	3 seats 0 vacancies
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$55 ¹⁰⁷		

Provides independent expert review to the Director of Building Inspection on the design and construction of buildings with special features or special design procedures ([Charter § D3.750-5](#), [Building Code § 105A.6](#)).

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)?	N/A ¹⁰⁸	
	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)?	N/A	
	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 ¹⁰⁹	
	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	

¹⁰⁷ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁰⁸ This body is only required to meet on an as-needed basis to advise on construction projects with special design features. As a "periodic meeting body" it is exempt from inactive and borderline inactive criteria.

¹⁰⁹ Building Inspection Commission, Code Advisory Committee, Abatement Appeals Board, Access Appeals Board, Board of Examiners

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

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria support potentially combining the Structural Advisory Committee (SAC) with other public bodies that focus on building permits or eliminating this body altogether.

Staff considered a potential consolidation with the Code Advisory Committee. However, combining these two bodies may be more effort than it's worth, since SAC meets infrequently and cost just \$55 to administer last year. For more information, see page 58.

The Task Force should consider eliminating the SAC and removing it from code. It meets very infrequently to provide independent expert review on building permit applications that involve special design features or procedures. A public meeting body subject to Brown Act requirements is likely detrimental to this group's ability to carry out its work. Under the Brown Act, a majority of members (2 out of 3) cannot legally discuss the project they are reviewing except in a properly noticed public meeting. This prohibits any offline collaboration on plan reviews. DBI should instead establish a similar permit peer review process without a public meeting body.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	3	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Department of Building Inspection, project owner (1 seat each and a 3 rd seat jointly appointed)	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	Duration of project review	3 years maximum	Yes	
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹¹⁰	No	None
Qualifications	Qualified engineers selected from a list by the Structural Engineers Association of Northern California	None required ¹¹¹	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter, Building Coe	Administrative Code	No	Align to template; remove from Charter and Building Code and move to Administrative Code. May include a brief cross-reference in Building Code for visibility
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; establish 3-year sunset date

The criteria-based outcome is to consider combining or eliminating the Structural Advisory Committee. However, if the Task Force chooses to keep the body, it may consider aligning the SAC to the advisory committee template.

¹¹⁰ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹¹¹ 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.

Policy Area: Economic Development

15. Airport Commission (Airport)

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

Primary Department	AIR	Established	1970
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	21
Policy Area	Transportation	Members (as of May 2025)	5 seats 0 vacancies

Oversees the construction, management, supervision, maintenance, extension, operation, use and control of all Airport property, as well as the assets under the Commission's jurisdiction. Has exclusive authority to plan and issue revenue bonds for airport-related purposes, subject to Board of Supervisors approval. ([Charter § 4.115](#))

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	
<i>Because the answer to all criteria is "no," the outcome is: consider keeping.</i>			

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria do not provide any reason to eliminate the Airport Commission.

The Airport Commission oversees San Francisco International Airport, which is a City department. The commission primarily acts a policy-making body by establishing the policies governing how the Airport operates, while the Airport Director oversees day-to-day operations. The Airport has a budget of almost \$2 billion and over 1,800 employees (approximately 1,820 FTEs) in FY26. The Airport is also an enterprise department, meaning the majority of its budget comes from earned revenue rather than from the general fund. The Airport Commission also is granted special powers to issue revenue bonds. This means that despite not being legally required, the Airport Commission is necessary in order for the Airport to issue revenue bonds without going to the voters for approval, allowing the Airport to independently manage its long-term capital needs and maintain stable fiscal oversight.

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	No confirmations ¹¹²	No confirmations ¹¹³	Yes	
Member removal	For cause; recall elections	At will	No	No change
Term length	4 years	4 years	Yes	
Term limits	None	3 terms	No	Align to template; add a limit of 3 terms
Qualifications	None	None required ¹¹⁴	Yes	Align to template; require appointing authority to submit information on why a candidate is qualified.
Establishing authority	Charter	TBD	No	None
Sunset date	None	None	Yes	
Hiring and Firing authority	Provide 3 candidates for hiring; sole authority for firing	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 role	No role ¹¹⁵	Yes	

¹¹² Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

¹¹³ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

¹¹⁴ Governance commissions not 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.

¹¹⁵ Exceptions if this is currently required by law

The Airport Commission has special fiduciary responsibilities. The Task Force discussed that public bodies that have these types of responsibilities may need exceptions to the templates in order to help protect them from political influence. For that reason, the Task Force may consider leaving the member removal and hiring and firing authority components as they are. Otherwise, the Task Force should align the Airport Commission to the governance commission template by adding a three-term limit and specifying that the Mayor must submit information on why a candidate is qualified when appointing them. The Task Force will also need to decide whether to keep the Airport Commission in the Charter or move it to the Administrative Code.

16. Board of Directors of the San Francisco Downtown Revitalization and Economic Recovery Financing District (Office of Economic and Workforce Development)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate Legally necessary for the City to pursue downtown revitalization activities

Primary Department	ECN	Established	2025
Current Type	Other	Meetings (CY24)	0
Policy Area	Economic Development	Members (as of May 2025)	0 seats N/A vacancies
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$0		

Responsible for preparing and overseeing a financing plan that directs certain property tax revenues toward major commercial-to-residential conversions and other projects that support downtown’s recovery as of July 2025. Operates under state law as an independent public agency focused solely on financing projects that benefit downtown and the broader city ([Administrative Code § 5.49](#)).

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?	No	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	N/A	
	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)?	N/A	
	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 ¹¹⁶	

¹¹⁶ Single neighborhood: downtown

5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No
<i>Because the answer to all criteria is "no," the outcome is: consider keeping.</i>	

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria do not provide any reason to eliminate the Board of Directors of the San Francisco Downtown Revitalization and Economic Recovery Financing District.

The Board is created pursuant to California Government Code §§ 62450–62458, known as the Downtown Revitalization Law, a new state framework that authorizes cities to establish Downtown Revitalization and Economic Recovery Financing Districts as separate public entities. The law was designed in response to the downtown office vacancy crisis, giving cities—particularly San Francisco—tools to convert underused commercial buildings into housing and to channel the resulting incremental property tax revenue into a public fund. These funds can be used to support critical revitalization projects such as housing, streetscape improvements, and other economic recovery efforts. Developed in the aftermath of the pandemic, the statute reflects the City’s goal of transforming large swaths of vacant office space into homes and creating a safer, more vibrant, 24-hour downtown, financed through revenue generated within the district itself rather than through the general fund.

Although the Board of Directors is not technically mandated by law, it is required once the City elects to establish a financing district in order to pursue downtown revitalization activities. Because the City has chosen to move forward with these activities, the creation of the Board is, in effect, legally necessary.

Furthermore, the legislation establishing the Board of Directors only took effect on July 13, 2025; modifying or eliminating a body created so recently would be premature.

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	President of the Board of Supervisors (3 seats) and the Board of Supervisors (2 seats)	N/A	Mayor	Yes - Advisory
Appointment confirmations	None	None	None ¹¹⁷	Yes - both
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 ¹¹⁸	3 terms	No
Qualifications	BOS President: 3 members of the Board of Supervisors BOS: 2 members of the public	None required ¹¹⁹	None required ¹¹⁵	Yes - both
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	TBD	Yes - Advisory
Sunset date	Once the District stops receiving property tax revenue	3 years	None	No
Hiring and firing authority	No	N/A	Consultative responsibilities only	Yes - Advisory
Contract approval authority	No	N/A	Retain status quo	Yes - Advisory
Budget approval authority	No	N/A	Yes	Yes - Advisory
Employee discipline authority	No	N/A	No role	Yes - Both

¹¹⁷ 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)

¹¹⁸ 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).

¹¹⁹ 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.

73 | Board of Directors of the San Francisco Downtown Revitalization and Economic Recovery Financing District (Office of Economic and Workforce Development) | Policy Area: Economic Development

The Board of Directors of the San Francisco Downtown Revitalization and Economic Recovery Financing District is categorized as an “Other” type of public body, meaning there is no relevant template to align it to. The body could be considered a governing board of a special financing district. Both the governance commission and advisory committee templates are shown for reference, but no changes are recommended. The Board must hold its first meeting by November 10, 2025. Given how new the Board is, the Task Force should not recommend any modifications.

17. Cannabis Oversight Committee (City Administrator's Office)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining or eliminating, but the body is already sunseting in 2027 May consider keeping but modifying as this body performs work no other body could perform

Primary Department	ADM	Established	2018
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	5
Policy Area	Economic Development	Members (as of May 2025)	16 seats 9 vacancies (56%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$29,977 ¹²⁰		

Advises the Board of Supervisors and Mayor on the implementation and enforcement of cannabis laws and regulations ([Admin. Code § 5.38-1](#)).

