



Commission Streamlining Task Force
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Second Draft: Commission Streamlining Task Force Final Report

Recommendations on appointive boards and commissions to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of San Francisco government.



January 14, 2026

About Proposition E

Approved by the voters in the November 2024 election, Proposition E established the Commission Streamlining Task Force to make recommendations to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors about ways to modify, eliminate, or combine the City's appointive boards and commissions for the more effective, efficient, and economical administration of City and County government.

About the Commission Streamlining Task Force

The Commission Streamlining Task Force has five members appointed by five authorities: Seat 1 is for the City Administrator or their designee; Seat 2 is for the Controller or their designee; Seat 3 is for the City Attorney or their designee; Seat 4 is for a public sector labor representative appointed by the Board of Supervisors President; Seat 5 is for an expert in open and accountable government appointed by the Mayor. The Task Force members are:

- ❖ **Sophie Hayward**, Legislative and Public Affairs Director, City Administrator's Office (Seat 1)
- ❖ **Natasha Mihal**, City Performance Director, Controller's Office (Seat 2)
- ❖ **Andrea Bruss**, Director of Government Legal Reform, City Attorney's Office (Seat 3)
- ❖ **Ed Harrington**, public sector labor representative, Board of Supervisors' Seat (Seat 4)
- ❖ **Sophia Kittler**, Budget Director, Mayor's Office (Seat 5, *9/12/25 - present*)
- ❖ **Jean Fraser**, Chief Executive Officer, Presidio Trust (former member, Seat 5, *1/31/25 – 9/10/25*)

Report prepared on behalf of the Commission Streamlining Task Force by:

- 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
- Chelsea Hall, Senior Project Analyst, City Administrator's Office

For more information, please contact:

Rachel Alonso, Project Director
commissionstreamlining@sfgov.org

Executive Summary


San Francisco's commission system includes over one thousand residents who volunteer their time to shape their government, reflecting the City's commitment to civic engagement and political activism. At its best, the system helps ensure that San Francisco's government remains transparent, accountable, and reflective of the diverse communities it serves. **However, many bodies have existed for decades without evaluating their efficacy. Some are defunct, have outlived their useful purpose, or perform duplicative work.**

In November 2024, San Francisco voters adopted Proposition E, which created a Task Force to recommend ways the City could change, eliminate, or consolidate San Francisco's boards and commissions to improve the administration of City government. The Task Force had one year to conduct a public process to methodically and fairly evaluate each of San Francisco's 152 boards and commissions. This report provides the results of this process.

Background

- **San Francisco currently has 152 boards and commissions – far more than most other cities.** Only 115 of them are active; the rest exist in law but may not have met in years. Some active bodies have outlived their useful purpose or perform duplicative work.
- The Charter establishes 42 bodies which cannot be updated without voter approval. Most of the rest are established across 11 different sections of Municipal Code.
- Most bodies are either “decision-making” or “advisory.” Each serves a different but important purpose for the City with different powers and duties.
- Key characteristics such as membership, appointment and removal processes, term lengths and limits differ widely between bodies, making the commission system confusing and difficult to engage with.

Figure 1: Current commission system



Process and Approach

Guided by Key Principles

- Effectively Elevate and Coordinate Public Input
- Create Clear Lines of Accountability
- Make Government Easier to Understand
- Use City Resources Responsibly

Followed a Methodical Process

- Scoping and data gathering
- Defining commission purposes and developing a decision-making approach
- Creating decision-making tools
- Discussing and evaluating each body individually
- Discussing operational improvements
- Finalizing recommendations

Stakeholder Engagement

Public input was critical to the Task Force's work. Throughout 2025, over **320 different people** spoke at public Task Force meetings, providing a total of **556 comments**. Stakeholders submitted **667 pieces of written public comment**. Task Force members and support staff also met with dozens of community members, commission staff, and department staff outside of official Task Force meetings.

In 2025, the Task Force held **21 public meetings** with **21 hours of public comment**

Recommendations

1. Strengthen Meaningful Public Engagement by Consolidating Boards and Commissions


Instead of spreading voices across 152 bodies that don't always coordinate effectively, the Task Force recommends retaining 85 bodies with well-defined scopes that will act as more robust and influential venues for public participation

- ✓ Keep 85 active and effective bodies
- ✓ Eliminate 37 inactive bodies
- ✓ Remove 25 additional bodies from code

2. Increase Flexibility to Adapt to New Challenges by Moving Bodies to the Administrative Code

The Charter serves as the City's constitution, outlining the basic structure of government. It can only be amended by the voters. Because Charter amendments require costly political campaigns, many bodies remain outdated as the City changes.

- ✓ Move most commissions, including all non-decision-making bodies, to the Administrative Code



3. Improve Accountability by Updating and Clarifying Commission Responsibilities

Voters expect to hold elected officials accountable for City performance. However, the Charter assigns oversight of certain City departments to appointed boards and commissions, which diffuses accountability.

- ✓ Shift some responsibility back to the Mayor by allowing them to hire and fire most department heads, while retaining a critical role for commissions in policymaking, oversight, and transparency.
- ✓ Clearly define the authority of each body to ensure effective governance.

4. Make Government More Consistent and Understandable by Standardizing Structure and Membership

The commission system is too complex, which makes government less transparent and hard for residents to understand and engage with. Many bodies have unique structures and responsibilities, requiring residents to invest time learning how each body operates and how to engage with it effectively.

- ✓ Align most bodies to set standards, including:
 - Adding term lengths and term limits
 - Adding 3-year sunset dates to most advisory bodies
 - Streamlining the appointment and removal process for commission members

This report also includes:

- Recommendations for managing and improving public bodies going forward
- Recommended changes to each public body, organized by policy area

Next Steps

By March 1, 2026, the Task Force will propose legislation to implement its recommendations, with the Board of Supervisors holding a hearing by April 1. Some changes can be enacted by ordinance unless vetoed by a two-thirds Board majority within 90 days. Others require a Charter amendment, which the Board may choose to place on the November 3, 2026 ballot.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Executive Summary | i |
| Table of Contents | iv |
| Summary Table: Recommended Changes to Each Public Body | v |
| Background and Introduction | 1 |
| Current State of the City's Commission System | 2 |
| Task Force Approach..... | 8 |
| Summary of Task Force Recommendations | 14 |
| Strengthen Meaningful Public Engagement by Consolidating Boards and Commissions | 14 |
| Increase Flexibility to Adapt to New Challenges by Moving Bodies to the Administrative Code..... | 17 |
| Improve Accountability by Updating and Clarifying Commission Responsibilities..... | 18 |
| Make Government More Consistent and Understandable by Standardizing Structure and Membership | 20 |
| Recommendations for Managing and Improving Public Bodies | 23 |
| Recommended Changes to Each Public Body..... | 27 |
| Conclusion | 88 |
| Appendix A: Proposition E..... | 89 |
| Appendix B: Meeting Schedule | 90 |
| Appendix C: Standard Responsibilities and Structures | 91 |
| Advisory Committee Standards | 91 |
| Governance Commission Standards..... | 92 |
| Appendix D: Evaluation Criteria | 93 |
| Appendix E: Record of Task Force Member Votes | 96 |

Summary Table: Recommended Changes to Each Public Body

This report includes the Task Force’s recommendations for each in-scope board or commission. This section lists each public body in alphabetical order, with a [link \[to be added\]](#) to the body’s summary in the “Recommended Changes to Each Public Body” section.

Legend:

Each row represents an in-scope public body and includes the proposed outcome, proposed changes to establishing authority, next step required for effectuating that change, and the page number where the description of all recommendations may be found.

| | |
|---|--|
| Possible proposed outcomes <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Keep<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦ <i>Description of proposed modifications, if any</i>• Combine<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦ <i>Description of proposed combined body</i>• Eliminate<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦ <i>Description of why body should be eliminated</i> | |
| Establishing Authority and Type | |
| If no changes are recommended: Current State | If changes recommended: Current State Recommended Change |
| Next step Ballot Measure: changes must be approved by voters Ordinance: changes may be made via Task Force ordinance | |

Summary Table

| Name | Recommendation | Establishing Authority | Next Step | Page |
|--|---|--|---------------------------|------|
| Abatement Appeals Board | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Move to Administrative Code | Charter, Building Code Administrative Code | Ordinance, ballot measure | |
| Access Appeals Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Becomes a subcommittee of Board of Appeals | Charter, Building Code Administrative Code | Ordinance, ballot measure | |
| Adult Day Health Care Planning Council | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Administrative Code remove from code | Ordinance | |
| Advisory Council on Human Rights | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Administrative Code remove from code | Ordinance | |
| Advisory Council to the Disability and Aging Services Commission | Combine <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Combine with Dignity Fund OAC Modify structure | Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| African American Arts and Cultural District Community Advisory Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Administrative Code remove from code | Ordinance | |
| Airport Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities | Charter | Ballot measure | |
| Area Loan Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Administrative Code remove from code | Ordinance | |
| Arts Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities | Charter | Ballot measure | |
| Asian Art Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure | Charter | Ballot measure | |
| Assessment Appeals Board | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes | Administrative Code | None | |
| Ballot Simplification Committee | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure Move to Administrative Code | Elections Code Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| Bayview Hunters Point Citizens Advisory Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Functions overlap with other bodies | Administrative Code remove from code | Ordinance | |
| Behavioral Health Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure | Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| Bicycle Advisory Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Functions overlap with City staff | Administrative Code remove from code | Ordinance | |
| Board of Appeals | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure Absorb functions from other bodies | Charter | Ballot measure | |
| Board of Directors of the San Francisco Downtown Revitalization and Economic Recovery Financing District | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes | Administrative Code | None | |
| Board of Examiners | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transfer functions to Board of Appeals | Charter, Building Code remove from code | Ordinance, ballot measure | |

vii | Summary Table: Recommended Changes to Each Public Body

| Name | Recommendation | Establishing Authority | Next Step | Page |
|---|--|--|---------------------------|------|
| Building Inspection Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities Move to Administrative Code | Charter Administrative Code | Ballot measure | |
| Cannabis Oversight Committee | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure | Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| Capital Implementation Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Park Code remove from code | Ordinance | |
| Capital Planning Committee | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes | Administrative Code | None | |
| Child Care Planning and Advisory Council | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor cleanup | Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| Children and Families First Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities Keep only in Administrative Code | Administrative Code, Charter | Ordinance, Ballot measure | |
| Children, Youth and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities Keep only in Administrative Code | Charter , Administrative Code | Ballot measure | |
| Citizens Advisory Committee for Street Utility Construction | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Administrative Code remove from code | Ordinance | |
| Citizens Committee on Community Development | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has fulfilled purpose Transfer functions to City staff | Administrative Code remove from code | Ordinance | |
| Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure Keep only in Administrative Code | Administrative Code, Charter | Ordinance, Ballot measure | |
| City Agency Task Force (Lead Abatement) | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Health Code remove from code | Ordinance | |
| City Hall Preservation Advisory Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Functions overlap with other bodies | Administrative Code remove from code | Ordinance | |
| City-Operated Farmers' Market Advisory Committees | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Administrative Code remove from code | Ordinance | |
| Civil Service Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure | Charter | Ballot measure | |
| Close Juvenile Hall Working Group | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Administrative Code remove from code | Ordinance | |
| Code Advisory Committee | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Move to Administrative Code | Charter, Building Code Administrative Code | Ordinance, Ballot measure | |
| Commission of Animal Control and Welfare | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities Move to Administrative Code | Health Code Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| Commission on the Environment | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities Move to Administrative Code | Charter Administrative Code | Ballot measure | |

| Name | Recommendation | Establishing Authority | Next Step | Page |
|---|---|--|----------------|------|
| Commission on the Status of Women | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities Move to Administrative Code | Charter Administrative Code | Ballot measure | |
| Commission Streamlining Task Force | No action <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow to sunset on planned date | Charter | None | |
| Committee for Planning Utility Construction Program | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Administrative Code remove from code | Ordinance | |
| Committee for Utility Liaison on Construction and Other Projects | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep as passive meeting body | Administrative Code remove from code | Ordinance | |
| Committee on City Workforce Alignment | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure | Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| Committee on Information Technology (COIT) | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes | Administrative Code | None | |
| Community Corrections Partnership | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure Codify in Administrative Code | None Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| Contract Review Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Administrative Code remove from code | Ordinance | |
| Delinquency Prevention Commission | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Administrative Code remove from code | Ordinance | |
| Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee | Combine <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Combine with DAS Advisory Council Keep only in Administrative Code | Charter , Administrative Code | Ballot measure | |
| Dignity Fund Service Providers Working Group | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not needed in Code Transfer functions to City staff | None (remove from code) | Ballot measure | |
| Disability and Aging Services Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities Move to Administrative Code | Charter Administrative Code | Ballot measure | |
| Disaster Council | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure | Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| Early Childhood Community Oversight and Advisory Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Functions overlap with other body | Administrative Code remove from code | Ballot measure | |
| Elections Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure | Charter | Ballot measure | |
| Elections Task Force | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes | Charter | None | |
| Employee Relations Board | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Charter remove from code | Ballot measure | |
| Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District Public Financing Authority No. 1 | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure | Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| Entertainment Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities Move to Administrative Code | Charter Administrative Code | Ballot measure | |
| Ethics Commission | TBD | TBD | TBD | |
| Family Violence Council | Keep | Administrative Code | Ordinance | |

ix | Summary Table: Recommended Changes to Each Public Body

| Name | Recommendation | Establishing Authority | Next Step | Page |
|---|---|---|----------------|------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure | | | |
| Film Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities | Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| Fine Arts Museums Board of Trustees | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure | Charter | Ballot measure | |
| Fire Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities | Charter | Ballot measure | |
| Food Security Task Force | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Functions overlap with City staff | Administrative Code <i>remove from code</i> | Ordinance | |
| Free City College Oversight Committee | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure | Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| Graffiti Advisory Board | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Administrative Code <i>remove from code</i> | Ordinance | |
| Health Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities | Charter | Ballot measure | |
| Health Service Board | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure | Charter | Ballot measure | |
| Historic Preservation Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities | Charter, Planning Code or <i>Administrative Code</i> | Ballot measure | |
| Homelessness Oversight Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Combine with LHCB Modify structure and responsibilities | Charter <i>Administrative Code</i> | Ballot measure | |
| Housing Code Enforcement Loan Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Administrative Code <i>remove from code</i> | Ordinance | |
| Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Administrative Code <i>remove from code</i> | Ordinance | |
| Human Rights Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities Move to Administrative Code | Charter <i>Administrative Code</i> | Ballot measure | |
| Human Services Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities Move to Administrative Code | Charter <i>Administrative Code</i> | Ballot measure | |
| Immigrant Rights Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure | Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| Inclusionary Housing Technical Advisory Committee | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure | Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| Industrial Development Authority Board | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Administrative Code <i>remove from code</i> | Ordinance | |
| Industrial Waste Review Board | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Public Works Code <i>remove from code</i> | Ordinance | |
| In-Home Supportive Services Public Authority Governing Body | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes | Administrative Code | None | |
| Interagency Planning and Implementation Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep as passive meeting body | Administrative Code <i>remove from code</i> | Ordinance | |

x | Summary Table: Recommended Changes to Each Public Body

| Name | Recommendation | Establishing Authority | Next Step | Page |
|---|---|---|---------------------------|------|
| Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation (ISCOTT) | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure Move to Administrative Code | Transportation Code Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| Joint Zoo Committee | No action | None | None | |
| Justice Tracking Information System (JUSTIS) Committee Governance Council | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Functions overlap with City staff | Administrative Code remove from code | Ordinance | |
| Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure Codify in Administrative code | None Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| Juvenile Probation Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities | Charter | Ballot measure | |
| Law Library Board of Trustees | Remove from Charter ¹ | Charter Remove from code | Ballot measure | |
| LGBTQI+ Advisory Committee | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure | Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| Library Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities | Charter | Ballot measure | |
| Local Business Enterprise Preference Program Working Group | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Administrative Code remove from code | Ordinance | |
| Local Homeless Coordinating Board | Combine <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure Becomes a subcommittee of HOC | Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| Long Term Care Coordinating Council | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | None (referenced in Charter and Administrative Code) | Ordinance, Ballot measure | |
| Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee | No action <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recent BOS action to sunset | Administrative Code | None | |
| Mission Bay Transportation Improvement Fund Advisory Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fulfilled purpose | Administrative Code Remove from code | Ordinance | |
| Municipal Green Building Task Force | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transfer functions to City staff | Environment Code Remove from code | Ordinance | |
| Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities | Charter | Ballot measure | |
| Municipal Transportation Agency Citizens' Advisory Council | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure Move to Administrative Code | Charter Administrative Code | Ballot measure | |
| Newsrack Advisory Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Public Works Code Remove from code | Ordinance | |
| Our Children, Our Families Council | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive Transfer functions to City staff | Charter, Administrative Code Remove from code | Ballot measure | |