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)?	Yes ¹²¹	Consider eliminating or combining
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	Yes	Consider modifying
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?	No	
	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 ¹²²	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	

¹²⁰ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹²¹ Seat vacancies: 56%

¹²² Narrow topic: Cannabis

Staff Discussion:

The Task Force should consider keeping but modifying the Cannabis Oversight Committee (COC). The evaluation criteria suggest combining or eliminating the COC, however, this body performs work no other body could perform. The COC brings together seasoned and new industry members to advise the City's elected leaders on how to implement and enforce cannabis laws. The COC uplifts members of the cannabis industry who are verified by the Office of Cannabis as Equity Applicants and Business Owners; these members meet many conditions based on justice involvement for cannabis offenses, income level, SFUSD attendance, and long-term San Francisco residence. Additionally, the Board of Supervisors approved Ordinance [6-25](#) six months ago extending the sunset date of this advisory body from 2025 to 2027, indicating a recent reaffirmation of the body and a sunset date earlier than the three-year advisory committee template.

The Task Force should consider modifying the COC to align with the advisory committee template to resolve its challenges of borderline inactivity. If the COC's membership requirements are pared back, the body would not have the seat vacancy challenges it currently experiences.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	16	15 maximum	No	Remove at least 1 seat
Appointing authority	Board of Supervisors (9 seats), Public Health, Police, Building Inspection, Planning, SFUSD, Fire, and Entertainment Commission	N/A	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 ¹²³	Yes	
Qualifications	Yes - specific qualifications by seat ¹²⁴	None required ¹²⁵	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	1/01/2027	3 years	Yes	

The Task Force may consider aligning the Cannabis Oversight Committee (COC) to the advisory committee template—although given the imminent sunset within months of a potential Task Force ordinance taking effect, it may choose to make no changes.

Downsizing the number of members may assist the COC in reducing its seat vacancy rate; to align with the advisory committee template, the COC should remove at least one seat. The Task Force could consider eliminating Seat 15, which must be held by a person with significant experience in workforce and economic development. The COC may invite workforce and economic development experts to

¹²³ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹²⁴ Seats 1-7 consist of non-voting public agency members: Public Health, Police, Building Inspection, Planning, Fire, Entertainment Commission, and SFUSD. Seats 8-16 consist of Board of Supervisor appointments and include an owner of a cannabis business permitted through the equity program; an operator of the cannabis cultivation, manufacturing, or distribution business with fewer than 20 employees at the time of appointment; 2 representatives of organized labor who work with cannabis business laborers; an owner of cannabis storefront retailer; an Equity Applicant; a subject matter expert on California's cannabis laws and regulations; a person with significant experience in workforce and economic development; a medicinal cannabis patient or consumer who has used cannabis in such a manner for at least five years and has extensively advocated for medicinal cannabis or has been involved implementing and running a Cannabis compassionate use program in compliance with the Compassionate Use Act of 1996.

¹²⁵ 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.

advise on specific matters before the body as needed. The Task Force may also consider eliminating the non-voting member seats, Seats 1-7, since they already do not vote on matters and their staff members attend only as frequently as their schedules allow. These departments may continue to participate in COC meetings as subject matter experts on specific agenda items or may attend as members of the public.

18. Entertainment Commission (City Administrator's Office)**Criteria-based outcome:** Keep**Notes:**

- Criteria provide no reason to eliminate
- Consider assigning appellate functions to Board of Appeals

Primary Department	ADM	Established	2002
Current Type	Regulatory	Meetings (CY24)	18
Policy Area	Economic Development	Members (as of May 2025)	7 seats 0 vacancies (0%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$205,814 ¹²⁶		

Coordinates planning and permitting for cultural, entertainment, athletic, and similar events and venues throughout the City, manages and mediates venue and residential relations, and promotes venues and events for the economic and cultural enrichment of San Francisco ([Charter § 4.117](#) and [Administrative Code Chapter 90](#)).

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?	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 ¹²⁷	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	

¹²⁶ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹²⁷ Narrow topic: Entertainment related permits

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

Staff Discussion:

Evaluation criteria do not provide any reason to eliminate the Entertainment Commission, which serves a unique purpose in the City's economic development landscape: to collaborate with and uplift venues and events to encourage a compliant and rich entertainment scene in the City. The Commission holds a suite of powers and duties. It may issue, condition, suspend, and revoke entertainment-related permits (e.g. sound, event locations). The Commission also mediates disputes between residents and venues in a transparent, public process to ensure a balance between a flourishing entertainment scene and an ideal residential life. It also coordinates City services for major events, like Pride and New Year's Eve. Last but not least, it promotes responsible operation of venues and events with strong safety and harm-reduction policies.

Before the Entertainment Commission's creation, permitting authority rested with the Police Department. The Entertainment Commission was intentionally designed over twenty years ago to remove entertainment permitting from law enforcement and place it into a civilian, public-facing forum that could provide regulatory consistency, professional enforcement, and transparent public mediation between residents, businesses, and City agencies.

The Entertainment Commission currently serves as the appellate body for staff decisions on entertainment permits under Administrative Code § 90.4(a). The Task Force has previously expressed concern about bodies both setting policies and hearing appeals of their own permits, noting that this overlap can blur lines between governance and adjudication. Transferring appeals to the Board of Appeals could promote consistency across City permitting processes and provide greater neutrality, since the Entertainment Commission currently both sets policy and hears appeals of its own permits. Under the current system, appellants effectively receive "two bites at the apple," with the ability to appeal to the Entertainment Commission and then again to the Board of Appeals. Moving all appeals directly to the Board of Appeals could eliminate that duplicative step, which may speed up resolution but would also reduce opportunities for appellants to challenge decisions. On the other hand, leaving the system as-is allows entertainment-related disputes to be resolved by a body with subject-matter expertise, a balanced membership representing industry and community interests, and procedures designed for the unique issues raised by nightlife and entertainment venues.

Possible Application of Governance Commission or Advisory Body 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 (4 seats); Board of Supervisors (3 seats)	N/A	Mayor	Yes – Advisory
Appointment confirmations	Mayoral appointments subject to Board of Supervisors approval with a public hearing and vote within 60 days	None	None ¹²⁸	No
Member removal	For cause	At will	At will	No
Term length	4 years	3 years maximum	4 years	Yes – Governance
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹²⁹	3 terms	No
Qualifications	Neighborhoods, entertainment, urban planning, law enforcement, and public health ¹³⁰	None required ¹³¹	None required ¹³²	Yes – Both
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	N/A	N/A	Retain status quo	Yes - Both

¹²⁸ 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)

¹²⁹ 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).

¹³⁰ Mayoral appointments must include one member representing City neighborhood associations or groups, one member representing entertainment associations or groups, one member representing the urban planning community, and one member representing the law enforcement community. Board of Supervisors appointments must include one member representing City neighborhood associations or groups, one member representing entertainment associations or groups, and one member representing the public health community.

¹³¹ 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.

¹³² See prior note

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?
Budget approval authority	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes – Governance
Employee discipline authority	None	N/A	No role	Yes - Both

The Entertainment Commission is primarily a regulatory body, but there is no template against which the Task Force could align. The Task Force may consider aligning the body to either the governance commission or advisory committee template. Given the Commission's permitting and enforcement authority, it may be more sensibly aligned to the governance commission template to reflect its binding authority over an important area of City regulation. However, it may be appropriate to move the Entertainment Commission from the Charter to the Administrative Code, since its core role is regulatory rather than constitutional in nature, its functions could be modified or consolidated in the future without requiring voter approval, and locating it in the Administrative Code would provide greater flexibility for the City to adapt its permitting and enforcement structures as nightlife and entertainment needs evolve.

19. [Small Business Commission](#) (Office of Economic and Workforce Development)

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

Primary Department	ECN	Established	2003
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	9 meetings
Policy Area	Economic Development	Members (as of May 2025)	7 seats 0 vacancies
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$85,139 ¹³³		

Oversees the Office of Small Business. Makes recommendations to the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and City departments regarding laws and policies that affect small businesses in San Francisco. Reviews and approves Legacy Business Registry applications. ([Charter § 4.134](#), [Admin. Code § 2A.240](#))

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 ¹³⁴	
		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	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?	No	
		5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	N/A	

¹³³ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹³⁴ Historic Preservation Commission (Legacy Businesses)

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria do not provide any reason to eliminate the Small Business Commission. It oversees the Office of Small Business (OSB), which is part of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development that employs 12 staff and has a budget of approximately \$4 million in FY26. In addition to overseeing OSB, the commission formally responds in support or opposition to legislative proposals affecting small businesses. Combining it with another of the City's public bodies is not practical because there is no other body that serves these purposes.

The Commission also serves as the final approval body for Legacy Business Registry applicants, a role which is duplicative with the Historic Preservation Commission. Legacy Businesses are eligible for grants and other financial and business assistance through OSB. Duplicative reviews by both the Small Business Commission and Historic Preservation Commission add approximately two weeks to one month of additional time and process for applicants. The Task Force should consider streamlining reviews and assigning sole responsibility to the Small Business Commission.

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 (4 seats), Board of Supervisors (3 seats)	N/A	Mayor	No
Appointment confirmations	None	None	None ¹³⁵	Yes
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 ¹³⁶	3 terms	No
Qualifications	At least five members shall be owners, operators, or officers of San Francisco small businesses. One member may be a current or former owner, operator, or officer. One member may be a representative of a neighborhood economic development organization or an expert in small business finance.	None required ¹³⁷	None required ¹³²	Yes
Establishing authority	Charter	Administrative Code	TBD	No
Sunset date	None	3 years	None	Yes - Governance
Hiring and firing authority	Yes. The Commission nominates and the Mayor appoints the Department Head; the Commission may remove the Department Head of its own initiative.	N/A	Consultative responsibilities only	No
Contract approval authority	No	N/A	Retain status quo	Yes
Budget approval authority	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes – Governance

¹³⁵ 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)

¹³⁶ 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).

¹³⁷ 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?
Employee discipline authority	No	N/A	No role	Yes

Because most of the Small Business Commission’s work is advisory—such as reviewing legislation, weighing in on regulations, and providing input on small business impacts—the Task Force may consider aligning the Small Business Commission (SBC) to the advisory committee template rather than the governance commission template.

Policy Area: Housing & Community Development

20. Citizens Committee on Community Development (Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or eliminate
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Fulfills a legal requirement, but the City could secure an alternative means of compliance

Primary Department	MYR	Established	2009
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	4
Policy Area	Housing and community development	Members (as of May 2025)	9 seats 3 vacancies (33%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$5,308 ¹³⁸		

Makes recommendations to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors on United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funding allocations and policy matters that are directly related to community development efforts in the City ([Admin. Code § 2A.290](#)).

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?	Yes	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	Yes ¹³⁹	Consider combining or eliminating
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	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	No	
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?	No	
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	

¹³⁸ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹³⁹ Any alternative would require HUD approval

5	Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ¹⁴⁰
		5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No

Staff Discussion:

The Citizens Committee on Community Development (CCCD) has historically fulfilled the City’s citizen participation requirement for certain federal entitlement grants administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), including the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME), Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA), and Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG). The Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) leads the City’s compliance efforts, but multiple departments benefit from these grant dollars.

While HUD requires a Consolidated Plan, a citizen participation plan, and robust public engagement for these programs, it does not specifically require an advisory committee. Instead, HUD regulations under 24 CFR Part 91.105 mandate that cities provide opportunities for public meetings, allow the public to review planning documents, and maintain a formal participation process.

The CCCD was incorporated into San Francisco’s Citizen Participation Plan decades ago and has been in place for roughly 16 years. However, the federal regulations allow MOHCD to amend its participation plan, and eliminating the CCCD would be considered a minor, non-substantial change under federal rules. This means that the City could choose to retire the CCCD and substitute a different public participation process—such as public hearings hosted directly by MOHCD—without jeopardizing federal funding, so long as HUD’s citizen participation requirements continue to be met.

Given this flexibility, the evaluation criteria support eliminating the CCCD. If eliminated, MOHCD should amend its citizen participation plan to outline how the federally required public process will continue, ensuring meaningful opportunities for resident input on the City’s use of HUD entitlement funds.

¹⁴⁰ HUD community development grants

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	9	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Mayor, Board of Supervisors	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	No confirmations	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	For cause	At will	No	Align to template; at-will removal by appointing authority
Term length	2 years	3 years maximum	Yes	Increase to 3 years
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹⁴¹	No	Align to template; establish 4-term limits
Qualifications	Professional expertise in various aspects of community development; ability to reflect and advance the concerns of low-income communities in the City	None required ¹⁴²	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; 3-year sunset

The criteria-based outcome is to potentially eliminate the Citizens Committee on Community Development. However, if the Task Force chooses to keep the body, it should align the CCCD to the advisory committee template by making members removable at-will rather than only for cause, increasing term length from two to three years and adding four-term limits and a sunset date.

¹⁴¹ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹⁴² 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.

21. [Inclusionary Housing Technical Advisory Committee](#) (Controller's Office)

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

Primary Department	CON	Established	2016
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	0
Policy Area	Housing and Community Development	Members (as of May 2025)	8 seats 0 vacancies (0%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$185,645 ¹⁴³		

Reviews the City's regular study of affordable housing requirements to make sure they are financially realistic. Advises City officials on whether developers can meet these obligations while still building new housing ([Administrative Code § 5.29-1](#)).

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 ¹⁴⁴	
	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 ¹⁴⁵	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	Consider keeping

¹⁴³ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁴⁴ This body is only convened every three years for a specific and defined purpose, meaning it is a periodic meeting body. Therefore, it is not considered inactive despite not having met in the last year.

¹⁴⁵ Narrow topic: inclusionary zoning.

Staff Discussion:

The Inclusionary Housing Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) helps the City analyze whether its affordable housing requirements are financially workable for developers. Under San Francisco's inclusionary housing law, new housing projects must set aside a portion of units as affordable or pay fees that support affordable housing elsewhere. Every three years, the City conducts a study to see if these requirements are realistic given construction costs, land values, and neighborhood conditions. The Advisory Committee, made up of experts in housing finance, reviews the study's assumptions and provides advice to the Controller, the Mayor, the Planning Department, and the Board of Supervisors. Its role is to make sure the City's affordable housing policies are grounded in real-world data to enable housing that is both financially feasible and meets community needs.

The evaluation criteria result in a recommendation to consider keeping the Inclusionary Housing Technical Advisory Committee. The TAC supports the goal that the City develop this feasibility analysis through an "inclusive and transparent public process." Members bring diverse expertise in housing development and development finance, adding perspectives that support the creation of a thoughtful and useful analysis. The Committee successfully brings in outside expertise that may otherwise be missing from the report development process that City staff alone may not provide, one of the key purposes of an advisory committee. Furthermore, since the TAC fulfills a unique function, meets only when needed, and has no clear overlap with other advisory bodies, there is no basis for eliminating or combining it.

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	Split appointments; Mayor (4 seats) and Board of Supervisors (4 seats)	N/A	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, add 3-year term lengths.
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹⁴⁶	No	Align to template; add limit of 4 terms.
Qualifications	Experience and expertise in development finance	None required ¹⁴⁷	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	No change

The Inclusionary Housing Technical Advisory Committee does not align to three elements of the advisory committee template. The Task Force should add four-term limits but should not recommend adding a sunset date; this body has a clear mandate to meet every three years for a specific purpose so adding a three-year sunset date does not make sense. The Task Force may consider partially aligning the TAC to the advisory body template by adding term lengths, specifying that the term length is one report cycle.

The Task Force should also recommend an additional code change. The Administrative Code states that “The Advisory Committee shall hold a regular meeting not less than once every four months.” However, this meeting cadence does not make sense given that the Advisory Committee’s sole purpose is to inform the Economic Feasibility Analysis, which occurs every 3 years. The City Attorney’s Office should work with the Controller’s Office to develop language clarifying when the body should meet.

¹⁴⁶ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹⁴⁷ 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.

22. [Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board](#) (Rent Board)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate Consider assigning appellate functions to Board of Appeals

Primary Department	RNT	Established	1979
Current Type	Regulatory	Meetings (CY24)	12 meetings
Policy Area	Housing and Community Development	Members (as of May 2025)	5 seats ¹⁴⁸ 0 vacancies
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$202,247 ¹⁴⁹		

Implements and administers the City's residential rent control ordinance by enacting policies, rules, and regulations as needed. Considers appeals of decisions issued by the Rent Board's Administrative Law Judges. Determines the interest rate on residential security deposits ([Administrative Code § 37.4](#)).

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	
<i>Because the answer to all criteria is "no," the outcome is: consider keeping</i>			

¹⁴⁸ The Rent Board consists of 5 regular members, each of whom have a specific alternate with the same qualifications as the regular member. 1 alternate seat is currently vacant.