¹ The Law Library Board of Trustees is established in state law and does not need to be established locally in the San Francisco Charter. Removing it will not affect the Law Library Board of Trustees' existence.

xi | Summary Table: Recommended Changes to Each Public Body

| Name | Recommendation | Establishing Authority | Next Step | Page |
|---|--|---|--------------------------------|------|
| Our City, Our Home Oversight Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Functions overlap with City staff and other bodies | Administrative Code Remove from code | Ballot measure | |
| Park, Recreation, And Open Space Advisory Committee | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure Move to Administrative Code | Charter Administrative code | Ballot measure | |
| Permit Prioritization Task Force | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive Transfer functions to City staff | Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Remove from code | Ordinance to Ethics Commission | |
| Planning Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities | Charter | Ballot measure | |
| Police Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities | Charter | Ballot Measure | |
| Port Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities | Charter | Ballot measure | |
| Public Utilities Citizens' Advisory Committee | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure Move to Administrative Code | Charter Administrative Code | Ballot measure | |
| Public Utilities Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities | Charter | Ballot measure | |
| Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure Move to Administrative Code | Charter Administrative Code | Ballot measure | |
| Public Works Commission | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Functions overlap with City staff/other bodies | Charter Remove from code | Ballot measure | |
| PUC Small Firm Advisory Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Administrative Code Remove from code | Ordinance | |
| Real Estate Fraud Prosecution Trust Fund Committee | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor cleanup | Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| Recreation and Park Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities | Charter | Ballot measure | |
| Reentry Council | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure | Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| Refuse Rate Board | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure Move to Administrative Code | Health Code Administrative Code | Ballot measure | |
| Relocation Appeals Board | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive Transfer functions to Board of Supervisors | Administrative Code Remove from code | Ordinance | |
| Residential Rehabilitation Area Citizen Advisory Committees | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Administrative Code Remove from code | Ordinance | |
| Residential Rehabilitation Area Rent Committees | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Administrative Code Remove from code | Ordinance | |
| Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes | Administrative Code | None | |

xii | Summary Table: Recommended Changes to Each Public Body

| Name | Recommendation | Establishing Authority | Next Step | Page |
|--|---|---|---------------------------|------|
| Retiree Health Care Trust Fund Board | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify structure | Charter | Ballot measure | |
| Retirement Board | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify structure | Charter | Ballot measure | |
| San Francisco Residential Hotel Operators Advisory Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inactive | Administrative Code <i>Remove from code</i> | Ordinance | |
| Sanitation and Streets Commission | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulfilled its purpose | Charter <i>Remove from code</i> | Ordinance | |
| Sentencing Commission | No action <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow to sunset in June 2026 | Administrative Code | None | |
| Service Provider Working Group | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify structure • Keep only in Administrative Code | Charter , Administrative Code | Ballot measure | |
| SFMTA Bond Oversight Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transfer functions to City staff | MTAB Resolution | Referral to MTAB | |
| Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Functions overlap with City staff and other bodies | Administrative Code <i>Remove from code</i> | Ordinance | |
| Shelter Monitoring Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Functions overlap with City staff | Administrative Code <i>Remove from code</i> | Ordinance | |
| Sheriff's Department Oversight Board | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify structure and responsibilities • Move to Administrative Code | Charter <i>Administrative Code</i> | Ballot measure | |
| Small Business Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify structure and responsibilities • Move to Administrative Code | Charter <i>Administrative Code</i> | Ballot measure | |
| SOMA Community Stabilization Fund Community Advisory Committee | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify structure | Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| South of Market Community Planning Advisory Committee | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify structure | Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| Southeast Community Facility Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify structure | Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| Special Strike Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out of compliance with state law | Charter | Ballot measure | |
| State Legislation Committee | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor cleanup | Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Advisory Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transfer functions to City staff | Police Code <i>Remove from code</i> | Ballot measure | |
| Street Design Review Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inactive | Administrative Code <i>Remove from code</i> | Ordinance | |
| Street Utilities Coordinating Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inactive | Administrative Code <i>Remove from code</i> | Ordinance | |
| Structural Advisory Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep as passive meeting body | Charter <i>Remove from code</i> | Ordinance, Ballot measure | |
| Subcontracting Goals Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inactive | Administrative Code <i>Remove from code</i> | Ordinance | |

| Name | Recommendation | Establishing Authority | Next Step | Page |
|---|--|--|----------------|------|
| Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure | Administrative Code | Ballot measure | |
| Sunshine Ordinance Task Force | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure | Administrative Code | Ballot measure | |
| Supportive Housing Services Fund Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Administrative Code <i>Remove from code</i> | Ordinance | |
| Sweatfree Procurement Advisory Group | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure Move to Administrative Code | Labor and Employment Code <i>Administrative Code</i> | Ordinance | |
| Treasure Island Development Authority Board of Directors | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure and responsibilities | Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island Citizens Advisory Board | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fulfilled its purpose | Board Resolution | Ordinance | |
| Treasury Oversight Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Functions overlap with City staff | Administrative Code <i>Remove from code</i> | Ordinance | |
| Urban Forestry Council | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Functions overlap with City staff Transfer oversight to Commission on Environment | Environment Code <i>Remove from Code</i> | Ordinance | |
| Veterans' Affairs Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure | Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| War Memorial Board of Trustees | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure | Charter | Ballot measure | |
| Waterfront Design Advisory Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Functions overlap with other bodies Keep as a passive meeting body | Planning Code <i>Remove from code</i> | Ordinance | |
| Workers' Compensation Council | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep as a passive meeting body | Administrative Code <i>Remove from code</i> | Ordinance | |
| Workforce Development Advisory Committee | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Administrative Code <i>Remove from code</i> | Ordinance | |
| Workforce Investment Board | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure | Administrative Code | Ordinance | |
| Working Group on Local Business Enterprise Preference Program for City Leases and Concession Agreements | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Administrative Code <i>Remove from code</i> | Ordinance | |
| Working Group to Investigate Barriers to LBE Participation | Eliminate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive | Administrative Code <i>Remove from code</i> | Ordinance | |
| Youth Commission | Keep <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify structure Move to Administrative Code | Charter Administrative Code | Ballot measure | |

Background and Introduction

The City and County of San Francisco has long been a place that values public service, creativity, political activism, and civic engagement. These values are deeply embedded in the City's system of participatory government, particularly through its boards and commissions. Over one thousand San Francisco residents volunteer their time to advise elected officials and City staff, shape policy decisions, and provide oversight of core government functions. By leveraging residents' perspectives, lived experiences, and expertise, boards and commissions enable community members to participate directly in decisions that affect their lives.

At its best, the commission system helps ensure that San Francisco's government remains transparent, accountable, and reflective of the diverse communities it serves. However, many of these bodies have existed for decades without review or evaluation of their efficacy. Some commissions have outlived their useful purpose and others perform work that duplicates the efforts of other volunteer bodies or professional City staff.

In November 2024, San Francisco voters adopted Proposition E with 53% support. This measure created a Task Force to recommend ways the City could change, eliminate, or consolidate commissions to improve the administration of City government.

History of San Francisco's Commission System

Appointive boards and commissions first emerged in U.S. cities in the late 19th century as Progressive Era reformers sought to wrest power from political machines and special interests. By appointing everyday citizens to oversee city departments, reformers hoped that commissions would reduce corruption and ensure that government actions better served the public interest.

San Francisco's commission system was enshrined in the City's 1898 Charter, with its first boards and commissions helping to oversee core government functions like firefighting, libraries, and police. Since then, the system has grown significantly in number and complexity. Notably, San Francisco has far more boards and commissions than most other cities.

In recent years, the commission system has come under scrutiny, with several reports raising concerns and proposing potential reforms.²

Proposition E and the Commission Streamlining Task Force

Voters approved Proposition E in November 2024, launching a year-long public process to evaluate the City's commissions and identify "ways to eliminate, consolidate, or limit the powers and duties of appointive boards and commissions for the more effective, efficient, and economical administration of City and County

² **San Francisco Civil Grand Jury.** (2024, June 20). *Commission Impossible? Getting the Most from San Francisco's Commissions.* <https://www.sf.gov/sites/default/files/2024-06/Commissions%20Impossible%20Report.pdf>

SPUR. (2024, July 31). *Designed to Serve: Resetting the city's governance structure to better meet the needs of San Franciscans.* https://www.spur.org/sites/default/files/2024-09/SPUR_Designed_to_Serve.pdf

Heidorn, N., Miller, K. P., & Nadon, B. (2023, August 17). *Re-Assessing San Francisco's Government Design.* The Rose Institute of State and Local Government, Claremont McKenna College. Commissioned by TogetherSF. https://roseinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/Together-SF-Report_081723_DIGITAL-1.pdf

government.”. The Proposition established a Task Force of experts in City management who led this work in full view of the public and heard from hundreds of San Francisco residents, including over 320 unique commenters who spoke in public meetings and 667 pieces of written feedback.³ Staff from the City Administrator’s and Controller’s Offices provided analysis and support for the Task Force’s deliberations and decision-making, and 44 other City departments provided qualitative and quantitative insights about their respective meeting bodies.

Proposition E also granted the Task Force the power to introduce legislation effectuating its recommendations. The City Attorney will work with the Task Force to draft two types of legislation:

1. **Ballot Measure**

Many of the Task Force’s recommendations will require voter approval, including any changes to Charter bodies or voter-approved bodies in the Municipal Codes. The City Attorney’s Office will draft a ballot measure to implement these recommendations, which the Task Force will submit to the Board of Supervisors by March 1, 2026. The Board will then decide whether to place the ballot measure, or an amended version of it, on the November 3, 2026 ballot. The measure will only take effect if voters approve it.

2. **Ordinances**

The City Attorney will also draft one or more ordinances, which the Task Force can submit to the Board of Supervisors at any time. These ordinances can amend any bodies that were not established by the voters. Unless two-thirds of the Board (8 out of 11 members) vote to reject them, the ordinances will automatically take effect within 90 days.

Current State of the City’s Commission System

Number of Commissions and Commission Members

San Francisco’s commissions go by many names – including boards, councils, committees, task forces, working groups, and more. The Board of Supervisors may establish bodies through legislation, San Franciscans may create them through citizen-led ballot measures, or any City leadership may convene them informally, outside of the legislative process. Proposition E focuses the Commission Streamlining Task Force’s work on “legislative bodies” as defined in [California Government Code Section 54952](#). These include bodies that are established in law or at the formal direction of another legislative body, such as a resolution by the Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors. The City participates in several legislative bodies that span multiple jurisdictions, such as the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). The Task Force did not evaluate these bodies, since it has no authority to amend them.

Before the Commission Streamlining Task Force began its work, the City lacked a complete or consistent list of public meeting bodies.⁴ In 2023, a Civil Grand Jury reviewed several lists from different City departments and found that none were comprehensive or fully aligned.

³ The creation of a Commission Streamlining Task Force was consistent with recommendations from the 2023-2024 Civil Grand Jury Report, “Commission Impossible,” as well as the Rose Institute for Local Government’s “Re-Assessing San Francisco’s Government Design.”

⁴ Koehn, J. (2023, July 6). *Only 1 person at SF City Hall knows the answer to this simple question*. The San Francisco Standard. <https://sfstandard.com/2023/07/06/only-1-person-at-sf-city-hall-knows-the-answer-to-this-simple-question/>

In addition to inconsistent lists, basic information about each commission was not tracked in a centralized location. The Clerk of the Board of Supervisors publishes appointment and membership details for bodies under the Board’s authority, to fulfill [Maddy Act](#) requirements, but this excludes bodies without Board appointments. The 311 system maintains a public online database, as required by [Ordinance No. 265-10](#), but relies on voluntary updates from departments and often lacks complete or timely data. The City Attorney’s list, while the most comprehensive prior to the Task Force’s work, includes only the names and code citations of each body, without further details. A 2024 memo by the City Attorney’s Office provided additional details on bodies with mayoral appointments, but not those without mayoral appointments.

Through a comprehensive review, the Task Force identified 152 legislative bodies with approximately 1,200 total members. However, only 115 of these bodies actively meet. The remainder are inactive, and many haven’t met in years.

| City Attorney List | 311 List | Maddy Act List | Task Force List |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 135 bodies | 102 bodies | 94 bodies | 152 bodies |

Establishing Authority

The Municipal Code establishes most bodies, and the Board of Supervisors is responsible for creating nearly all of them. The Task Force may amend these bodies via ordinance. A few bodies in the Municipal Codes are voter-approved, so only voters may amend them.⁶

The Charter establishes most of the remaining bodies, which can only be modified with voter approval. A few bodies are referenced in both the Charter and Code, and a very small number are established by other means, such as an MTA Board Resolution or a Memorandum of Understanding.