¹⁴⁹ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria do not provide any reason to eliminate the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board (Rent Board).

The Rent Board was created in 1979 to address the City's housing crisis. Its core mission is to protect tenants from excessive rent increases and unjust evictions, ensure fair and adequate rents for landlords, promote the preservation of sound and affordable housing, and provide a mechanism for tenant and landlord dispute resolution. The Rent Board oversees a department of the same name with a \$14.5 million budget and approximately 50 employees.

The Rent Board currently acts in both a governance capacity—approving budgets, setting policy, and participating in hiring/firing of the Rent Board's Executive Director—and a regulatory capacity—issuing 127 pages of rules and regulations to implement the San Francisco Rent Ordinance.

The Rent Board also serves an appellate function, deciding 70 appeals in the last year on decisions rendered by Administrative Law Judges (ALJs) from the Rent Board department. The Task Force has previously emphasized that appeals bodies should be independent from the City departments whose decisions they review. The Task Force may consider re-assigning the Rent Board's appellate function to the Board of Appeals in order to create more separation and neutrality. In doing so, the City may obtain a single appeals body related to housing, building, and permitting. If re-assigned, the Board of Appeals may need additional staff to handle the increased appeals workload.

Possible Application of Appeals Board or Governance Commission Templates:

Template component	Current State	Appeals Board Template	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?
Number of Members	5	3-7	5-7	Yes – Both
Appointing authority	Mayor	N/A ¹⁵⁰	Mayor	Yes – Governance
Appointment confirmations	None	N/A	None ¹⁵¹	Yes – Governance
Member removal	At will	Members are “removeable” - removal is not at will but is at a lower threshold than for cause removals. Details TBD.	At will	Yes – Governance
Term length	4 years	4 years	4 years	Yes – Both
Term limits	None	3 terms	3 terms	No – assign term limits
Qualifications	2 landlords, 2 tenants, and 1 person who is neither a landlord nor a tenant and who owns no residential rental property	Qualifications required; determined by authorizing legislation	None required	Yes – Both
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	TBD	TBD	No
Sunset date	None	None; Evaluate workload/purpose every 5 years.	None	Yes – Both
Hiring and firing authority	Yes. The Commission nominates and the Mayor appoints the Executive Director (ED) of the Rent Board; the Commission may remove the ED of its own initiative.	N/A	Consultative responsibilities only	No

¹⁵⁰ Task Force Members determined that no changes should be made to current bodies around appointing authority and appointment confirmations. They deferred decision-making on whether they would recommend an appointing authority and appointment confirmation approach for future bodies.

¹⁵¹ 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)

Template component	Current State	Appeals Board Template	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?
Contract approval authority	No	N/A	Retain status quo	Yes – Both
Budget approval authority	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes – Governance
Employee discipline authority	No	N/A	No role	Yes – Both

The Rent Board Commission currently acts as a governance, regulatory, and appeals body. There is no regulatory template to adhere to, so the Task Force may consider aligning the Rent Board Commission to either the governance commission or appeals board template.

23. SoMa Community Stabilization Fund Community Advisory Committee (Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or Eliminate			
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining with the South of Market Community Planning Advisory Committee (CPAC) or eliminating 			
Primary Department	MYR	Established	2006
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	4
Policy Area	Housing and Community Development	Members (as of May 2025)	7 total seats 2 vacant seats (29%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$11,755 ¹⁵²		

Advises the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), the Board of Supervisors, and other City agencies on the administration and expenditure of the SoMa Community Stabilization Fund and related sources. The Committee makes recommendations on funding priorities for cultural preservation, community improvements, public investments, affordable housing, and jobs-housing linkage programs within the East SoMa, Central SoMa, and Western SoMa Area Plans. It also advises on the use of funds from the 706 Mission Community Development and Open Space Funds, collaborates with City departments to monitor implementation of SoMa area plans, and develops annual recommendations to MOHCD on the Expenditure Plan ([Admin. Code § 5.27](#)).

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)?	Yes	Consider combining or eliminating
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	Yes	Consider modifying
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ¹⁵³	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes	Consider Combining or Eliminating

¹⁵² Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁵³ South of Market Community Planning Advisory Committee

		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 ¹⁵⁴	
		5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes	Consider combining or eliminating

Staff Discussion:

The SoMa Community Stabilization Fund Community Advisory Committee (CAC) was created in 2005, when the Board of Supervisors established the SoMa Community Stabilization Fund through fees on new residential development in the Rincon Hill Area Plan. The Fund was designed to offset the impacts of gentrification and residential growth by supporting affordable housing, cultural preservation, small business stability, and community services in the SoMa neighborhood. The Advisory Committee was established to guide the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) and the Board of Supervisors on how these resources should be allocated, ensuring that community voices shape investments aimed at stabilizing long-term residents and businesses in a rapidly changing neighborhood.

While the City has other public bodies related to development impact fees, this one does more than program funds for infrastructure; the CAC helps decide how development fees are reinvested in the neighborhood by advising on funding for affordable housing, cultural preservation, and community services, in addition to public improvements. The CAC ensures that residents, small businesses, and cultural organizations most affected by the neighborhood’s development have a direct say in how mitigation funds are spent.

The Task Force could consider combining the CAC with the South of Market Community Planning Advisory Committee (CPAC). However, the two bodies serve distinct purposes. The CAC oversees how dedicated funds are spent to prevent displacement, preserve cultural assets, and support affordable housing and workforce stability, while the CPAC focuses on long-term land use and development issues, such as reviewing major projects and prioritizing community improvements. Merging them could risk weakening either planning oversight or community stabilization, though closer coordination between the two could improve alignment where development and community protection intersect.

The Task Force could also consider eliminating the CAC. Membership and participation have been a consistent challenge: the CAC currently has five of seven seats filled, with two vacancies and some relatively inactive current members. The CAC did make recommendations for \$890,000 in FY 2024–25 and about \$2.4 million total across FY 2025–26 and FY 2026–27, but future allocations are expected to be limited, with one final round anticipated unless new revenues are identified. This is because most of the applicable buildable parcels within Rincon Hill have been completed; there is only one more parcel which may generate a fee, and revenue isn’t projected until 2034. Furthermore, the SoMa Fund Ordinance already provides clear guidance on how funds should be allocated, and to strengthen transparency and accountability, MOHCD could establish a public-facing reporting

¹⁵⁴ Single neighborhood: South of Market

mechanism to share the status of the fund and its expenditures with the community. Further, because the nonprofit community representatives who serve on the CAC are likely to be grantees themselves, there may be conflicts of interest when the CAC makes its funding recommendations.

Finally, although the evaluation criteria do not suggest this, the Task Force may choose to keep the CAC. Without a standing committee, there may be less consistency in how community voices are incorporated into funding decisions, and residents could perceive that opportunities for influence are less transparent or equitable. A formal committee provides a guaranteed public forum with defined membership and procedures, whereas staff-led outreach might vary in scope or visibility depending on resources and priorities. When it was initially discussed as a "borderline inactive" body at the Task Force's August 20, 2025 meeting, public commenters from SOMCAN and SOMA Pilipinas emphasized that the CAC ensures community input into how dedicated funds are spent to prevent displacement, preserve affordable housing, and support cultural districts. They stressed that the body plays a trusted role in helping residents influence decisions that directly affect stability and equity in the neighborhood. If the Task Force decides to keep the CAC, it may also wish to reduce the number of seats to address the current 29% vacancy rate; this option is described in more detail on the following page.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	7	15 maximum	Yes	Consider reducing seats from 7 to 5 due to vacancies
Appointing authority	Board of Supervisors	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	No confirmations	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	4 years	3 years maximum	No	Reduce term length from 4 to 3 years
Term limits	2 consecutive terms	Case-by-case ¹⁵⁵	Yes	
Qualifications	Residents and representatives of SoMa with specific expertise or experience ¹⁵⁶	None required ¹⁵⁷	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	2035	3 years	No	Modify to sunset in 3 years

The criteria-based outcome is to potentially eliminate or combine the SoMa Community Stabilization Fund CAC. However, if the Task Force chooses to keep the body, it should align the CAC to the advisory committee template.

While the CAC falls within the advisory committee template maximum of 15 seats, the body also meets the Task Force’s definition of “borderline inactive” because at 29%, its vacancy rate exceeds 25%. Should the Task Force choose to keep the CAC, it may consider reducing the number of seats to address the vacancy rate. However, the body did not cancel any meetings in 2024, indicating that it does not suffer from issues making quorum. Furthermore, Administrative Code section 5.27-2(a) states that “The Board of Supervisors shall appoint one alternate member of the Committee for each of the seats of the seven voting members. An alternate member shall temporarily

¹⁵⁵ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹⁵⁶ Representatives of or expertise with (1) low-income SoMa residents; (2) employment development and/or labor; (3) a senior or disabled SoMa resident; (4) affordable housing expertise and familiarity with the SoMa neighborhood; (5) an arts or cultural organization or a cultural district in SoMa 6) direct service provider to SoMa residents; (7) small business expertise and familiarity with the neighborhood; (8) a youth or representative of a youth-development organization.

¹⁵⁷ 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.

serve on the Committee as a voting member when there is a vacancy in the seat or when the seat is filled but the individual holding the seat is absent from the meeting."

Policy Area: Planning and Land Use

24. [Bayview Hunters Point Community Planning Advisory Committee](#) (Planning Department)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or Eliminate
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating due to high vacancies and overlap with other public bodies

Primary Department	CPC	Established	2013
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	7
Policy Area	Planning and Land Use	Members (as of May 2025)	12 total seats 6 vacant seats (50%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$ 15,005 ¹⁵⁸		

Advises the City on planning and land use policy for Zone 2 and Survey Area C of the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area ([Admin. Code § 5.71](#)).

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)?	Yes	Consider combining or eliminating
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	Yes	Consider modifying
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ¹⁵⁹	
	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	

¹⁵⁸ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁵⁹ Planning Commission

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

Yes

Consider combining or eliminating

Staff Discussion:

The Bayview Hunters Point Citizens Advisory Committee (Bayview CAC) was created in 2013 after the dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency to provide policy advice on land use matters and community guidance on whether development projects furthered General Plan policies. At the time, it was intended to carry forward the role of Redevelopment Project Area Committees and provide a structured community voice during a period of uncertainty. Keeping the body could ensure that residents of Bayview Hunters Point—a neighborhood that has experienced long-term disinvestment—continue to have a formal forum to voice concerns, particularly on projects with significant community impacts. For many, the existence of a committee dedicated to Bayview signals a commitment to equity and engagement in an area historically overlooked in City decision-making.

On the other hand, the Bayview CAC has struggled with effectiveness and relevance. It met only four times in the past year, often failed to reach quorum due to inconsistent membership and vacancies, and its recommendations have limited weight since the Planning Commission and other bodies already review the same projects with actual approval authority. Public participation has been minimal, with most meetings drawing no or only a handful of comments. Moreover, its jurisdiction overlaps with other committees and commissions, such as the OCII Hunters Point CAC, the SFPUC CAC, the Planning Commission, and the Historic Preservation Commission, creating duplicative processes without producing measurable outcomes. However, none of these are suitable for the CAC to be combined with, given their much broader mandates.

In weighing whether to keep or eliminate the Bayview CAC, the Task Force should consider whether resources are better spent on alternative, more effective forms of community engagement in Bayview Hunters Point. While maintaining a formal advisory body may carry symbolic importance for community representation, the evidence suggests it has not been successful at influencing policy or ensuring robust participation, raising the question of whether its function could be better met through enhanced outreach and engagement strategies led by staff.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	12	15 maximum	Yes	Consider reducing seats to address quorum issues
Appointing authority	Mayor (4 seats), District 10 Supervisors (4 seats), and City Administrator (4 seats)	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 ¹⁶⁰	No	Align to template; add 6-term limit
Qualifications	Items such as volunteer commitment, land use/urban planning expertise, and community or residency ties ¹⁶¹	None required ¹⁶²	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; add a 3-year sunset date

The criteria-based outcome is to potentially eliminate the Bayview CAC. However, if the Task Force chooses to keep the body, it should align the CAC to the Advisory Committee template by adding term limits and a sunset date. While outside the scope of the template, the City Administrator should be removed as an appointing authority, because the office's work does not overlap with planning or land use.

¹⁶⁰ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹⁶¹ Members must be able to volunteer at least 10 hours per week and bring experience in areas such as City boards or commissions, land use policies, zoning, architecture, engineering, construction, historic preservation, public art, transportation, planning, or affordable housing. Non-voting members must have professional expertise or training in fields like architecture, land use, or urban planning. All members must also meet residency or community criteria, such as living in the project area, owning property or a business in San Francisco, representing a neighborhood group, or being a San Francisco resident with experience in architecture, planning, or land use.

¹⁶² 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.

25. [Historic Preservation Commission](#) (Planning Department)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or Eliminate			
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining with the Planning Commission and/or transferring the function to preservation planners within the Planning Department 			
Primary Department	CPC	Established	2008 ¹⁶³
Current Type	Regulatory	Meetings (CY24)	16
Policy Area	Planning and Land Use	Members (as of May 2025)	7 seats 0 vacancies
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$330,754 ¹⁶⁴		

Advises the city on historic preservation matters, including the approval, disapproval, or modification of landmark designations and historic district designations. Reviews and approves changes to designated historic buildings and districts, including major alterations and agreements that encourage the preservation and rehabilitation of historic properties ([Charter § 4.135](#)).

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 ¹⁶⁵	
	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 ¹⁶⁶	

¹⁶³ The Historic Preservation Commission was established by Proposition J in November 2008. It replaced the Landmark Advisory Board, which was first established in 1967 with the adoption of Article 10 of the Planning Code.

¹⁶⁴ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁶⁵ Planning Commission, Small Business Commission (Legacy Businesses)

¹⁶⁶ Historic preservation

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

Yes

Consider combining or eliminating

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria support potentially eliminating the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) or consolidating its core functions with the Planning Commission.

Across the U.S., some jurisdictions maintain stand-alone preservation commissions with decision-making authority, while others assign preservation responsibilities to commissions embedded within planning departments, or handle them directly through planning commissions or staff without a separate appointed body. This range of approaches suggests that if San Francisco eliminated the HPC, consolidating its functions under the Planning Commission or Planning Department staff would be consistent with models used elsewhere.

The HPC has the authority to approve certain permit applications¹⁶⁷ and to refer some historic preservation matters directly to the Board of Supervisors for approval.¹⁶⁸ The HPC also provides guidance to Planning Department staff, the Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors on the City's General Plan, California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) reviews, proposed ordinances, and other topics. Should the Task Force choose to eliminate this body, these duties would need to be re-assigned to the Planning Commission or Planning Department staff.

It seems plausible that the Planning Department and Planning Commission could review permit applications and address other historic preservation matters currently overseen by the HPC. The Planning Department already employs approximately 12 preservation planners. While the Planning Commission does not require any of its members to have experience in historic preservation, the Task Force could consider adding historic preservationist seats to the Planning Commission if it chooses to eliminate the Historic Preservation Commission. Historic preservation plays an important role in maintaining the City's cultural identity, protecting architectural resources, and ensuring that growth and change do not erase valued community landmarks. Any restructuring of the HPC should continue to safeguard these goals, even if the responsibility is reassigned to another body.

If the Task Force chooses to maintain the HPC, staff recommend it retain decision-making authority. The HPC was established in 2008 to replace the former Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (Landmarks Board) to streamline permitting and improve efficiency. Previously, certain permit applications were heard by the Landmarks Board, then forwarded to the Planning Commission for a final hearing and decision. Landmark/historic district designations were heard by the Landmarks Board, heard again by the Planning Commission, then forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for a final hearing and decision. The HPC was vested with decision-making authority for permit applications, and the ability to directly forward landmark/historic district designations to the Board of Supervisors, thus reducing the number of rounds of review for permit applications and

¹⁶⁷ HPC may approve, disapprove, or modify Certificates of Appropriateness and Major Permits to Alter

¹⁶⁸ HPC may recommend approval, disapproval, or modification of landmark designations, historic district designations, Mills Act Contracts, Significant or Contributory Building and Conservation District designations, to the Board of Supervisors without referral or recommendation from the Planning Commission.

landmark/historic district designations. Maintaining HPC as an advisory body would re-introduce an additional round of review, which is contrary to the intent of commission streamlining.

The Task Force may also choose to keep the HPC but remove its role in Legacy Business Registry review. Currently, the HPC provides an initial review of legacy business applications before they are forwarded to the Small Business Commission for final review and approval. Eliminating HPC review would streamline the process for small business applicants. The HPC's core focus is on the preservation of physical resources (buildings, districts, structures), not business operations.