Types of Commissions

While the Charter and Municipal Codes don’t formally define different “types” of commissions, and many do not fit neatly into a single category, there is general consensus that most bodies fall into one or more of the following categories:⁷

| Establishing Authority | Number |
|--|------------|
| Charter | 42 |
| Municipal Codes | 91 |
| Administrative Code | 76 |
| Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code | 1 |
| Environment Code | 2 |
| Health Code | 3 |
| Labor and Employment Code | 1 |
| Municipal Elections Code | 1 |
| Park Code | 1 |
| Planning Code | 2 |
| Police Code | 1 |
| Public Works Code | 2 |
| Transportation Code | 1 |
| Both Charter and Code | 13 |
| Neither Charter nor Code | 6 |
| Board Resolution | 1 |
| MTAB Resolution | 1 |
| State law only | 2 |
| Memorandum of Understanding | 1 |
| None ⁵ | 1 |
| Total | 152 |

⁵ The Long Term Care Coordinating Council is not established in law or at the formal direction of a legislative body. However, it has duties assigned in the Charter, which places it in-scope for the Task Force

⁶ [X] bodies were established by initiative ordinance, which means they can only be amended by the voters unless the ballot measure expressly allows the Board of Supervisors to amend

⁷ The Civil Grand Jury identified three types of bodies in *Commission Impossible*– decision-making, quasi-judicial, and advisory. SPUR proposed three types in their *Designed to Serve*– governance, regulatory, and advisory.

Decision-Making Bodies

- **Governance Bodies** oversee City departments and are typically established in the Charter. Most have existed for decades, with the earliest dating back to the late nineteenth century.⁸ Charter Sec. 4.102 outlines eleven powers and duties for these groups, including hiring and firing department heads, approving budgets, and setting policy. Some also have additional duties outlined in their enabling legislation.
Examples: Police Commission, Airport Commission
- **Appeals Boards** uphold and enforce the law by hearing and deciding challenges to City decisions.
Examples: Board of Appeals, Assessment Appeals Board
- **Regulatory Bodies** enforce laws by issuing rules, making decisions, and approving rates or permits. Many governance bodies have regulatory functions, and vice versa.
Examples: Rent Board, Refuse Rate Board

Non-Decision-Making Bodies

- **Advisory Bodies** provide feedback and recommendations to City departments and elected officials. While they lack decision-making authority, they provide critical input on a range of issues. Most are established in the Municipal Codes, though a few are in the Charter.
Examples: Youth Commission, SFMTA Citizens' Advisory Council
- **Staff Working Groups** coordinate across departments to formulate citywide plans, take positions on legislation, or oversee implementation activities. While City staff coordinate every day, these are legally codified groups that hold public meetings.
Examples: State Legislation Committee, Capital Planning Committee

Powers and Duties

[Charter Section 4.102](#) outlines the basic powers and duties of bodies established in the Charter. In general, these bodies oversee City departments and exercise the following powers:

1. **Policymaking:** Approving goals, objectives, plans, programs, and setting policy for the department
2. **Budget authority:** Approving departmental budgets, rates, and fees
3. **Hiring:** Recommending at least three qualified candidates for department head to the Mayor
4. **Firing:** Removing a department head
5. **Power of Inquiry:** Holding hearings, taking testimony, and conducting investigations into any aspect of government operations within its jurisdiction

Some Charter bodies specify additional duties in their enabling legislation while others, such as the Youth Commission, do not oversee City departments and therefore lack the powers in Section 4.102.

Bodies established in Municipal Code may have a wide range of responsibilities, which their establishing legislation dictates. Some have specific decision-making authority, such as the Residential Rent and Stabilization Board ("Rent Board"), while others are purely advisory.

⁸ Only five governance bodies have been established since 2000: the Elections Commission (2001), Small Business Commission (2003), Public Works Commission (2022), Sanitation and Streets Commission (2022), and Homelessness Oversight Commission (2022)

Membership and Appointments

Among the 115 active bodies, there are approximately 1,200 total seats.⁹ As of May 2025, when the Task Force surveyed these bodies, approximately eight out of ten seats were filled, for about 1,000 total members.

There are many different and complex approaches to filling these seats, and the establishing legislation for each body outlines which entity is responsible for appointing which seats.

Nominations

Several commissions have an initial nominating step before appointing members, requiring another body to forward names to the appointing authority.

Appointments


The **Mayor** or the **Board of Supervisors** appoint most members, though there are several different appointment structures. For example, there are six different types of Board appointments:

- Appointed by the Board President
- Nominated by the Board President and approved by the full Board
- Appointed by a District Supervisor
- Nominated by a District Supervisor and approved by the full Board
- Nominated by the Rules Committee and approved by the full Board
- Nominated by some other body and approved by the full Board

Many other entities also make appointments. These include:

- City departments (e.g., Department of Public Health)
- Other boards or commissions (e.g., the Building Inspection Commission)
- Self-appointing bodies (e.g., the Fine Arts Museum Board of Trustees)
- Ex officio seats¹⁰ (e.g., the City Administrator)
- Other governmental entities (e.g., City College)
- Community based organizations (e.g., Safe and Sound)
- Elected members (e.g., Health Service Board)
- Private companies (e.g., PG&E)

Seats by Appointing Authority



⁹ Several bodies have undefined membership, such as the Service Provider Working Group or the Workforce Investment Board.

¹⁰ Seats that are tied to a particular office or position

Confirmations

Some appointments require Board of Supervisors confirmation; however, confirmation processes differ between bodies. These include:

- Appointments that require affirmative Board confirmation and do not take effect until the Board takes action
- Appointments that require affirmative Board confirmation, but are deemed approved if the Board fails to act within a specified time
- Appointments that take effect immediately, unless rejected by a two-thirds majority of the Board within 30 days ¹¹

Qualifications

General Qualifications

Charter Section 4.101 governs eligibility requirements for appointees to bodies in the Charter or Municipal Code, unless otherwise specified. Appointees should broadly reflect the diversity of the City.

- **Charter-created bodies:** members must be San Francisco residents of legal voting age, unless the Charter explicitly provides an exception (e.g., the Youth Commission).
- **Ordinance-created bodies:** the appointing authority may waive residency or age requirements if no qualified candidates are available. The establishing ordinance may also specify that members need not be City residents or of legal voting age.

Body-specific Qualifications

Most bodies establish minimum qualifications for appointees, such as requiring members to represent a specific neighborhood, profession, trade, union, business, or to meet other specialized criteria. These requirements can help ensure that bodies contain the relevant skills, perspectives, and experiences needed to fulfill their missions. However, narrowly defined special qualifications can also make it difficult to fill vacancies.

In some cases, qualifications apply to the body as a whole – for example, the MTA Board of Directors requires at least four of its seven members to be regular Muni riders. More often, qualifications apply to individual seats. It is relatively rare for bodies to have no special qualifications, but this is more common for governance bodies like the Airport Commission or the Planning Commission.

Term Lengths and Term Limits

Term Lengths

Most commissioners serve for a set term length, commonly two years for advisory bodies or four years for governance bodies. Several bodies do not specify term lengths for their members; many of these are staff working groups with ex officio membership.

¹¹ Mayoral appointments that are subject to Charter Sec. 3.100 (18)

Holdover Appointments

Most commissioners may continue serving beyond their term if they are not replaced or reappointed. These are called holdover appointments. The Charter typically limits holdover appointments to Charter commissions to 60 days after the term expires. Holdover appointments to non-Charter bodies may serve indefinitely unless the authorizing legislation provides otherwise.

Term Limits

As a general rule, there are no term limits for members of commissions unless otherwise provided in the establishing legislation. Staff identified just 13 bodies where term limits are in place. However, the Board of Supervisors has included term limits for many bodies recently established by ordinance.

Member Removal

There are three general approaches to member removal:

- **At will appointments.** Members of most commissions, especially advisory bodies, serve at the pleasure of their appointing authority, meaning that whoever appointed them may remove them for any reason at any time. 90 out of 115 active bodies allow for at-will removal of their members.
- **For cause removals.** Other members, typically those of Charter bodies, can only be removed for official misconduct. This is a high bar, which requires a formal hearing at the Ethics Commission, and a three-fourths vote by the Board of Supervisors (9 out of 11 members). 25 out of 115 active bodies provide for-cause protections for commissioners. In practice, removal for cause is exceedingly rare.
- **Recall elections.** Members of four bodies – the Airport Commission, Ethics Commission, Port commission, and Public Utilities Commission – may be recalled by the voters.

Sunset Dates

The Board of Supervisors Rules of Order (Rule 2.21) states that whenever the Board creates a new meeting body, the enabling legislation should include “a sunset clause not to exceed three years.” This has become customary for bodies recently established by Board ordinance.

However, this was not always Board practice and does not apply to bodies established by the voters. **Just 21 out of 152 bodies currently have sunset dates.** The Task Force identified 37 inactive bodies, some of which hadn’t met in years. Without a sunset date, these groups remain in law unless affirmatively removed by the Board of Supervisors or the voters.

Cost to Operate Boards and Commissions

While the Task Force did not factor cost into its decision-making, Proposition E required the Budget and Legislative Analyst (BLA) to prepare a report with the estimated annual financial cost to the City of operating each appointive board or commission. The BLA analyzed 118 bodies, the total financial cost of which was \$33,894,772 in Fiscal Year 2024, or approximately \$305,000 for each body.

For more information, see the BLA’s September 1 report, “[Analysis of Proposition E Approved by the Voters of San Francisco in November 2024](https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/BLA.PropE_.090125.pdf)”. https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/BLA.PropE_.090125.pdf

Task Force Approach

As described above, the Proposition E legislation created the Commission Streamlining Task Force to conduct a comprehensive review of the City's public bodies and make recommendations to "optimize the number, functions, and structure of City commissions." This section outlines the Task Force's approach to developing recommendations.

Key Principles

The commission system gives residents an opportunity to help shape their government, ensures important decision-making occurs in full view of the public, and elevates diverse voices and opinions. At its best, the system is an important mechanism for transparency, accountability, and equity. However, the current state of San Francisco's commission system is falling short of those goals. By approving Proposition E, voters empowered the Commission Streamlining Task Force to make recommendations to address these challenges. With this in mind, the Task Force grounded its work in four principles that guided its approach to developing recommendations.

Effectively Elevating and Coordinating Public Input

Commission streamlining should not place government efficiency and impactful public participation at odds. Instead, streamlining should better organize public input and target it more effectively. The initial goal of the commission system was to provide venues for diverse voices that are not always represented in government. However, those voices are currently spread across 152 bodies that may not coordinate but often overlap. For example, five bodies advise the City on homelessness and ten advise on housing and community development. Some bodies may make recommendations on narrow topics without factoring in larger contexts around policies, strategy, and funding. This leads to fragmented conversations about policy, budget, and programs that lack a strategic approach to important issues and limit the utility of that input. This dilutes each body's impact, making it harder for public voices to sway policy and decision-making. The Task Force's recommendations promote coordinated and intentionally-structured bodies, which ensure that there are defined and resourced forums for San Franciscans to have real impact on the City's policies.

Creating Clear Lines of Accountability

Streamlining is an opportunity to clarify who is accountable for key City decisions. The commission system intentionally shifts power away from elected officials and places it in the hands of independent citizens. While this structure sought to promote fairness and reduce political influence, it has also led to diffuse accountability, making it difficult to hold the City accountable for decisions and outcomes. The public typically sees the Mayor as responsible for the City's decisions, but in many cases, commissions must approve key actions. Commissioners are not elected and therefore voters cannot directly hold them accountable. This creates a dual chain of command that can complicate leadership, decision-making, and accountability, where voters may only directly influence one side of the chain. This complexity also makes it difficult for residents—especially those not deeply involved in City Hall—to understand how decisions are made or who to hold accountable. As a result, the system is opaque and inaccessible to the people it serves. The Task Force designed recommendations to clarify responsibility, making it easier for San Franciscans to hold their elected officials accountable.

Making Government Easier to Understand

The current commission system can be confusing, with many bodies having different structures, responsibilities, approaches to appointments, and establishing authorities. While one of the purposes of the commission system is to provide for more public engagement in government, the system's complexity actually makes government more opaque to residents who are not already involved in City Hall. The Task Force's recommendations seek to bring consistency into the system, where appropriate, to make San Francisco's government more accessible to the people it serves.

Responsible Use of City Resources

Streamlining is an opportunity to ensure the City deploys resources in a targeted and intentional way. San Francisco's 152 boards, commissions, and advisory bodies require significant staff time and resources to administer. In FY24 alone, City staff supported 1,560 public meetings. Departments often present the same information repeatedly across multiple commissions, diverting time from other work. Persistent vacancies are another challenge, with nearly 1,500 seats for appointing authorities to keep filled. Some positions require highly specific qualifications, making it difficult to recruit eligible candidates. This means the City is spending resources administering a system that can be duplicative and lacking investment. The Task Force's recommendations target the City's resources to a fewer number of bodies, ensuring that remaining bodies are robust forums for public input, with greater investment from City staff, elected officials, and San Francisco residents.

Meeting Schedule and Cadence

Proposition E mandated that the Task Force start meeting by February 1, 2025, and submit a report by February 1, 2026, giving the Task Force only one year to comprehensively review 152 public meeting bodies. The Task Force met twice per month in City Hall, starting January 31, 2025. Meeting topics included informational presentations from outside experts, staff presentations providing updates on work, and in-depth discussions of each public meeting body by policy area. For a detailed list of meeting dates and topics, please see Appendix B

Defining Scope and Gathering Data

When the Task Force started its work there was no definitive list of the appointive boards and commissions in the Charter and Municipal Codes. To begin its analysis, the Task Force first needed to identify which bodies were in scope and understand their key characteristics, such as purpose, number of members, who appoints those members, if the body is in the Charter or Code, and if it meets regularly.


In its first meeting, the Task Force directed staff to create a workbook listing all bodies and those key characteristics. Staff consulted existing lists and, in consultation with the City Attorney's Office, developed a comprehensive list of 191 bodies, 152 of which are in-scope for the Task Force's review. The Task Force prioritized which information was most important to gather first to support its decision-making and staff presented a draft of the workbook with 25 data fields on March 19, 2025. In April and May, staff surveyed 42 City departments to validate information and collect additional data on meetings and membership. Staff finalized data collection throughout April and May and posted updated versions of the workbook monthly. The latest version of the workbook, published in [December 2025], contains [39] data fields.

Defining Purpose and Developing an Approach

Task Force members brought a range of experience and perspectives to this work. Before they could agree on a decision-making approach, Task Force members first had to align their views on the role of boards and commissions in government and the scope of potential reforms.

The Task Force began by investigating different types of public bodies, their responsibilities, and the different purposes they serve. Outside experts, Task Force members, and staff presented background information, supplemental research, and potential decision-making approaches. Based on this information, the Task Force identified five general types of bodies and developed common naming conventions, definitions, and stated purposes for each. While many bodies do not neatly fit into a category, this exercise provided a framework to start assessing the reasons why each body may exist and if each is adding the intended value to the City.

FIGURE 1: TYPES OF PUBLIC BODIES



The Task Force also discussed that all public bodies should promote transparency and provide valuable pathways for public participation, while also noting that these bodies are just one of many ways San Francisco departments engage the public.

The Task Force's final approach included two stages, first defining an ideal state for the commission system, then holistically evaluating each body and recommending whether to keep, modify, combine, or eliminate it.

Creating Decision-Making Tools

The Task Force developed two tools to support decision-making and help define the ideal state: evaluation criteria and standards for body structure and responsibilities.

Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation criteria are a set of yes/no questions assessing the value-add of each public body. Answering the questions for each body helped determine if the Task Force should recommend keeping, combining, or

eliminating it. Having a set of clear and objective criteria enabled the Task Force to make an organized assessment of each body and supported fair, equitable, and transparent decision-making.

The Task Force's discussions about the purpose and value of public bodies informed the evaluation criteria, which resulted in 12 questions across four sections:

1. **Legal Requirements:** questions assess if state or federal law require a body or a body's functions.
2. **Activity:** questions determine if a body does not meet or rarely meets, and if so, if there is a clear rationale for retaining the body. Otherwise, the Task Force recommended combining or eliminating it.
3. **Overlap with Other Bodies:** questions assess if there are multiple bodies covering similar topics or policy areas and if there were opportunities to combine or eliminate overlapping bodies.
4. **Breadth of Focus:** questions determine if the body has a narrow focus on one funding source, neighborhood, demographic group, or narrow topic and if so, whether another body or City staff could adequately represent those interests.

The [full evaluation criteria](#) is available online and in Appendix D for review.

Standardizing Structures and Responsibilities

The Task Force's second tool establishes standard structures and responsibilities for each type of public body. These standards, or templates, include components like the number of members, appointing authorities, budget authority, and the ability to hire and fire department heads. The Task Force assessed each body against those standards to guide recommended changes.

The Task Force developed a set of standards for two types of bodies: governance commissions and advisory committees¹². As with the evaluation criteria, the goal of these standards is to provide transparent and consistent rationale for the Task Force's decisions. The templates serve two additional key purposes, related to the Task Force's key considerations outlined in the beginning of this section:

- 1) **Making government more understandable.** Proposition E identified a need to assess boards and commissions due to their complexity and inconsistency. Differences in scope, purpose, and structure make it difficult for San Franciscans to understand their government and determine who to hold accountable. Standardizing functions, appointments, membership, and other elements, where possible, helps make government more transparent and understandable for residents.
- 2) **Making government work better.** The Task Force designed the template components to help each body meet a consistent core purpose, ensuring that each public body was helping City government meet the needs of San Franciscans.

While the Task Force aimed to apply consistent standards where appropriate, it also recognized that some bodies required exceptions. This flexibility allowed the Task Force to aim for consistency, while considering the unique purposes or structures of specific bodies. A detailed discussion of the different templates and their components can be found in the "[Recommend Changes to Public Bodies](#)" section below.

Using the Decision-Making Tools

While the Task Force's tools supported initial objective assessments of each body, the Task Force's approach evolved over time. The decision-making tools provided a starting point for the Task Force's discussion, but

¹² The Task Force initially also developed standards for Appeals Boards, but in practice opted to not apply the templates to current appeals boards. Because this template was not ultimately deployed, the Task Force opted to exclude it from the report.

the assessment of each body integrated nuanced details about each body, the members' own experiences, and stakeholder input to craft final recommendations.

Policy Area Discussions

To conduct its holistic evaluation of each body, the Task Force discussed each of the 115 active bodies over five meetings, organized by broad policy area. In these meetings, the Task Force discussed each body holistically and then voted on whether to recommend keeping, modifying, combining, or eliminating each.

For some decisions, Task Force members requested staff collect additional information prior to taking a final vote. The Task Force revisited these conversations from November 2025 through January 2026.

Staff Memos

Staff drafted informational memos that apply the evaluation criteria and templates to inform public discussion of each body. These memos also included a brief overview for each body. The Task Force used these memos as the starting point for its discussions, considering the memos alongside stakeholder input and additional relevant information to vote on its recommendations. Staff posted these memos online approximately 1.5 weeks prior to each meeting. This provided advocates, departments, and members of the public with sufficient time to understand the potential outcomes for each body and prepare responsive input for the Task Force.

Operational Improvements

Proposition E also emphasized the need to make recommendations to help the commission system function more smoothly. The Task Force discussed recommendations for operational improvements to the City's commission structure to support the health of the commission system moving forward. Examples include building commissioner trainings and maintaining a comprehensive list of active bodies.

Finalizing Recommendations

Prior to finalizing decisions, the Task Force compared decisions across bodies, ensuring it took a consistent approach to recommendations where possible. The Task Force memorialized its final recommendations and a record of its process in this final report.

Stakeholder Input

Department Engagement

Staff sent department staff a questionnaire for each body, to supplement information as necessary. These questionnaires asked for additional details beyond what was available in the workbook, such as how the body's purpose had changed over time and its role in contract approvals. Departments returned **76 total questionnaires** and the Task Force used this input to inform its final recommendations. Where applicable, Task Force members and staff met with departments to better understand options for changes and the potential impacts of changes to those bodies.

Public Input and Engagement

Public input was critical to the Task Force’s decision-making process. Commissioners, advocates, and the general public provided valuable input via written, in-person, and virtual public comment.¹³ Task Force members and support staff also met with dozens of community members outside of official Task Force meetings, as requested.

Throughout 2025, over **320 unique people** spoke at public Task Force meetings, providing a total of **556 comments**. This averages out to **over 19 unique people** providing comments each meeting and increased **to 82 attendees participating** in meetings focused on policy-area discussions. This amounted to 21 total hours of public comment across the 21 meetings. Members of the public also provided **667 pieces of written public comment**.

The Task Force members read and considered all public input. Where possible, staff incorporated public input into the memos and Task Force members used it to inform final recommendations, several of which were directly influenced by public engagement.

To encourage public participation, the Task Force created [an accessible website](#) that highlighted clear instructions for submitting input. Staff engaged with the Board of Supervisors and relevant departments and asked them to share with their relevant commissions, mailing lists, newsletters, and social media pages.

The Task Force is deeply grateful for the public’s thoughtful engagement throughout the process.

How to get involved

Updated November 3, 2025: The Task Force is working to finalize its report of recommendations to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors now through the end of January 2026. Submit written public comment by emailing CommissionStreamlining@sfgov.org prior to any meeting. Comments will be posted on this page under "Public Correspondence." You can also give public comment live during the meetings, either in-person or on WebEx.



Commission Staff Engagement

Input from public meeting body staff was critical to shape operational improvement opportunities. Staff held a meeting with over **65 clerks, secretaries, and commission staff** from all public body types to gather input on mission and commission scope management, onboarding and training, strengths, and best practices. The Task Force considered the challenges and solutions raised by body staff and uplifted their successes to help improve the administration of bodies.

¹³ Written public comments are available online at <https://www.sf.gov/commission-streamlining-task-force-public-correspondence> and meeting minutes summarize verbal input.

Summary of Task Force Recommendations

This section provides a high-level overview of the Task Force's recommendations.

Strengthen Meaningful Public Engagement by Consolidating Boards and Commissions

The Task Force identified 152 bodies for its analysis. 115 of these actively meet, and the remaining 37 are inactive. After a comprehensive review of each body, the Task Force recommends reducing the number of active meeting bodies from 115 to 85.

Why Streamline Public Meeting Bodies?

Reducing the number of public meeting bodies will strengthen the commission system in several key ways:

1. **Elevate and coordinate public input:** Fragmented and duplicative bodies dilute each other's impact. Instead of spreading voices across 152 bodies that don't always coordinate effectively, the Task Force recommends retaining 85 bodies with well-defined scopes that will act as more robust and influential venues for public participation.
2. **Make government easier to understand:** A sprawling commission system can make government opaque and inaccessible to many, especially those who don't regularly engage with City Hall. Streamlining helps residents more easily identify how to engage with their government.
3. **Use public resources efficiently and responsibly:** Fewer bodies mean less duplication of effort. City staff can focus their time and resources more effectively, reducing the need to present the same information to multiple commissions and minimizing administrative overhead.

Keep 85 Active and Effective Bodies

Through a comprehensive review of each body, the Task Force identified 85 that actively contribute valuable advice, governance, and oversight to improve the administration of City government. These bodies should be retained and, in many cases, should assume the functions of overlapping or related bodies recommended for elimination. Two of these bodies should be kept and restructured as subcommittees of other bodies. In one instance, the Task Force recommends fully consolidating two bodies into a newly formed entity.

- 84 existing bodies should be kept
- One new body should be created by consolidating two bodies with overlapping responsibilities

Eliminate 37 Inactive Bodies

Of the 61 bodies recommended for elimination, 37 are inactive. Many of the inactive bodies have not met in years but have continued to exist indefinitely without sunset dates. Others have recently concluded the work they set out to do. One was recently found to be out of compliance with state law and cannot legally convene.¹⁴

¹⁴ California Public Employment Relations Board [Decision No. 2867-M](#) (July 24, 2023)

Remove 25 Additional Bodies from Code


The remaining bodies actively meet, but face challenges such as:

- Difficulty meeting and achieving quorum
- Overlapping responsibilities with other bodies or City staff
- Functions that could be fulfilled as passive meeting bodies

Five are internal staff working groups that do not need to be codified or operate as public meeting bodies. In one case, the Task Force recommends removing a body from the Charter because it is established by state law (the Law Library Board of Trustees) and will continue to exist whether or not it's codified locally.

While this report uses the term "eliminate", it is more accurate to say these bodies should be eliminated from the legal code. Some of these bodies may, and should, continue meeting as passive meeting bodies that are not subject to the full range of public meeting requirements.

The Task Force does not recommend any action for four meeting bodies. One is established in MOU, which the Task Force cannot amend. The other three are scheduled to sunset within the next year and should be allowed to do so.



Passive Meeting Body:


A multimember body created in writing or by the initiative of a member of a policy body, the Mayor, or a department head, to advise the official at whose initiative the body was created. Gatherings of passive meeting bodies are not subject to the broad array of open government requirements that apply to policy bodies under the Brown Act and Sunshine Ordinance.

Impact by Policy Area


The Task Force identified overlapping bodies with similar responsibilities and mandates. While some served complementary purposes, others fragmented decision-making and diluted accountability. The final recommendations reduce the number of bodies across nearly all policy areas.

Recommended Number of Bodies by Policy Area


General Administration & Finance




Housing and Economic Development




Infrastructure, Climate, & Mobility



Public Health & Wellbeing



Public Safety



Increase Flexibility to Adapt to New Challenges by Moving Bodies to the Administrative Code

The Charter serves as the City's constitution, outlining the basic structure and function of government. It can only be amended by a vote of the people. Because Charter amendments require costly political campaigns, many Charter bodies remain outdated as the City changes. For example:


- The Sanitation and Streets Commission oversees a department that no longer exists.
- The Special Strike Committee no longer complies with State law.
- The Employee Relations Board has, to the best of City staff's knowledge, never met.
- Youth Commissioners cannot be compensated or reimbursed, which is a barrier to low-income youth participation.

The Municipal Codes, in contrast, provide detailed guidance on government operations and the Board of Supervisors may amend them, subject to Mayoral veto. This allows the City to update them as needs evolve so that they remain relevant and effective. Generally, this flexibility makes government more responsive and effective.

While most of the bodies in the Administrative Code are advisory, many essential decision-making bodies, such as the Assessment Appeals Board, Children and Families First Commission, Film Commission, and Rent Board, exist in the Administrative Code. Each of these has endured for decades and are often cited as models of effectiveness.

The Task Force recommends moving most commissions, including all non-decision-making bodies, to the Administrative Code so the Board of Supervisors can amend them as needs change over time.

Many commissions are currently established in other sections of the Municipal Codes, such as the Building Code, Police Code, or Health Code. These should generally move to **Chapter 5 of the Administrative Code** for centralized tracking.



Improve Accountability by Updating and Clarifying Commission Responsibilities

Why Update and Clarify Responsibilities?

Voters expect to hold elected officials accountable for City performance. However, the Charter currently assigns oversight of certain City departments to appointed boards and commissions, which diffuses accountability and limits the Mayor's ability to manage executive functions. Because these are un-elected volunteers, this structure makes it harder for the public to understand who is responsible for key decisions and outcomes and to hold them accountable.

The Task Force recommends shifting some responsibility back to the Mayor by allowing them to hire and fire most department heads, while still retaining a critical role for governance bodies in policymaking, oversight, and transparency. This approach strengthens accountability and makes government easier to understand.

Recommended Scope and Responsibilities

The Task Force recommends clearly defining the authority of each body to ensure effective governance.

Governance commissions, appeals boards, and other decision-making bodies should exercise the powers and duties assigned in Charter § 4.102 and any additional responsibilities assigned in their enabling legislation.


Advisory committees play a vital role in shaping citywide policy by contributing subject-matter expertise and fostering cross-departmental collaboration. For decades, bodies like the Immigrant Rights Commission, Child Care Planning and Advisory Council, and Behavioral Health Commission have brought lived experience and critical insights to policy discussions. Because advisory committees vary in scope and function, the Task Force does not recommend standardizing their duties. Instead, enabling legislation should define each committee's responsibilities to best support its mission.

| Type of Body | Responsibilities |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Decision-making bodies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversee and help direct the work of City departments • Formulate departmental goals, objectives, policies, and programs • Approve departmental budgets • Provide input to the Mayor on appointing and removing department heads • If part of the executive branch, support and further the mayor's objectives. • May hear and decide appeals of City decisions • Provide a forum for public input and transparency |
| Advisory committees | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advise City departments, elected officials, and/or decision-making bodies • Shape citywide policy by contributing subject-matter expertise and lived experience • May advise departments or elected officials on budget priorities or funding allocations • Provide a forum for public input and transparency |

Recommended Changes to Hiring and Firing Authority

Currently, Charter § 4.102 allows most governance commissions to nominate three candidates for department head and to remove them. This creates a dual chain of command that can complicate leadership and accountability.

The Task Force recommends allowing the Mayor to hire and fire most department heads, with input and consultation from their respective governance commissions. However, certain governance commissions, such as the Ethics Commission, Elections Commission, and Retirement Board should retain hiring and firing authority to protect their independence and insulate their departments from political interference.



Legend:

No change recommended

Recommend changing to mayoral appointments

Other Updates and Clarifications

1. Contract approval

Under the Charter, the Board of Supervisors is the City's legislative body with authority over contract approval. Commissions possess legal contract approval authority only where the Board has affirmatively granted it through legislation; neither the Charter nor the Administrative Code alone confers independent contract approval power.

In practice, some commissions adopt policies requiring departments to submit contracts for commission review, but the commission's approval or rejection of the contracts is not legally binding.

The Task Force recommends clarifying commissions' legal authority through better training and onboarding.

The Task Force considered granting commissions this authority for contracts above a certain threshold, but felt this task was best left to the Board of Supervisors. The Board may choose to assign contract approval authority to commissions via ordinance as it has done for public works contracts and sole source grants through Chapter 6 and Chapter 21G of the Administrative Code, respectively.

2. **Employee discipline**

Commissions should not have a role in employee discipline, unless required by law. Currently, only the Police Commission and Fire Commission are required to have such authority.

Make Government More Consistent and Understandable by Standardizing Structure and Membership

Why Standardize Structure and Membership?

As noted in the key principles section, the current commission system is too complex, which makes government less transparent and harder for everyday residents to understand and engage with. Many of the 152 public meeting bodies have unique structures and responsibilities, requiring residents to invest time learning how each body operates and how to engage with it effectively.