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	Appointments are effective on the date the Board of Supervisors adopt a motion to approve the nomination or 60 days after the nomination is sent to the clerk of the Board of Supervisors; the Board of Supervisors may hold a public hearing and vote on the nomination within 60 days of the nomination being sent to the Board.	No confirmations	No	Align to template; no confirmations
Member removal	For cause	At will	No	Align to template; at will removal
Term length	4 years	3 years maximum	No	Align to template; 3-year terms
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹⁶⁹	No	Align to template; 4-term limits
Qualifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seats 1 and 2 - licensed architects with expertise in historic architecture • Seat 3 - architectural historian • Seat 4 - historian with expertise in North American or Bay Area history • Seat 5 - historic preservation professional • Seat 6 – meets seats 1-3 qualifications or is an archeologist, real estate professional, structural engineer, or conservationist • Seat 7 - at-large seat 	None required ¹⁷⁰	Yes	<p><u>Option 1:</u> Modify seat requirements to become desirable professional qualifications.</p> <p><u>Option 2:</u> Retain 4 seats with more general professional qualifications (e.g., any of the professions currently named in seats 1-6) and establish 3 at-large seats.</p>

¹⁶⁹ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹⁷⁰ 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	Charter	Administrative Code	No	Align to template; move to Administrative Code
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; 3 year sunset

The HPC is currently a regulatory body with decision-making authority, however there is no Regulatory Body template to adhere to. If the Task Force chooses to keep the HPC, it may consider aligning or partially aligning this body to the Advisory Committee template.

The Task Force should also consider adjusting the HPC's stringent seat qualifications, which shrink the pool of qualified applicants and make it difficult to fill seats.¹⁷¹ Currently, seats 1-6 each require specific professional experience and/or certifications in fields related to historic preservation. The proposal includes two options for broadening these requirements. First, the Task Force could make the professional requirements for seats 1-6 desired qualifications, rather than mandatory qualifications. This would create additional flexibility for the Mayor to appoint qualified applicants to any seat but would retain a list of desirable characteristics for the Mayor to consider. Second, the Task Force could create 4 seats with broad professional qualifications and 3 at-large seats. The broad professional qualifications could allow the Mayor to appoint any person who meets any of the qualifications currently listed as seat requirements:

- A licensed architect meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for historic architecture;
- An architectural historian meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for architectural history with specialized training and/or demonstrable experience in North American or Bay Area architectural history;
- An historian meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for history with specialized training and/or demonstrable experience in North American or Bay Area history;
- An historic preservation professional or professional in a field such as law, land use, community planning or urban design with specialized training and/or demonstrable experience in historic preservation or historic preservation planning;
- A professional archeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Archeology;
- A real estate professional or contractor who has demonstrated a special interest, competence, experience, and knowledge in historic preservation;
- A licensed structural engineer with at least four years of experience in seismic and structural engineering principals applied to historic structures; or
- A person with training and professional experience with materials conservation.

¹⁷¹ HPC's seat qualifications are among the most specific in the City. The City once faced a lawsuit challenging whether an HPC member met the seat requirements

26. Interagency Planning and Implementation Committee (Planning Department)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate, but it should be Can be a staff working group passive meeting body and deleted from code to align with current practices

Primary Department	CPC	Established	2009
Current Type	Staff Working Group	Meetings (CY24)	6
Policy Area	Planning and Land Use	Members (as of May 2025)	9 seats 0 vacancies
Annual Cost (FY25)	N/A ¹⁷²		

Prioritizes expenditures of development impact fees collected from eleven Area Plans, which guide long-term growth and, taken together, are expected to have created 44,500 housing units and 60,000 jobs over the next twenty to twenty-five years from plan adoption. Coordinates across City agencies to fund the infrastructure and public improvements (such as parks and streetscape upgrades) needed to support this growth ([Administrative Code § 36.3](#)).

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 ¹⁷³	
	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	

¹⁷² Costs for this body were not reported in the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁷³ Planning 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
	Because the answer to all criteria is "no," the outcome is: consider keeping.		

Staff Discussion:

As a body, the Interagency Planning and Implementation Committee (IPIC) is responsible for overseeing the implementation of eleven Area Plans, where growth from new housing and jobs is planned. IPIC is comprised of representatives of the City agencies that are responsible for providing the community improvements as outlined in those Area Plans, such as the Municipal Transportation Agency, Public Works, and Recreation and Parks.

In practice, IPIC functions as a staff working group and has not operated as a public meeting body. Despite what the evaluation criteria suggest, IPIC should be deleted from the Administrative Code so that staff may continue to collaborate without being subject to Brown Act requirements.

At its September 17, 2025 meeting, the Commission Streamlining Task Force recommended removing other interdepartmental coordination groups, such as the Committee for Utility Liaison on Construction and Other Projects (CULCOP) and the Municipal Green Building Task Force, from the Administrative Code and reconstituting them as passive meeting bodies. The Task Force reasoned that coordination work can continue without the full obligations of the Brown Act, which some groups have struggled to meet. For similar reasons, the Task Force may elect to apply this approach to IPIC, preserving its coordinating function while reducing administrative burden and legal risk. IPIC staff should continue publishing annual reports and other public materials to ensure transparency and accessibility of their work.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	9	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	CPC, DPW, MTA, RPD, SFCTA, OPF, DEC ¹⁷⁴	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	N/A	At will	N/A	
Term length	None	3 years maximum	No	N/A – not applicable to a staff working group
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹⁷⁵	No	N/A – not applicable to a staff working group
Qualifications	Employees of nominating departments	None required ¹⁷⁶	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; establish 3-year sunset date

The Task Force should consider eliminating IPIC from code. However, if the Task Force chooses to keep the body, the Task Force should not align it to a template, since there is no staff working group template. The table above shows IPIC in comparison to the Advisory Committee template.

¹⁷⁴ City Planning, Department of Public Works, Municipal Transportation Agency, Recreation and Parks Department, San Francisco County Transit Authority, Office of Public Finance, Department of Early Childhood

¹⁷⁵ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹⁷⁶ 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.

27. Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee (Planning Department)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or Eliminate	
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining with other public bodies focused on planning/land use or eliminating 	

Primary Department	CPC	Established	2008
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	4
Policy Area	Planning and Land Use	Members (as of May 2025)	9 seats 0 vacancies
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$ 13,589 ¹⁷⁷		

Provides advice to the Planning Director, the Interagency Plan Implementation Committee, the Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors regarding implementation of the Market/Octavia Area Plan and the plan's community improvements ([Planning Code § 341.5](#); [Board of Supervisors Res. No. 474-08](#)).

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 ¹⁷⁸	
	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 ¹⁷⁹	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes	Consider Eliminating

¹⁷⁷ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁷⁸ Planning Commission, Interagency Plan Implementation Committee

¹⁷⁹ Market and Octavia Area Plan

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria support potentially combining the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee with other public bodies focused on planning and land use or eliminating it altogether.

Combining the Market and Octavia Advisory Committee does not make sense, as the Planning Commission has a much broader mandate and the Interagency Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC) is a staff working group. However, eliminating the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee seems reasonable, since the Planning Commission and IPIC already implement and provide oversight for the City's various Area Plans, including the Market and Octavia Area Plan. If this body is eliminated, the Planning Commission should continue to gather community input from residents about the implementation of the Market and Octavia Area Plan.

A parallel effort to sunset this body is currently underway at the Board of Supervisors. In June, draft [legislation](#) was introduced which would sunset this body six months after the ordinance becomes effective. In July, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the proposed legislation with modifications, and it was passed on first reading at the September 16th Board of Supervisors meeting. The Task Force should continue to monitor the status of this body and may wish to offer a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors if the legislation is not passed.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	9	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Mayor and Board of Supervisors	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 ¹⁸⁰	No	Align to template; institute 12-year (6 term) limits if re-authorized
Qualifications	Must live within the Market and Octavia plan area.	None required ¹⁸¹	Yes	
Establishing authority	Planning Code, Board of Supervisors Resolution	Administrative Code	No	Align to template; move from Planning Code to Administrative Code. May maintain a brief cross-reference in Planning Code for visibility
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; 3-year sunset date

If the Task Force decides to keep the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee, it should be aligned to the Advisory Committee template by instituting term limits, moving its establishing authority from the Planning Code to the Administrative Code, and adding a 3-year sunset date.

¹⁸⁰ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹⁸¹ 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.

28. [Planning Commission](#) (Planning Department)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest keeping and potentially absorbing other commissions

Primary Department	CPC	Established	1929
Current Type	Governance (with Regulatory functions)	Meetings (CY24)	35
Policy Area	Planning and Land Use	Members (as of May 2025)	7 seats 0 vacancies (0%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$1,223,842 ¹⁸²		

Oversees the Planning Department. Reviews all proposed amendments to the Planning Code, periodically recommends amendments to the City's General Plan to the Board of Supervisors, and provides findings regarding consistency with the General Plan before the Board may act on certain matters. Has review authority over most land use entitlements regulated by the Planning Code, although the Commission may delegate this review function to Department staff ([Charter § 4.105](#)).

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 ¹⁸³	
	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 ¹⁸⁴	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	

¹⁸² Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁸³ Planning Commissions are not legally required, but are expressly authorized by State law (Cal Gov Code 65100 et seq.)

¹⁸⁴ Bayview Hunters Point CAC, Historic Preservation Commission, Interagency Planning and Implementation Committee, Market and Octavia CAC, SOMA Community Planning Advisory Committee.

	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	
<i>Because the answer to all criteria is "no," the outcome is: consider keeping.</i>			

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria provide no reason for eliminating the Planning Commission and suggest that the Task Force should potentially expand its scope. The Commission oversees the Planning Department, which has a budget of \$58 million and over 150 employees (FTEs) for FY26, but the Commission's primary role is more regulatory than governance.

Planning Commissions are a fundamental part of City governance that allow for public input and transparent decision-making on land use decisions and policy. San Francisco's Planning Commission meets weekly, and meetings include reviewing and approving legislative amendments, conditional use authorizations, office allocations, large project authorizations, general plan amendments, area plans, development agreements and hearing informational items. Initially, the Planning Commission reviewed and approved all permit applications, but as development activity and the volume of permits increased, the Department now reviews most permits.

The Planning Commission pre-dates the Planning Department; it was established in the Charter nearly 100 years ago. As a result, both the Charter and Planning Code give the Planning Commission broad powers that are not fully aligned with how other City departments and their governing bodies are structured. The Planning Commission's mandate has not updated to reflect the growth and evolution of San Francisco government over the past century.

The City is making permit streamlining a priority. The Mayor's [Executive Directive 25-01](#), "Permitting Reform," directs staff to "develop and recommend amendments to the City Charter to consider merging key permitting functions into a single department." Such departmental consolidation would have a significant impact on the relevant commissions. If carried out, this kind of consolidation would significantly change how commissions oversee permitting and land use, since their roles and responsibilities could shift or even be reduced. Because of this, any recommendation from the Task Force regarding the Planning Commission should reflect the latest considerations stemming from the directive to the extent information is available. Accordingly, the Task Force should recommend that staff and the City Attorney's Office request an update from the Mayor's Office and PermitSF leadership to ensure that the Task Force's work is informed by those developments.

While the evaluation criteria suggest expanding the Commission's scope, the Task Force may want to consider its scope more holistically, by evaluating which functions and responsibilities should remain with the Department, and whether the Planning Commission should absorb functions of the Historic Preservation Commission and various community advisory committees.

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	Split appointments: 4 Mayoral and 3 Board of Supervisors appointees.	Mayor	No	Align to template; Mayor is the only appointing authority.
Appointment confirmations	Yes ¹⁸⁵	No confirmations ¹⁸⁶	No	Align to template; no confirmations but allow Board to reject with 2/3 majority.
Member removal	For cause	At will	No	Align to template; each authority may remove their own appointees at will.
Term length	4 years	4 years	Yes	
Term limits	None	3 terms	No	Align to template; add 3-term limits.
Qualifications	None	None required ¹⁸⁷	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter	TBD	TBD	No change; keep in Charter
Sunset date	None	None	Yes	
Hiring and Firing Authority	Yes; nominates 3 candidates for hiring, has sole firing authority.	Consultative responsibilities only	No	Align to template; remove hiring and firing authority from Commission.
Contract approval authority	Approves very few contracts, 1-2 per year.	Retain status quo	Yes	
Budget approval authority	Yes	Yes	Yes	

¹⁸⁵ Per the Charter: each nomination of the Mayor and the President of the Board of Supervisors is subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors, and shall be the subject of a public hearing and vote within 60 days. If the Board fails to act on the nomination within 60 days of the date the nomination is transmitted to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, the nominee shall be deemed approved. The appointment shall become effective on the date the Board adopts a motion approving the nomination or after 60 days of the date the nomination is transmitted to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

¹⁸⁶ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

¹⁸⁷ Governance commissions not 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	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Employee discipline authority	None	No role ¹⁸⁸	Yes	

The Task Force should recommend aligning the Planning Commission to the governance commission template by having the Mayor be the sole appointing authority for all members, aligning appointment confirmations to Charter § 3.100.18, adding three-term limits for appointees, and removing hiring and firing authority.

¹⁸⁸ Exceptions if this is currently required by law

29. South of Market Community Planning Advisory Committee (Planning Department)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or Eliminate
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining with the SoMa Community Stabilization Fund Community Advisory Committee (CAC) or eliminating

Primary Department	CPC	Established	2019
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	4
Policy Area	Planning and Land Use	Members (as of May 2025)	11 total seats 4 vacant seats (36%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$13,589 ¹⁸⁹		

Provides residents, workers, and community stakeholders a direct role in advising City officials on managing growth in the Central SoMa, Western SoMa, and East SoMa Area Plans. Reviews development proposals, recommends priorities for public improvements funded through impact fees and community facilities districts, and helps monitor implementation of the SoMa area plans over time ([Admin. Code § 5.26](#)).

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)?	Yes	Consider combining or eliminating
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	Yes	Consider modifying
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ¹⁹⁰	
	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?	N/A	

¹⁸⁹ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁹⁰ SoMa Community Stabilization Fund Community Advisory Committee, Interagency Planning and Implementation Committee; Planning Commission

5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ¹⁹¹	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes	Consider combining or eliminating

Staff Discussion:

The South of Market Community Planning Advisory Committee (CPAC) was established in 2019 as part of the City’s broader implementation of the Central SoMa, Western SoMa, and East SoMa Area Plans. It was created to give residents, workers, and community stakeholders a direct role in advising City officials on how growth in these plan areas should be managed. The Committee reviews development proposals, recommends priorities for public improvements funded through impact fees and community facilities districts, and helps monitor implementation of the SoMa area plans over time. By bringing together voices representing small business, affordable housing, labor, cultural preservation, and social services, the Committee was intended to ensure that large-scale development in SoMa is balanced with investments that reflect community needs and protect neighborhood character.

The Task Force could consider combining the CPAC with the SoMa Community Stabilization Fund Community Advisory Committee (CAC). However, the two bodies serve distinct purposes. The CPAC focuses on long-term land use and development issues, such as reviewing major projects and prioritizing community improvements, while the CAC oversees how dedicated funds are spent to prevent displacement, preserve cultural assets, and support affordable housing and workforce stability. Merging them could risk weakening either planning oversight or community stabilization, though closer coordination between the two could improve alignment where development and community protection intersect.

The Task Force could also consider eliminating the CPAC, which may streamline processes by allowing staff to conduct outreach and gather community input directly, without the administrative burden of maintaining a formal body. This could give staff more flexibility in designing engagement tailored to specific projects or needs and reduce duplication with other committees. However, without a standing committee, there may be less consistency in how community voices are included, and residents could perceive that opportunities for influence are less transparent or less equitable. A formal committee provides a guaranteed public forum with defined membership and procedures, whereas staff-led outreach might vary in scope or visibility depending on resources and priorities.

Finally, although the evaluation criteria do not suggest this, the Task Force may choose to keep the CPAC, which was created only six years ago as part of a rezoning process. When it was initially discussed as a “borderline inactive” body at the Task Force’s August 20, 2025 meeting, public commenters from SOMCAN and SOMA Pilipinas emphasized that CPAC provides a vital forum for SoMa residents to weigh in on planning and rezoning decisions. They noted that eliminating the committee would remove an important avenue for community voices in shaping land use, development, and neighborhood priorities. If the Task Force decides to keep the CPAC, it may also

¹⁹¹ Single neighborhood: SoMa

wish to reduce the number of seats to address the current 36% vacancy rate, and option which is described in more detail on the following page.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	11	15 maximum	Yes	Consider reducing seats
Appointing authority	Mayor (4 seats) and Board of Supervisors ¹⁹² (7 seats)	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	3 years	3 years maximum	Yes	
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹⁹³	No	Add 4-term limits
Qualifications	Small business, infrastructure/safety, cultural preservation, affordable housing, social services, parks/open space, labor/employment expertise, plus general community members ¹⁹⁴	None required ¹⁹⁵	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	2035	3 years	No	Modify to sunset in 3 years

While the SoMa CPAC falls within the Advisory Committee template maximum of 15 seats, the body also meets the Task Force’s definition of “borderline inactive” because at 36%, its vacancy rate exceeds 25%. Should the Task Force choose to keep the CPAC, it may consider reducing the number of seats to address the vacancy rate. However, the body did not cancel any meetings in 2024, indicating that it does not suffer from issues making quorum.