To address this, the Task Force generally recommends standardizing commission structures and applying these standards to any new bodies created in the future. This approach will make government easier for the public to understand.

Standardization will also leverage best practices to improve commission effectiveness. For example:

- Adopting **term lengths** and **term limits** adheres to general best practices, creating opportunities for broader public participation and balancing the benefits of both experience and new perspectives.
- Establishing **sunset dates** for advisory bodies will ensure regular review of each body's relevance and impact
- Simplifying **appointment and removal procedures** will fill vacant seats more quickly and create clearer lines of accountability for commissioners

However, recognizing that one size does not fit all, the Task Force also recommends exceptions where appropriate. These are discussed in the "Recommended Changes to Each Public Body" section.

Recommended Structures for Different Types of Meeting Bodies

| Component | Governance Commissions | Advisory Committees |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| Number of members | 5-7 | 15 maximum |
| When bodies are too large, it becomes difficult to function effectively, maintain quorum, and make timely decisions. While advisory committees often require more members to broaden expertise and public input, governance and appeals bodies should generally not exceed seven members. All bodies should have an odd number of members to avoid tie votes. | | |
| Appointing authority | Mayor (default) | No recommendation |
| Most governance commissions oversee executive branch departments. Their role is to support the Mayor's objectives by offering deeper oversight than the Mayor's office can provide alone. As a result, the Mayor should generally appoint these commission members. Other bodies insulate decision-making from political influence, particularly around long-term financial planning or topics impacting elected officials. In these cases, split appointments may be appropriate. The Task Force recommends defaulting to Mayoral appointments, with exceptions made as needed. For advisory committees and appeals boards, which serve specific purposes, the appropriate appointing authority will differ depending on need. | | |
| Appointment Confirmations | No confirmations | No confirmations |
| Confirmations are already standardized for Mayoral appointments under Charter § 3.100.18, where they are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days. Some bodies have exceptions to this rule. The Task Force wanted to standardize to existing language unless there was a good reason not to. | | |
| Member Removal | At will | At will |
| Current processes for removing members for cause make it exceptionally challenging to remove ineffective members, leading to ineffective bodies. The City has not removed a commissioner using the current for-cause process in the past 40 years. The Task Force recommends that most appointments be at-will, unless additional protection is needed to insulate decision-making bodies from political influence. | | |
| Term Lengths and Limits | 4-year terms 3 terms maximum | 3-year terms Term limits on a case-by-case basis |
| The Task Force recommends that no commission member serve for more than 12 years. Most terms are currently 4 years, so the Task Force aligned the templates to the most common practice. Advisory committees differ due to the addition of 3-year sunset dates; no terms should extend beyond a body's sunset date. | | |
| Qualifications | Body-level desirable qualifications | Body-level desirable qualifications |
| The Task Force has found many existing qualifications overly restrictive, making it difficult to find qualified candidates and leading to unfilled seats. Where it makes sense, the Task Force recommends making qualifications for governance and advisory bodies desirable and body-level (rather than seat-level). The Mayor is already required to submit information indicating why a candidate is qualified under Charter § 3.100.18; the Task Force recommends standardizing this practice to all appointments. | | |
| Sunset Dates | No sunset date | 3 years |
| The Charter and Administrative Code include bodies that are defunct, either because they achieved their purpose or the underlying conditions necessitating them are no longer applicable. However, the City cannot remove them because they are in the Charter or voter-approved. Adding a sunset date ensures | | |

that advisory bodies continue to serve their purpose and add value to the City, and add a mechanism for removing them once they are no longer necessary. Crucially, the Task Force does not believe all advisory bodies should last only 3 years, rather, that having a sunset date requires the Board of Supervisors to affirmatively renew body and provides regular intervals to assess the need for it.

Membership

The Task Force recommends modifying, combining, or eliminating certain bodies to reduce the total number of commission seats from approximately 1,500 to 900.

Nearly 20% of all seats belong to a single body – the DCYF Service Provider Working Group (SPWG) – which consists of 295 members and doesn't currently function as a Brown Act-compliant public meeting body. Excluding SPWG, **the Task Force recommends reducing the total number of commission seats from approximately 1,200 to 900.**

| Current Type of Body | Current Seats | Recommended Seats | Seat Reduction | Percent Change |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Governance | 254 | 236 | 18 | -7% |
| Advisory | 545 | 333 | 212 | -39% |
| Staff Working Groups | 241 | 169 | 72 | -30% |
| Other | 147 | 137 | 10 | -7% |
| Total | 1187 | 875 | 312 | -26% |
| <i>Service Provider Working Group</i> | <i>295</i> | <i>7</i> | <i>288</i> | <i>-98%</i> |
| Total (including SPWG) | 1482 | 882 | 600 | -40% |

Standardize Naming Conventions

The Task Force recommends standardizing naming conventions to align with body type.

- Advisory bodies should be **councils**
- Decision-making bodies should be **boards or commissions**

The Task Force's ordinance and Charter amendment rename many bodies to align with these conventions. However, some advisory bodies should retain their current names for historical significance and branding purposes. Any new bodies should follow these guidelines.

Recommendations for Managing and Improving Public Bodies

On October 20, 2025, Task Force staff met with over 65 clerks, secretaries, and commission staff from all public body types to source best practices on mission and scope management, member onboarding and training, and meeting facilitation. Participants also shared common challenges faced by public meeting bodies and identified possible process improvements to support and improve commission administration.

Task Force staff also investigated how peer jurisdictions approach similar matters and researched literature to recommend best practices.

The Task Force explored how to strengthen and support public meeting bodies to promote effective and efficient administration at its November 19th meeting. The section below summarizes the topics discussed.

Clearly Define Each Body's Mission and Scope

Each commission should clearly define its mission and scope to anchor member discussions on relevant topics and business. Without an articulated mission, members do not have a shared goal to work towards. Likewise, without a clearly defined scope, members may pursue too many avenues for change, reducing their ability to provide useful advice and execute plans effectively.


Ensure Role Clarity for Commission Members

Commission staff cited the following best practices to ensure role clarity.

- **Regular communication of jurisdiction** reminds members of what they may influence and how they may do so, making their bodies more efficient and effective.
- **Documented role descriptions** provide reference tools for questions about powers, duties, and responsibilities.
- **Trainings** teach and reinforce key responsibilities and expectations.
- **One-on-one meetings** with commissioners and staff set expectations and create space for discussions and questions beyond official meetings.

Provide Robust Onboarding and Training for Commission Members and Support Staff

Commission staff currently train and onboard members through new member orientations, commissioner role trainings, commission retreats, and one-on-one regular check-ins before meetings. While these approaches provide solid foundations, commission members and support staff may benefit from additional trainings, such as:



Task Force staff also identified best practices from peer jurisdictions. Many created guides and handbooks to instruct advisory body members and staffers on how to administer a public meeting body. These handbooks include rules on email correspondence between members, meeting conduct, reasons for removal from office, and tips on how to be an effective member. They also include introductions on how city government operates, the Brown Act, and the role of City staff and commission members. Examples of guides and handbooks include the following.

- The City of Santa Rosa published a [Guide for Advisory Bodies](#) in May 2025.
- The City Clerk of San Luis Obispo published an [Advisory Body Handbook](#) in October 2024.
- The City Clerk of El Cerrito published a [Handbook for City Advisory Body Members](#) in March 2024.
- The City Clerk of Lake Shasta published a [Guide for Advisory Bodies](#).

Plan and Facilitate Effective Meetings

Commission staff shared the factors leading to effective and successful meetings, including the following.

- **Preparing in advance** by creating facilitation guides for Chairs, drafting scripts for the secretary or clerk, and briefing Chairs on agenda topics. Following up with post-meeting debriefs to improve future sessions.
- **Developing structured agendas** ahead of time based on calendared topics, incorporating input from Chairs and the City Attorney's Office.
- **A strong chair** to implement the agenda and guide discussion helps keep members on task.
- **Managing discussions effectively** by monitoring timing, maintaining focus within the body's purview, and guiding deliberations.
- **Provide staff support during meetings**, including presentations to share relevant information on agenda topics and ensuring City staff, including a City Attorney, are available to answer questions and clarify issues for informed decision-making.

Task Force staff asked whether minimum numbers of meetings should be prescribed for bodies to assess how active they are. Instead, the Task Force suggested that each body should state how frequently they should meet and be measured against their own goal.

Provide Commissions with Greater City Support

Commission staff requested the following support from the City.

- **Faster, more consistent appointments** by appointing authorities. Clerks and secretaries may provide support or recommend candidates, but the appointing authorities should lead the process and act expeditiously to fill vacancies when they arise.
- **Closer collaboration between departments and their commissions** to enhance mission cohesion and engagement, achieve the goals for their body, and to be more aware of department policies and programs.
- **Additional support for all commissions from the City Attorney and Clerk of the Board** to clarify their powers, responsibilities, and limitations and to share best practices for managing their body lawfully and successfully.
- **Increase SFGovTV availability and technology support** to successfully hold meetings with fewer technological delays and malfunctions.
- **Maintain an up-to-date list of public meeting rooms** and provide more rooms with sufficient technology set-ups to host public meetings.

Update Rules and Requirements to Improve Flexibility and Participation

- **Remove the Charter § 4.102 requirement that commissions hire a secretary** to allow for greater staffing flexibility. While staff support is critical, the Charter should not dictate how staff support is provided.
- **Remove floating seat requirements** that require a specific percentage of membership to hold a particular quality or expertise, since they make the appointment process slower and more difficult. The Task Force addressed this issue in their body-by-body deliberations by frequently making member qualifications desirable at the body level.
- **Lobby the state to allow for virtual meetings**, which would increase quorum by making it easier for members to attend meetings and broaden who may participate by reducing barriers to engagement. California's current Brown Act dictates that public meeting bodies must hold open and public meetings.¹⁵
- **Clarify livestreaming rules** to broaden community engagement.

Track Commission Data and Performance

Empower Appointing Authorities to Ensure Quality and Consistent Performance Measurement and Data Maintenance

Through research and conversations with commission staff, Task Force staff found a need for greater commission performance and data maintenance. They observed inconsistencies between the way public bodies measured their successes, reported on their activities, and shared other key public information. Staff presented the Task Force with three options to provide additional performance and data maintenance for all

¹⁵ California's Brown Act dictates that public meeting bodies must hold open and public meetings. [SB 707](#) (2025), effective in 2026, expands and reorganizes the teleconferencing provisions of the Brown Act.

public hearing bodies: creating a new oversight body, assigning the oversight work to the Controller's Office, or mandating appointing authorities perform enhanced management. Instead, Task Force members affirmed that appointing authorities should ensure that bodies accomplish their missions through appointing qualified and dedicated members and be responsible for the quality of the information shared. They stated the communication of information to the public is part of every public meeting body's role. Task Force members also noted that the public may raise concerns about bodies' performance and communication of information to the Board of Supervisors so the creation of an additional body or assigning oversight to another department could create an unnecessary and burdensome workload for City staff.

Adapt Reporting Requirements Based on Commission Needs

The Task Force considered the recommendation for greater standardization of reports, as recommended by the Civil Grand Jury in "Commission Impossible." The recommendation called for requiring reports to include information such as the body's statement of purpose, description of activities and achievements, commissioner names, and more. Task Force members found standardizing reporting requirements unnecessary since much of the information to be included in reports already exists on public body websites. They remarked that report drafting best practices should not be codified as standards since future reporting needs may change. The Task Force also noted that quarterly or annual reporting requirements may be too frequent, as much of the desired information is already available on commission websites, and the intended audience for reports is unclear. They directed the City Attorney to remove annual reporting to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors requirements for decision-making bodies out of the Charter. In contrast, they noted it may be beneficial for limited-in-time bodies to produce a report to summarize their work.

Retain Meeting Minutes Standards

The Task Force also considered whether to standardize meeting minutes beyond standards set by Administrative Code § 67.16. They opposed adding new requirements stating best practices should not be codified in the Charter. Task Force members also noted that future technology may assist in producing minutes so codifying further best practices may restrict future minutes production.

Coordinate Interdepartmental Maintenance of the List of Bodies

The Task Force also considered which entities should maintain a current list of public hearing bodies. Currently, the City Attorney's Office, the Clerk of the Board, and the City Administrator's Office maintain lists. The City Attorney's Office currently cites the Task Force's list of bodies but previously listed 135 bodies and organized them by whether members filed statements of economic interests with the Ethics Commission to indicate if they are decision-making bodies or advisory bodies. The Clerk of the Board's list complies with the Maddy Act, noting all upcoming appointments to boards, commissions, and committees per Cal. Gov. Code § 54972. The City Administrator's list is managed by their 311 program as a database of 100 bodies, noting their mandates and authorizing language; however, the database is supposed to reflect all 115 active commissions and public meeting bodies. Task Force staff investigated how peer jurisdictions maintain their lists of bodies and observed that the Counties of Los Angeles, San Diego, and Santa Clara assign this responsibility to their Clerk of the Board. The Office of the City Clerk maintains a commission database for Los Angeles, San Jose, and Berkeley.

The Task Force opted not to codify charging a specific entity with maintaining a current list of bodies; in doing so, the City Attorney Office, the Clerk of the Board, and the City Administrator's Office 311 program will continue producing their lists of bodies. The Task Force suggested the offices responsible for producing lists of bodies coordinate list maintenance going forward.

Recommended Changes to Each Public Body

This section provides a brief summary of recommendations for each public body, organized by policy area. It is intended to provide a brief overview of the Task Force's decisions and recommendations and note where recommendations deviate from the standards, as discussed in prior sections.

Reference Table for Each Public Body

| Policy Area | List of Bodies | Page |
|--|--|------|
| Arts and Culture | African American Arts and Cultural District Community Advisory Committee, Arts Commission, Asian Art Commission, Film Commission, Fine Arts Museums Board of Trustees, Library Commission, Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Advisory Committee, War Memorial Board of Trustees | XX |
| Building and Permitting | Abatement Appeals Board, Access Appeals Commission, Board of Appeals, Board of Examiners, Building Inspection Commission, Code Advisory Committee, Permit Prioritization Task Force, Relocation Appeals Board, Structural Advisory Committee | |
| Capital Projects and Infrastructure | Capital Planning Committee, Citizens Advisory Committee for Street Utility Construction, Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee, Committee for Planning Utility Construction Program, Committee for Utility Liaison on Construction and Other Projects, Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District Public Financing Authority No. 1, Municipal Green Building Task Force, SFMTA Bond Oversight Committee, Street Utilities Coordinating Committee | |
| Children and Youth | Child Care Planning and Advisory Council, Children and Families First Commission, Children, Youth and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee, Early Childhood Community Oversight and Advisory Committee, Free City College Oversight Committee, Our Children, Our Families Council, Service Provider Working Group, Youth Commission | |
| City Employment and Benefits | Civil Service Commission, Employee Relations Board, Health Service Board, Retiree Health Care Trust Fund Board, Retirement Board, Special Strike Committee | |
| Community Health | Behavioral Health Commission, City Agency Task Force (Lead Abatement), Food Security Task Force, Health Commission, Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee | |
| Economic Development | Airport Commission, Board of Directors of the San Francisco Downtown Revitalization and Economic Recovery Financing District, Cannabis Oversight Committee, Entertainment Commission, Small Business Commission | |
| Elections | Ballot Simplification Committee, Elections Commission, Elections Task Force | |
| General City Administration | Assessment Appeals Board, City Hall Preservation Advisory Committee, City-Operated Farmers' Market Advisory Committee, Commission of Animal Control and Welfare, Commission Streamlining Task Force, Committee on Information Technology (COIT), Contract Review Committee, Justice Tracking Information System (JUSTIS) Committee Governance Council, Law Library Board of Trustees, Local Business Enterprise Preference Program Working Group, Refuse Rate Board, State Legislation Committee, Subcontracting Goals Committee, Sweatfree Procurement Advisory Group, Treasury Oversight Committee, Workers' Compensation Council, Working Group on Local Business Enterprise Preference Program for City Leases and Concession Agreements, Working Group to Investigate Barriers to LBE Participation | |
| Homelessness | Homelessness Oversight Commission, Local Homeless Coordinating Board, Our City, Our Home Oversight Committee, Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee, Shelter Monitoring Committee | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Housing and Community Development | Citizens Committee on Community Development, Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board, Inclusionary Housing Technical Advisory Committee, Residential Rehabilitation Area Citizen Advisory Committees, Residential Rehabilitation Area Rent Committees, Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board, San Francisco Residential Hotel Operators Advisory Committee, SOMA Community Stabilization Fund Community Advisory Committee, Southeast Community Facility Commission, Supportive Housing Services Fund Committee | |
| Human Rights | Advisory Council on Human Rights, Commission on the Status of Women, Family Violence Council, Human Rights Commission, Immigrant Rights Commission, LGBTQI+ Advisory Committee | |
| Human Services | Adult Day Health Care Planning Council, Advisory Council to the Disability and Aging Services Commission, Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee, Dignity Fund Service Providers Working Group, Disability and Aging Services Commission, Human Services Commission, In-Home Supportive Services Public Authority Governing Body, Long Term Care Coordinating Council, Veterans' Affairs Commission | |
| Justice System | Close Juvenile Hall Working Group, Community Corrections Partnership, Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council, Juvenile Probation Commission, Reentry Council, Sentencing Commission | |
| Parks and Environment | Capital Implementation Committee; Commission on the Environment; Joint Zoo Committee; Park, Recreation, And Open Space Advisory Committee; Recreation and Park Commission; Urban Forestry Council | |
| Planning and Land Use | Bayview Hunters Point Citizens Advisory Committee, Historic Preservation Commission, Interagency Planning and Implementation Committee, Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee, Planning Commission, South of Market Community Planning Advisory Committee, Street Design Review Committee, Treasure Island Development Authority Board of Directors, Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island Citizens Advisory Board | |
| Port | Port Commission, Waterfront Design Advisory Committee | |
| Public Integrity | Ethics Commission, Sunshine Ordinance Task Force | |
| Public Protection | Delinquency Prevention Commission, Disaster Council, Fire Commission, Police Commission, Real Estate Fraud Prosecution Trust Fund Committee, Sheriff's Department Oversight Board | |
| Public Utilities | Public Utilities Citizens' Advisory Committee, Public Utilities Commission, Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board, PUC Small Firm Advisory Committee | |
| Public Works | Graffiti Advisory Board, Industrial Waste Review Board, Newsrack Advisory Committee, Public Works Commission, Sanitation and Streets Commission | |
| Transportation | Bicycle Advisory Committee, Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation (ISCOTT), Mission Bay Transportation Improvement Fund Advisory Committee, Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors, Municipal Transportation Agency Citizens' Advisory Council | |
| Workforce Development | Committee on City Workforce Alignment, Industrial Development Authority Board, Workforce Development Advisory Committee, Workforce Investment Board | |

Legend

Proposed changes:

If no changes are recommended:

Current State

If changes recommended:

~~Current State~~

Recommended Change

DRAFT

Arts and Culture

The Task Force discussed and recommended changes to arts and culture bodies at its July 16, October 1, and December 3, 2025, meetings (“Inactive Bodies,” “Housing and Economic Development,” “Deferred Decisions.”). For more information, please refer to the [July 16](#), [October 1](#), and December 3 meeting minutes, and accompanying materials (Housing and Economic Development [memo](#) and [presentation](#), Inactive Bodies [memo](#) and [presentation](#)).

African American Arts and Cultural District Community Advisory Committee – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force unanimously voted to eliminate this body in its July 16th meeting, as part of a vote to accept staff recommendations to eliminate 31 inactive bodies. Although the Board of Supervisors formally established this Advisory Committee in 2020 and publicly noticed vacancies in early 2021, there have been no nominations, appointments, or convenings to date. As a result, the body has remained inactive since its inception.

Next step: ordinance

Arts Commission – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|---|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Decision-making Advisory | Charter | 15 | MYR | 4 years | None 3 years | At will | None |
| Changes to Responsibilities: Consultative role in design of public buildings, advisory and consultative role in arts expenditures, remove department head hiring and firing authority, remove budget and contract approval authority. | | | | | | | |

The Arts Commission oversees a City agency, also called the Arts Commission, and has an expansive scope that includes oversight and administration of arts-related policies and funds for art. The Arts Commission has an important role in preserving San Francisco’s role as a leader in promoting and supporting creative arts. 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 Task Force recommends retaining the Arts Commission in the Charter along with its mission and general role and moving the majority of its functions into the Administrative Code to allow for future flexibility, given upcoming changes and uncertainty about arts administration Citywide. It also recommends language changes to amend the Arts Commission’s role from oversight to advisory in some functions.

Next step: ballot measure

Asian Art Commission – Keep, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|-----------------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Charter | 27 | MYR | 3 years | None | For cause At will | None |

The Task Force discussed the Asian Art Commission, Fine Arts Museums Board of Trustees, and War Memorial Board of Trustees together since these three bodies oversee “charitable trust departments” and are

legally required. These bodies have unique fiduciary responsibilities and oversee departments with unique structures. Each is an art-related body overseeing City-owned property that an external entity manages. As a result, the Task Force recommends that the Asian Art Commission retain certain responsibilities such as hiring/firing the Asian Art Museum Director, nominating new members for the Mayor to appoint, and allowing the Commission to set its own term limits in its bylaws, although the Task Force recommends a maximum of 12 years.

Next step: ballot measure

Film Commission – Keep, modify responsibilities

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|--|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------|
| Decision-making Advisory | Administrative Code | 11 | MYR | 4 years | None | At will | None |
| Changes to Responsibilities: | | | | | | | |
| Remove department head hiring and firing authority | | | | | | | |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Film Commission which currently oversees FilmSF, a division currently within the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD). The FY25-26 Mayor's budget proposed combining the Film Commission with the Arts Commission and Grants for the Arts to create a larger arts agency. However, the exact details and timeline of that change are still to be decided. The Task Force Members noted the Film Commission's value in bringing film business to San Francisco, which helps drive economic activity and is already advisory in nature. The Task Force recommends only minimal changes to responsibilities, largely leaving structures as-is and retaining the name as the "Film Commission" since the name is an important part of the body's brand.

Next step: ordinance

Fine Arts Museums Board of Trustees – Keep, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|-----------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Charter | Up to 62 Up to 20 | FAM Board of Trustees MYR | 3 years | None | For cause At will | None |

The Task Force discussed the Asian Art Commission, Fine Arts Museums (FAM) Board of Trustees, and War Memorial Board of Trustees together since these three bodies oversee "charitable trust departments" and are legally required. These bodies have unique fiduciary responsibilities and oversee departments with unique structures. Each is an art-related body overseeing City-owned property that an external entity manages. As a result, the Task Force recommends that the Board of Trustees retain certain responsibilities such as hiring and firing the executive director, nominating new members for the Mayor to appoint, and allowing the Board of Trustees to set its own term limits in its bylaws, although the Task Force recommends a maximum of 12 years (four terms). The Task Force also recommends aligning quorum rules to standard practices, per Charter § 4.104b, which defines quorum as "the presence of a majority of the members."

Next step: ballot measure

Library Commission – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|--|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Charter | 7 | MYR | 4 years | None 3 terms | At will | None |
| Changes to Responsibilities: | | | | | | | |
| Remove department head hiring and firing authority | | | | | | | |

The Library Commission oversees the Library Department and provides space for public engagement around library services. The Task Force recommends keeping the Library Commission and making changes consistent with the Task Force's standards for governance commissions.

Next step: ballot measure

Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Advisory Committee: Eliminate, transfer functions to City staff

The Task Force recommends eliminating Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Advisory Committee. This body meets quarterly and its primary function is reviewing and approving Art Vendor licenses. Recent changes in State and local law have rendered this license obsolete and the Arts Commission and City Attorney are working to update this license program and bring it into compliance with State law. As part of these changes, City staff could take over license review and approval and address applications on a rolling basis, allowing for more efficient license processing for applicants. Task Force members requested that the Arts Commission department continue engaging with artists as part of the licensing process, despite eliminating the Committee, and build that engagement into future program updates.

Next step: ballot measure

War Memorial Board of Trustees: Keep, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|--|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Charter | 11 | MYR | 3 years | None | For cause At will | None |
| Changes to Responsibilities: | | | | | | | |
| Remove department head hiring and firing authority | | | | | | | |

The Task Force discussed the Asian Art Commission, Fine Arts Museums (FAM) Board of Trustees, and War Memorial Board of Trustees together since these three bodies oversee "charitable trust departments" and are legally required. These bodies have unique fiduciary responsibilities and oversee departments with unique structures. Each is an art-related body overseeing City-owned property that an external entity manages. As a result, the Task Force recommends that the Board of Trustees retain certain responsibilities such as allowing the Board of Trustees to set its own term limits in its bylaws, although the Task Force recommends a maximum of 12 years (four terms). Unlike the Asian Art Commission and Fine Arts Museums (FAM) Board of Trustees, the Task Force recommends removing department head hiring and firing authority.

Next step: ballot measure

Building and Permitting

The Task Force discussed and recommended changes to building and permitting bodies at its July 16 and October 1, 2025, meetings ("Inactive Bodies," "Housing and Economic Development"). For more information, please refer to the [July 16](#) and [October 1](#) meeting minutes, and accompanying materials (Housing and Economic Development [memo](#) and [presentation](#), Inactive Bodies [memo](#) and [presentation](#).)¹⁶

Abatement Appeals Board (AAB) – Keep, move to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|-----------------|--|---------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Charter, Building Code Administrative Code | 7 | Building Inspection Commission | 2 years 4 years | None 3 terms | For cause At will | None |

The Task Force recommended keeping the Department of Building Inspection (DBI)'s Abatement Appeals Board (AAB), which hears and decides appeals by property owners who are contesting orders from the City to fix building code violations.

Next step: Ordinance and ballot measure

Access Appeals Commission (AAC) – Keep as a Subcommittee of the Board of Appeals, move to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|-----------------|--|---------|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Charter, Building Code Administrative Code | 5 | Building Inspection Commission | 4 years | None | At will | None |

The Task Force considered eliminating the Access Appeals Commission (AAC), which conducts hearings on DBI's interpretations of disability access regulations and enforcement, but determined this body should be kept and re-structured as a subcommittee of the BOA. The AAC met five times and heard just two appeals in the last twenty-one months. Given this limited activity, the AAC's existence as a stand-alone body may not be necessary. However, the AAC fulfils a required role under state law, and its membership requirements are specialized and defined by the state. The Task Force recommends establishing a standing Access Appeals subcommittee under the BOA, comprised of separate individuals who meet the state's membership requirements and convene only as needed to hear accessibility appeals.

Next step: ballot measure

Board of Appeals (BOA) – Keep, modify structure and absorb functions from other bodies

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|-----------------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Charter | 5 | MYR, BOS President | 4 years | None 3 terms | For cause | None |

¹⁶ All materials can be found at <https://www.sf.gov/commission-streamlining-task-force>

The Task Force recommends keeping the Board of Appeals and expanding its duties to hear all appeals previously heard by the Access Appeals Commission (AAC) and Board of Examiners (BOE) as discussed elsewhere in this section. The department expressed a capacity and willingness to hear these additional appeals.

Next step: ballot measure

Board of Examiners (BOE) – Eliminate, transfer functions to Board of Appeals

The Task Force recommends eliminating the BOE, which hears appeals by property owners of construction safety or building code enforcement actions by DBI, and assigning its duties to the BOA. In practice, the BOE has little activity; it did not meet at all during FY 2024. 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.

The BOE also determines whether new construction methods or materials comply with safety standards. However, given that the BOE rarely meets and that DBI exists to ensure buildings are safe and compliant with building codes, a stand-alone body may not be necessary.

Next step: ballot measure

Building Inspection Commission (BIC) – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities, move to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|--|---|---------|---------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Charter Administrative Code | 7 | MYR, BOS President | 2 years 4 years | None 3 terms | For cause At will | None |
| Changes to Responsibilities: | | | | | | | |
| Remove department head hiring and firing authority | | | | | | | |

The Task Force recommended keeping the Building Inspection Commission (BIC), which oversees DBI, but moving it from Charter to code. Both BIC and DBI have undergone numerous changes over time and may change further as the City undertakes [permitting reform](#). Moving the body to code allows the Board of Supervisors to make future changes via the regular legislative process.

Next step: ballot measure

Code Advisory Committee (CAC) – Keep, move to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|----------|--|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Advisory | Charter, Building Code Administrative Code | 17 | BIC | 3 years | None 4 terms | At will | None |

The Task Force recommended keeping the Code Advisory Committee, which advises the BIC on changes to building codes, but removing references in the Charter and moving its establishing authority from the Building Code to the Administrative Code.

Next step: ballot measure

Permit Prioritization Task Force – Eliminate (inactive), transfer functions to City staff

The Task Force unanimously voted to eliminate the Permit Prioritization Task Force in its July 16th meeting, as part of a vote to accept staff recommendations to eliminate 31 inactive bodies. It was established in 2023 with the goal of recommending permit prioritization guidelines for several City departments by June 30, 2024. The Task Force achieved this goal, and its work has since been operationalized by City staff. This body is no longer meeting.

The Permit Prioritization Task Force can only be removed from the Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code by a specific process involving supermajorities of the Ethics Commission (4/5 approval) and Board of Supervisors (8/11 approval). We recommend forwarding this recommendation to the Ethics Commission for consideration and action.

Next step: ordinance to Ethics Commission¹⁷

Relocation Appeals Board – Eliminate (inactive), transfer functions to Board of Supervisors

The Task Force unanimously voted to eliminate the Relocation Appeals Board in its July 16th meeting, as part of a vote to accept staff recommendations to eliminate 31 inactive bodies. The Relocation Appeals Board was previously required by California Health & Safety Code 33417.5 for cities and counties which had a Redevelopment Agency in order to hear complaints by individuals forced to relocate their homes or businesses.