¹⁹² Nominated by the District 6 Supervisor and appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

¹⁹³ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹⁹⁴ Expertise in small business, pedestrian and transit safety, historic or cultural preservation, affordable housing development, and direct social services for SoMa residents. One seat is reserved for someone with a record of advocacy for parks, recreation, or open space, and another for someone with labor or workforce development experience. Several seats have no special qualifications. Each seat is required to have an alternate member who can step in if the primary member is absent or the seat is vacant.

¹⁹⁵ 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.

Policy Area: Workforce Development

30. Committee on City Workforce Alignment (Office of Economic and Workforce Development)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate Could be a staff working group passive meeting body and deleted from code

Primary Department	ECN	Established	2022
Current Type	Staff Working Group	Meetings (CY24)	4
Policy Area	Workforce Development	Members (as of May 2025)	17 seats 1 vacancy (6%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$275,108 ¹⁹⁶		

Brings together City department heads, nonprofit executives, and labor leaders to better coordinate workforce development services across City departments and increase service effectiveness through methods such as program evaluation and deduplication of client data. Will establish a shared approach to workforce development services that leads to measurable system success ([Administrative Code § 30.5](#)).

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 ¹⁹⁷	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	

¹⁹⁶ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁹⁷ Workforce Investment 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?
		5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?
<i>Because the answer to all criteria is "no," the outcome is: consider keeping</i>		

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria do not provide any reason to eliminate the Committee on City Workforce Alignment, which was established to coordinate workforce development programs across multiple departments and funding streams, filling a system-level role. Eliminating or combining it could risk leaving gaps in citywide workforce planning and oversight. At the same time, the Committee is relatively new, and some of its coordination functions could likely be carried out by staff in consultation with relevant stakeholders, leaving open the question of whether a separate body is necessary.

In the past, the Workforce Investment San Francisco (WISF) board took on this citywide role in addition to its federally required responsibilities. That structure proved unworkable: WISF is best suited to focus on overseeing federal workforce funding, which represent only a small share of overall resources, while the broader \$200 million citywide workforce system requires a separate body to ensure coordination, avoid duplication, and guide strategy across departments. The Alignment Committee was created three years ago to fill that gap and provide the oversight and coordination WISF could not manage well.

At its September 17, 2025 meeting, the Commission Streamlining Task Force recommended removing other interdepartmental coordination groups, such as the Committee for Utility Liaison on Construction and Other Projects (CULCOP) and the Municipal Green Building Task Force, from the Administrative Code and reconstituting them as passive meeting bodies. The Task Force reasoned that coordination work can continue without the formal obligations imposed by the Brown Act, which some groups have struggled to meet. For similar reasons, the Task Force may elect to apply this approach to the Committee on City Workforce Alignment, preserving its coordinating function while reducing administrative burden and legal risk.

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 by 2 seats
Appointing authority	Mayor (3 seats); Board of Supervisors (3 seats); various City departments (11 seats) ¹⁹⁸	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	3 years	3 years maximum	Yes	
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹⁹⁹	No	Align to template; incorporate term limits for public seats
Qualifications	In addition to the 11 City employees, 6 public members must be nonprofit workforce providers or experienced labor representatives ²⁰⁰	None required ²⁰¹	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	No	3 years	No	Align to template; add a 3-year sunset date

¹⁹⁸ Board of Supervisors or another City employee; Office of Economic and Workforce Development; Human Rights Commission; Human Services Agency; Department of Children, Youth and Their Families; Public Utilities Commission; Human Resources; Public Health; Public Works; Homelessness and Supportive Housing; Adult Probation

¹⁹⁹ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

²⁰⁰ Four seats are filled by nonprofit representatives providing workforce development services to low-income residents and those with barriers to employment, while the two remaining public seats are filled by labor representatives with leadership experience and expertise in workforce development systems, policies, and apprenticeship programs,

²⁰¹ 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 Committee on City Workforce Alignment is a hybrid Staff Working Group and Advisory Committee body. The table above shows the Committee in comparison to the Advisory Committee template for the Task Force's consideration, since there is no Staff Working Group template.

The Committee currently has 17 seats, while the Advisory Committee template maximum is 15 seats. The Task Force should direct staff to work with the Office of Economic and Workforce Development on which two seats are least useful. It may be that one or two of the 11 City departments is not necessary. Otherwise, the body could be reduced from four to three non-profit representatives and from two to one labor representatives. Alternatively, the Task Force may elect to grant an exception for the Committee and make no changes to the number of seats.

Term limits for the public seats should be added to ensure broad participation over time and give more nonprofits and labor representatives a chance to engage.

Finally, while workforce development is an ongoing need, the Committee should have a sunset date to ensure it remains effective and to allow the Board of Supervisors and the public to review its progress and make adjustments if necessary.

31. [Workforce Investment Board](#) (Office of Economic and Workforce Development)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legally required to exist

Primary Department	ECN	Established	2007
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	4
Policy Area	Workforce Development	Members (as of May 2025)	Unlimited seats; currently 28 are filled. Vacancies are not applicable.
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$ 94,677 ²⁰²		

Oversees San Francisco's workforce development strategies and receives and manages the City's federal funding through the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) (Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, 29 U.S.C. § 3101 et seq., California Unemployment Insurance Code § 14200 et seq., [San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 30](#)).

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	N/A
	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	N/A
	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 ²⁰³	No
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	No	

²⁰² Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

²⁰³ Committee on City Workforce Alignment

5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	N/A
<i>Because the answer to all criteria is "no," the outcome is: consider keeping</i>	

Staff Discussion:

Federal Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) funding requires every local area to have a workforce development board specifically to oversee federal funding. San Francisco's Workforce Investment Board is known as Workforce Investment SF, or WISF. Its functions cannot be transferred to another board or commission. Thus, the Task Force must keep WISF.

As described in the Committee on City Workforce Alignment, approximately fifteen years ago, WISF included a citywide role in addition to its federally required responsibilities. That structure proved unworkable: WISF is best suited to focus on overseeing federal workforce funding, which represents only a small share of overall resources, while the broader \$200 million citywide workforce system should be handled separately.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	Indefinite quantity; 28 filled seats	15 maximum	No	Align to template; remove 11 members
Appointing authority	Mayor	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	Board of Supervisors has 30 days to reject ²⁰⁴	No confirmations	No	Align to template; remove BOS opportunity to reject Mayoral appointees
Member removal	By 2/3 vote of members ²⁰⁵	At will	No	No recommendation – Task Force to discuss
Term length	2 years	3 years maximum	Yes	
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ²⁰⁶	No	Align to template; add 6-term limits
Qualifications	Federally mandated to ensure a mix of business, labor, education, and community representatives	None required ²⁰⁷	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Do not align to template; federally required

The Workforce Investment Board is an Advisory Committee with 28 members, almost twice the maximum recommended by the Task Force's Advisory Committee template. The Task Force should direct staff to confer with the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) about how well WISF currently operates and whether reducing the number of seats might make the body more effective. Unlike most commissions, WISF's seats are not set in the Administrative Code, so a maximum number of seats would need to be added there to

²⁰⁴ Prior to making any appointments to the WISF, the Mayor shall submit the name of each nominee to the Board of Supervisors. Unless BOS disapproves a nominee within 30 days after receipt of the Notice of Appointment, the appointment shall become final. The Mayor need not submit WISF nominees to the BOS for approval if the Mayor appoints two members of BOS to the WISF, which has been the common practice.

²⁰⁵ Per bylaws section 4.10: Any Member may be recommended for removal from membership by a vote of two-thirds of the Members present and voting

²⁰⁶ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

²⁰⁷ 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.

make this change effective. Based on the federal [Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act Section 107\(b\)](#), Local Workforce Development Boards must contain a minimum of 17 members. OEWD appreciates having a broad cross-section of business and labor representation.

The Task Force should also remove the Board of Supervisors' ability to reject mayoral appointees and establish term limits for members.

Currently, member removal is governed by WISF's bylaws. The Task Force may choose to ask WISF to amend its bylaws, add removal language into the Administrative Code, or leave the current system in place.

Finally, because WISF is federally required, a sunset date is not appropriate. An exception to the Advisory Committee template should be made for this body.