San Francisco no longer has a Redevelopment Agency, as all such agencies were dissolved by the State. The successor Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure does not plan to conduct any relocations. As a general practice, the City does not force the relocation of homes or businesses. The Relocation Appeals Board has not had members appointed for at least the last 10 years, and no actions have been taken.

However, state law still requires an appeals process if there is a forced relocation of a home or business by any City agency. The Task Force recommends transferring this duty to the Board of Supervisors.

Next step: ordinance

Structural Advisory Committee (SAC) – Eliminate, may continue as passive meeting body

The Task Force voted to eliminate the Structural Advisory Committee, which is convened periodically to provide independent expert review on building permit applications that involve special design features or procedures. This type of peer review is likely to be faster and more effective without an official policy body subject to Brown Act requirements.

Next step: ballot measure

¹⁷ Requires supermajority approval by the Ethics Commission (4/5 votes) and Board of Supervisors (8/11 votes)

Capital Projects and Infrastructure

The Task Force discussed and recommended changes to Capital Projects and Infrastructure bodies at its July 16 and September 17, 2025, meetings (“Inactive Bodies,” “Infrastructure, Climate, and Mobility,” “General Administration and Finance”). For more information on each body and a summary of the Task Force’s discussion, please refer to the [July 16th](#) and [September 17th](#) meeting minutes and accompanying materials (Infrastructure, Climate, and Mobility [memo](#), and [presentation](#) and Inactive Bodies [memo](#), and [presentation](#), General Administration and Finance [memo](#) and [presentation](#)).¹⁸

Capital Planning Committee (CPC) – Keep, no changes

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|---------------------|------------------------|---------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------|
| Staff working group | Administrative Code | 11 | Ex officio membership ¹⁹ | None | None | N/A | None |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Capital Planning Committee (CPC), which plans, prioritizes, and coordinates the City’s capital investments. While a combination with the Citizens’ General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee (CGOBOC) did not make sense, the Task Force identified a disconnect between the City’s capital planning and oversight activities. Future efforts should aim to better align CPC’s forward-looking, strategic planning with CGOBOC’s retrospective oversight role.

Next step: none

Citizens’ General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee – Keep, modify structure, keep only in Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|----------|---|---------|---------------------|-------------------------------|---|----------------|--------|
| Advisory | Administrative Code, Charter | 9 | MYR, BOS, CON, CGJ | 2 years 3 years | 2 consecutive terms 4 terms | At will | None |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Citizens’ General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee (CGOBOC), which provides public oversight and transparency into San Francisco’s General Obligation (GO) bond expenditures. While a combination with the Capital Planning Committee (CPC) did not make sense, the Task Force identified a disconnect between the City’s capital planning and oversight activities. Future efforts should aim to better align CPC’s forward-looking, strategic planning with CGOBOC’s retrospective oversight role.

Next step: ballot measure and ordinance²⁰

Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District Public Financing Authority No. 1 – Keep, modify structure

¹⁸ All materials can be found at <https://www.sf.gov/commission-streamlining-task-force>

¹⁹ Committee members are the City Administrator, President of the Board of Supervisors, Mayor’s Finance Director, Controller, and department heads or their designees from City Planning, Public Works, Airport, Municipal Transportation Agency, Public Utilities Commission, Recreation and Parks, and Port.

²⁰ No changes to CGOBOC’s Charter authority

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|-------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|--|
| Other | Administrative Code | 5 | BOS | 4 years | None 3 terms | At will | Upon dissolution of EIFD ²¹ |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD) Public Financing Authority No. 1, which serves as the state-mandated governing body for the City's EIFDs.

Next step: none

SFMTA Bond Oversight Committee (SFMTA BOC) – Eliminate, transfer functions to City staff

The Task Force recommends eliminating the SFMTA Bond Oversight Committee (SFMTA BOC), which monitors spending of revenue bond proceeds for transportation projects. While oversight and transparency are valuable for all public spending, revenue bonds differ from general obligation bonds in key ways: they are not always subject to voter approval and are repaid through user-generated revenue (e.g., transit fares, parking fees) rather than citywide taxes. This makes the need for a citizen oversight body less clear.

No other City entities that issue revenue bonds, including the Board of Supervisors, Port, Airport, and Public Utilities Commission, have similar citizen oversight committees. SFMTA staff already report on revenue bond expenditures and should continue to do so, regardless of whether SFMTA BOC is eliminated.

Because SFMTA BOC was established by an MTA Board of Directors (MTAB) resolution, only MTAB can eliminate it. The Task Force cannot enact this recommendation via its ordinance or ballot measure.

Next step: none²²

Municipal Green Building Task Force (MGBTF) – Eliminate, transfer functions to City staff

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Municipal Green Building Task Force (MGBTF), which shares green building best practices among City departments and reviews waiver requests related to Environmental Code requirements for municipal construction projects. The Task Force believes these functions can and should be handled by staff, without the need for a formal public meeting body. The Task Force also recommends that other staff working groups like the MGBTF generally do not need to be codified as public meeting bodies.

Next step: ordinance

Committee for Utility Liaison on Construction and Other Projects (CULCOP) – Eliminate, keep as passive meeting body

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Committee for Utility Liaison on Construction and Other Projects (CULCOP), which coordinates street excavation, utility work, paving and other construction projects in the public right of way, with the understanding that its functions can and should be carried out by staff without

²¹ Unless the Board of Supervisors extends the Public Financing Authority, it can only sunset when the EIFDs are no longer collecting property tax revenues or when there are no outstanding bonds or other debt, whichever date is later (Administrative Code § 5.48-8).

²² This body was established by an MTA Board of Directors Resolution, so the Task Force cannot eliminate it by ordinance or ballot measure.

the need for a formal public meeting body. CULCOP is a staff working group that is not currently operating as a public meeting body, despite being codified in the Administrative Code.

Next step: ordinance

Citizens Advisory Committee for Street Utility Construction – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Citizens Advisory Committee for Street Utility Construction, which has not been active for years. Section 5.60-5.66 of the Administrative Code establishes four bodies to coordinate construction work in the public right-of-way. However, only one body – CULCOP – actively meets to serve this purpose. The other three bodies, including the Citizens Advisory Committee for Street Utility Construction, appear to have outlived their useful purpose and can safely be eliminated.

Next step: ordinance

Committee for Planning Utility Construction Program – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Committee for Planning Utility Construction Program, which has not been active for years. Section 5.60-5.66 of the Administrative Code establishes four bodies to coordinate construction work in the public right-of-way. However, only one body – CULCOP – actively meets to serve this purpose. The other three bodies, including the Committee for Planning Utility Construction Program, appear to have outlived their useful purpose and can safely be eliminated.

Next step: ordinance

Street Utilities Coordinating Committee – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Street Utilities Coordinating Committee, which has not been active for years. Section 5.60-5.66 of the Administrative Code establishes four bodies to coordinate construction work in the public right-of-way. However, only one body – CULCOP – actively meets to serve this purpose. The other three bodies, including the Street Utilities Coordinating Committee, appear to have outlived their useful purpose and can safely be eliminated.

Next step: ordinance

Capital Implementation Committee – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Capital Implementation Committee, which was created to support coordination between the Recreation and Parks Department and Department of Public Works following the passage of the 2000 Neighborhood Parks Bond. However, bond funds were fully expended by 2020, and this body likely stopped meeting long before then. This inactive body has outlived its useful purpose and can safely be eliminated.

Next step: ordinance

City Employment and Benefits

The Task Force discussed and recommended changes to City employment and benefits bodies at its July 16 and November 5 meetings (“Inactive Bodies,” and “General Administration and Finance”). For more information, please refer to the [July 16th](#) and [November 5th](#) meeting minutes and accompanying materials (General Administration and Finance [memo](#) and [presentation](#); Inactive Bodies [memo](#), and [presentation](#)).

Civil Service Commission – Keep, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|-----------------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Charter | 5 | MYR | 6 years | None 2 terms | For cause | None |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Civil Service Commission, which ensures a fair, credible, and robust merit system of employment for City employees.

Next step: ballot measure

Employee Relations Board – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force unanimously voted to eliminate the Employee Relations Board in its July 16th meeting, as part of a vote to accept staff recommendations to eliminate 31 inactive bodies. This body has never been active.

Next step: ballot measure

Health Service Board – Keep, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|-------|------------------------|---------|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Other | Charter | 7 | MYR, BOS President, CON, elected ²³ | 5 years 4 years | None 3 terms | At will | None |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Health Service Board, which contracts for and administers health plans for Health Service System members and their dependents. Currently, the Controller’s Office appointee must be confirmed by the Board itself; the Task Force recommends removing this requirement to align the Controller’s appointment with the Mayor and Board of Supervisors President’s appointments.

Next step: ballot measure

Retiree Health Care Trust Fund Board – Keep, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|-------|------------------------|---------|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Other | Charter | 5 | CON, TTX, SFERS, elected ²⁴ | 5 years 4 years | None 3 terms | At will | None |

²³ Three members are elected by Health Service System members, from among their membership

²⁴ Two members are elected by Health Service System members, from among their membership

The Task Force recommends keeping the Retiree Health Care Trust Fund Board, which oversees the City's contribution to the health care premiums of its retirees and their survivors. While the Task Force considered consolidating the RHCTFB with the Retirement Board given their similar roles managing trust fund investments, it ultimately chose to keep them separate, absent a recommendation to combine them from San Francisco Employees' Retirement System (SFERS) staff. However, the Task Force recommends moving the RHCTFB to the Administrative Code to allow for greater flexibility in the future.

Next step: ballot measure

Retirement Board – Keep, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|-------|------------------------|---------|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Other | Charter | 7 | MYR (3), BOS President (1), elected (3) ²⁵ | 5 years 4 years | None 3 terms | At will | None |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Retirement Board, which oversees administration, pension fund investment, member benefits, and actuarial funding of the city employees' retirement plan. While the Task Force explored a potential consolidation with the Retiree Health Care Trust Fund Board, it opted against the change in the absence of a SFERS staff recommendation to combine the two bodies. Both trust funds are legally required to have oversight boards.

Next step: ballot measure

Special Strike Committee – Eliminate, out of compliance with state law

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Special Strike Committee, which violates state law. In 2023, the California Public Employment Relations Board (PERB) ruled that San Francisco's strike prohibitions in Charter Section A8.346 violated state labor law, rendering the Special Strike Committee and other provisions of that Charter section unenforceable. In addition to eliminating the body, the Task Force would a broader Charter amendment to repeal Section A8.346 in its entirety and authorize the City Attorney to remove any future Charter provisions deemed unlawful without requiring voter approval.

Next step: ballot measure

²⁵ Three members are elected by Retirement System members, from among their membership

Children and Youth

The Task Force discussed and recommended changes to Children and Youth services bodies at its October 15 meeting ("Public Health and Wellbeing"). For more information, please refer to the [meeting minutes](#) and accompanying materials ([memo](#) and [presentation](#)).

Child Care Planning and Advisory Council (CPAC) – Keep, minor cleanup

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|----------|------------------------|---------|-------------------------|-------------|---------------------|----------------|--------|
| Advisory | Administrative Code | 25 | BOS, Board of Education | 3 years | 2 consecutive terms | At will | None |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Child Care Planning and Advisory Council (CPAC), which fulfils a State legal requirement as San Francisco's local childcare and development planning council. CPAC advises on childcare for children up to age twelve, covering both early care and education (ECE) and out-of-school time (OST) programs for school-aged children. The Task Force does not recommend any changes to the body, but directed the City Attorney to update outdated references to DCYF, which no longer provides administrative support, and replace them with DEC.

Next step: ordinance

Children and Families First Commission (First 5) – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities, keep only in Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|--|---|---------|----------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Administrative Code, Charter | 9 | BOS, Mayor, DPH, HSA, DCYF | 4 years | None 3 terms | At will | None |
| Changes to responsibilities: | | | | | | | |
| Budget approval authority only over Proposition 10 sales tax fund. | | | | | | | |
| Remove role in department head hiring | | | | | | | |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Children and Families First Commission (First 5), which is legally required to oversee certain early care and education funding from the state. First 5 also performs expanded duties beyond state requirements, advising on the Department of Early Childhood's (DEC) entire budget, approving the department's strategic plan, and recommending candidates for department head to the Mayor.

The Task Force had a lengthy discussion about whether First 5 is the right body to oversee DEC, since its membership, which is mandated by state law, includes a member of the Board of Supervisors and staff from other City departments. This setup is unusual for overseeing an executive branch department. Ultimately, the Task Force concluded that while imperfect, First 5 provides sufficient oversight and should keep most of its current responsibilities.

Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee (OAC) – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities, move to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------|
|------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------|

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|----|----------|---------|---------------------|---------|------|
| Decision-making | Charter, Administrative Code | 11 | MYR, BOS | 2 years | 2 consecutive terms | At will | None |
| Changes to responsibilities: | | | | | | | |
| Remove role in department head hiring and evaluation | | | | | | | |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee (OAC), which oversees the Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families (DCYF). Despite being larger than most governance bodies, the Task Force recommends retaining the body's current membership. It also recommends retaining current term lengths and limits, which differ from other governance bodies.

Next step: ballot measure

Early Childhood Community Oversight and Advisory Committee (EC COAC) – Eliminate, functions overlap with other body

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Early Childhood Community Oversight and Advisory Committee (EC COAC), due to its significant overlap with the Children and Families First Commission (First 5). Both bodies meet jointly four times per year and have nearly identical responsibilities under the Administrative Code. Together, they develop policy recommendations for the Department of Early Childhood (DEC), advise on funding guidelines, review the department's annual report and strategic plan, hold budget hearings, and recommend candidates for department head to the Mayor. The two also share similar membership requirements, with family support providers and child care coordinating groups represented on each. However, First 5 is a decision-making body while EC COAC is purely advisory. Given this overlap, the Task Force recommends retaining only First 5 as the sole body providing oversight and advice to DEC.

Next step: ballot measure

Free City College Oversight Committee – Keep, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|----------|------------------------|---------|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------|
| Advisory | Administrative Code | 15 | MYR, BOS, CCSF ²⁶ , SFUSD, CON, DCYF | None 3 years | None 4 terms | At will | 06/30/29 |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Free City College Oversight Committee, which oversees the implementation of the Free City College program. This body is scheduled to sunset in 2029, when the current funding agreement for the program expires.

Next step: ordinance

Service Provider Working Group (SPWG) – Keep, modify structure, move to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------|
|------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------|

²⁶ Three seats appointed by the City College Board of Trustees and one seat each from the City College Associated Students, CCSF Academic Senate, and the labor union representing the largest number of classified City College employees

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|---|---------------------|----------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------|----------------------------|
| Advisory | Charter Administrative Code | 295 7 | DCYF OAC | None 3 years | None 4 terms | At will | None 3 years |
|----------|---|---------------------|----------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------|----------------------------|

The Task Force recommends keeping the Service Provider Working Group (SPWG), which advises the Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee (OAC) on funding priorities, policy development, and other concerns related to the Children and Youth Fund. Currently, SPWG consists of 295 members and does not function as a Brown-Act compliant public meeting body. Task Force staff met with SPWG leadership to develop a proposal to bring the body into compliance by shrinking its membership to seven.

Next step: ballot measure

Youth Commission – Keep, modify structure, move to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|----------|---|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Advisory | Charter Administrative Code | 17 | MYR (6), BOS (11) | 1 year | None 3 terms | At will | None |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Youth Commission, which advises the Board of Supervisors and Mayor on policies and laws related to young people, but moving it from the Charter to Administrative Code to be consistent with other advisory committees. The Task Force also recommends establishing term limits, emphasizing the importance of creating opportunities for more youth to participate. The Task Force also recommended removing the Charter prohibition on stipends for youth commissioners, which is a barrier to participation for low-income youth.

Next step: ballot measure

Our Children, Our Families Council (OCOF) – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Our Children, Our Families Council (OCOF), which hasn't met since 2019 or 2020. The forty-member body was created in 2014 to align City, school district, and community efforts to improve outcomes for children, youth, and families. However, its large membership proved ineffective and the group stopped meeting at the onset of the pandemic. A November 2024 ballot measure (Prop J) established an OCOF Initiative, consisting of City staff, who could carry out the OCOF Council's Charter mandated duties: developing a San Francisco Children and Families Plan, an outcomes framework, and facilitating coordination between City departments, SFUSD, and community groups.

Next step: ballot measure

Community Health

The Task Force discussed and recommended changes to community health bodies at its July 16 and October 15, 2025, meetings (“Inactive Bodies” and “Public Health and Wellbeing”). For more information, please refer to the [July 16](#) and [October 15](#) meeting minutes and accompanying materials (Public Health and Wellbeing [memo](#) and [presentation](#); Inactive Bodies [memo](#) and [presentation](#)).²⁷

Behavioral Health Commission – Keep, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|----------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|--------|
| Advisory | Administrative Code | 12 | BOS | 3 years | 2 terms | For cause At will | None |

State law requires the Behavioral Health Commission to exist and mandates specific structures and duties, such as supporting the selection process for the Director of Behavioral Health Services. As a result, the Task Force recommends keeping the body and making only minor modifications to the structure.

Next step: ordinance

City Agency Task Force (Lead Abatement) – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force unanimously voted to eliminate the City Agency Task Force (Lead Abatement) in its July 16th meeting, as part of a vote to accept staff recommendations to eliminate 31 inactive bodies. This body’s purpose was to exchange information regarding lead education and abatement and to coordinate lead abatement activities across multiple City departments. Based on available information, it appears that this body has not met since 1999 yet lead abatement and education efforts have continued citywide.

Next step: ordinance

Food Security Task Force – Eliminate (functions overlap with City staff)

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Food Security Task Force (FSTF), but ensuring the Human Services Commission provides regular opportunities for discussion on Citywide food security. When the body launched in 2005, there were no City teams dedicated to food security. In 2020, San Francisco’s Human Services Agency (HSA) created a Citywide Food Access Team as part of the City’s COVID response. This unit now has staff dedicated to food security, contracts with CBOs to deliver food access programs, and is a forum for Citywide coordination. The fact that the City has now integrated food access programming into its regular activities suggests that the Food Security Task Force has outlived its useful purpose. Having the Human Services Commission provide space for discussion on food security ensures that there will also still be a public forum for public input into food security programming and coordination. Furthermore, the FSTF has an impending sunset date on July 1, 2026, around when the Task Force’s ordinance would take effect.

Next step: ordinance

Health Commission – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities

²⁷ All materials can be found at <https://www.sf.gov/commission-streamlining-task-force>

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|--|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Charter | 7 | MYR | 4 years | None 3 terms | For cause At will | None |
| Changes to responsibilities: | | | | | | | |
| Remove department head hiring and firing authority | | | | | | | |

The Health Commission fulfills legally required functions and oversees the Department of Public Health. Legally, another body could assume its duties, however, in practice no other body has the required expertise and/or capacity. The Task Force recommends keeping the Commission.

Next step: ballot measure

Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee – Keep, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|----------|------------------------|---------|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--|
| Advisory | Administrative Code | 16 | BOS (8), DPH (3), SFUSD Board of Education (2), DCYF, OEWD, RPD. | 2 years 3 years | None 4 terms | At will | 12/31/2028 Sunset when tax sunsets |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee (SDDTAC), which makes recommendations on budget allocations of the Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax and evaluates its impact. The Task Force discussed the broader potential implications of eliminating the body, noting that the soda industry has fought against this and similar taxes statewide and some members voiced concern that eliminating the body could compromise the tax itself. The Task Force also noted that the soda tax differs from other funds with dedicated advisory bodies that the Task Force recommended eliminating, because the soda tax revenues go into the general fund rather than being retained as a separate, restricted fund for specific purposes. This means that the advisory committee is a valuable forum for public input into the programs and uses the tax funds, providing additional rationale for retaining the body.

Next step: ballot measure

Economic Development

The Task Force discussed and recommended changes to economic development bodies at its October 1, 2025, meeting (“Housing and Economic Development”). For more information on each body and a summary of the Task Force’s discussion, please refer to the [meeting minutes](#) and accompanying materials (Housing and Economic Development [memo](#) and [presentation](#)).²⁸

Airport Commission – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|--|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|--|--------|
| Decision-making | Charter | 5 | MYR | 4 years | None 3 terms | For cause, recall election At will | None |
| Changes to responsibilities | | | | | | | |
| Remove department head hiring and firing authority | | | | | | | |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Airport Commission and making minor changes, such as removing the ability for voters to recall commission members. Because this body oversees the Airport department, manages the Airport’s assets, and has the power to issue revenue bonds, it should remain in the Charter.

Next step: ballot measure

Board of Directors of the San Francisco Downtown Revitalization and Economic Recovery Financing District – Keep, no changes

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|-----------------|------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Administrative Code | 5 | President of BOS (3), BOS (2) | 4 years | None | At will | None |

The Board of Directors of the San Francisco Downtown Revitalization and Economic Recovery Financing District is newly formed in 2025 and had not yet met when the Task Force discussed it. Because it is newly formed and is legally required for the downtown financing district, the Task Force recommends keeping it and making no changes.

Next step: none

Cannabis Oversight Committee – Keep, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|----------|------------------------|---------------------|---|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------|
| Advisory | Administrative Code | 16 15 | BOS (9), DPH, POL, DBI, CPC, ENT, FIR, SFUSD | 2 years | None | At will | 1/1/27 |

²⁸ All materials can be found at <https://www.sf.gov/commission-streamlining-task-force>

The Task Force praised the Cannabis Oversight Committee as a successful example of a time-limited advisory body and recommends keeping the body until its sunset date but reducing the number of members to 15 by removing SFUSD's non-voting seat.

Next step: ordinance

Entertainment Commission – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities, move to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|--|---|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Charter Administrative Code | 7 | MYR (4), BOS (3) | 4 years | None 3 terms | For cause At will | None |
| Changes to responsibilities | | | | | | | |
| Remove department head hiring and firing authority | | | | | | | |

The Entertainment Commission plays a unique economic development role in San Francisco to encourage a rich, compliant, and vibrant entertainment scene. Its responsibilities go beyond those of a more typical governance commission, including permitting and hearing appeals of the Director's decisions. The Task Force discussed the value of the Entertainment Commission, particularly in supporting San Francisco's pandemic recovery. The Task Force recommends keeping the Commission and moving it to the Administrative Code in order to allow for future flexibility. Recommended modifications include removing qualifications requirements, however, the Task Force recommends deviating from standards for decision-making bodies by retaining split appointments.

Next step: ballot measure

Small Business Commission – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities, move to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|---|---|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Decision-making Advisory | Charter Administrative Code | 7 | MYR (4), BOS (3) | 4 years | None 3 terms | For cause At will | None 3 years |
| Changes to responsibilities | | | | | | | |
| Remove department head hiring and firing authority, remove Legacy Business application review | | | | | | | |

The Small Business Commission oversees the Office of Small Business (OSB), which is a small division under the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD). The Task Force discussed that because the Commission already operates primarily in an advisory capacity, it would be more appropriate to make modifications that align to advisory committee standards and move it to the Administrative Code. The Task Force also recommends removing the Commission's role in approving the Legacy Business Program applications, which could be department staff's responsibility.

Next step: ballot measure

Elections

The Task Force discussed and recommended changes to elections bodies at its November 5 meeting (“General Administration and Finance”). For more information, please refer to the [meeting minutes](#) and accompanying materials ([memo](#) and [presentation](#)).

Ballot Simplification Committee – Keep, modify structure, move to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|----------|--|---------|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------|
| Advisory | Elections Code Administrative Code | 5 | MYR (2), BOS (3) (2), SFUSD (1) | 2 years | None | At will | None |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Ballot Simplification Committee, which plays a unique and important role in ensuring San Francisco’s ballots are easily understandable. Members expressed support and appreciation for the Ballot Simplification Committee, noting its success and the value it adds to San Francisco’s elections. Recommended modifications include amending the current appointment process, which currently names specific entities to nominate appointees. Instead, appointing authorities should consult with organizations focused on journalism and voter protection to identify candidates. Instead of having one seat where the Board appoints the member based on a nomination from SFUSD Superintendent, the Task Force recommends having the Superintendent appoint their nominee directly. The Task Force also recommended amending qualifications for that member, making it desirable to have professional experience in reading education, to make it easier to identify qualified appointees.

Next step: ordinance

Elections Commission – Keep, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|-----------------|------------------------|---------|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Charter | 7 | 7 appointing authorities | 5 years | 2 terms | For cause At will | None |

The Elections Commission oversees the Elections Department and helps support the effective operation of San Francisco government, upholding public trust in San Francisco’s free and fair elections. The Task Force recommends keeping the Commission and keeping it in the Charter, given its importance to San Francisco’s democracy. The Task Force recommends retaining split appointments with multiple appointing authorities and the Commission’s hiring and firing authority over the Elections Director. While different from the recommended appointment structure and duties for other governance bodies, these exceptions help maintain the body and department’s political independence.

Next step: ballot measure

Elections Task Force – Keep, no changes

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|-----------------|------------------------|---------|--|----------------------------|-------------|----------------|--------|
| Decision-Making | Charter | 9 | MYR (3), BOS (3), Elections Commission (3) | Duration of the Task Force | None | At will | None |

The Elections (Redistricting) Task Force convenes every ten years, as needed, to redraw supervisorial district lines. This is a critical function that supports San Francisco's democracy. However, after a challenging process in 2022, many have recommended changes to this body. While modifications are warranted, the Commission Streamlining Task Force does not have the necessary time for the public engagement required to determine the best changes to this body. Because the next redistricting process will not occur until after the 2030 census, there is more time to determine what the future iteration of this body should look like. The Task Force recommends that the City undertake a comprehensive reform process that includes assessing membership, appointments, and qualifications.

Next step: none

General City Administration

The Task Force discussed and recommended changes to public integrity bodies at its July 16 and November 5 meetings (“Inactive Bodies,” and “General Administration and Finance”). For more information, please refer to the July 16th [meeting minutes](#), November 5th [meeting minutes](#) and accompanying materials (General Administration [memo](#) and [presentation](#); [Inactive Bodies memo](#) and [presentation](#)).

Assessment Appeals Board – Keep, no changes

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|-----------------|------------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Administrative Code | 24 ²⁹ | BOS | 3 years | None | For cause | None |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Assessment Appeals Board, which hears and adjudicates taxpayers’ appeals of the Assessor’s Office property assessments, with no changes to the body’s structure or functions. The AAB fulfills a state legal obligation as San Francisco’s local board of equalization. Appeals have surged in recent years due to real estate market volatility and declining commercial property values following the COVID-19 pandemic. State law requires appeals to be resolved within two years; missing this deadline automatically grants the taxpayer’s proposed valuation, potentially reducing the City’s property tax base. Since property taxes fund roughly one-third of the General Fund, the AAB’s timely work is critical to the City’s fiscal stability.

Next step: none

City Hall Preservation Advisory Committee – Eliminate, functions overlap with other bodies

The Task Force recommends eliminating the City Hall Preservation Advisory Committee, which advises City officials on the maintenance and preservation of City Hall. Established following the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake, the committee was created to ensure that City Hall’s historic and architectural significance was preserved as the building was renovated. More than three decades later, the committee has largely outlived its useful purpose. It now has minimal activity, limited public engagement, and overlapping responsibilities with other bodies, such as the Planning Commission, Historic Preservation Commission, and Arts Commission. As a designated San Francisco and National Historic Landmark, any proposed changes to City Hall must already undergo review and approval by the Historic Preservation Commission through a process governed by Article 10 of the Planning Code. Eliminating the committee will streamline City operations without compromising preservation standards or public accountability.

Next step: ordinance

City-Operated Farmers’ Market Advisory Committees – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force unanimously voted to eliminate the City-Operated Farmers’ Market Advisory Committees in its July 16th meeting, as part of a vote to accept staff recommendations to eliminate 31 inactive bodies. This body was established to advise on the Alemany Farmers Market operations but has not met since 2022.

Next step: ordinance

²⁹ Three boards, each with five regular members and three alternates

Commission on Animal Control and Welfare – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|---|---|--------------------------|---|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Advisory | Health Code Administrative Code | 7 voting 4 non-voting | BOS (7); ACC, DPH, SFPD, RPD ³⁰ | 2 years | None 6 terms | At will | None 3 years |
| Changes to responsibilities | | | | | | | |
| Change reporting requirement from quarterly to annual | | | | | | | |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Commission on Animal Control and Welfare, which advises the City on animal control and welfare-related issues. Established in 1971, prior to the creation of the Department of Animal Care and Control, it operates independently of any City department and serves as the only dedicated public forum for animal welfare concerns. The commission received strong public support, with nearly 200 written comments urging its continuation. The Task Force recommends eliminating the commission's quarterly reporting requirement, which is inconsistent with other bodies. It also recommends eliminating the requirement that one member be a veterinarian, which has proven difficult to find, and instead make this a desirable qualification.

Next step: ordinance

Commission Streamlining Task Force – No action (allow to sunset in 2027)

The Task Force recommends allowing itself to sunset on January 31, 2027. No action is needed to make this happen.

However, the Task Force strongly recommends the City review and evaluate its Charter at some regular cadence going forward. The Board should establish a periodic Charter review process, which should include a review and evaluation of public meeting bodies, to propose amendments to ensure the Charter remains relevant and enables effective and efficient governance.

Next step: none

Committee on Information Technology (COIT) – Keep, no changes

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|---------------------|------------------------|---------|---|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------|
| Staff working group | Administrative Code | 18 | MYR, BOS, CAO, COB, CON, HRC, CIO, CISO | 2 years | None | At will | None |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Committee on Information Technology (COIT), which is a staff working group that coordinates the City's information and communication technology plans, policies, budgets, and projects of citywide significance.

³⁰ Voting members are appointed by the Board of Supervisors. Non-voting representatives from the Department of Animal Care and Control (ACC), Department of Public Health (DPH), Police Department (SFPD), and Recreation and Park Department (RPD)

Next step: none

Contract Review Committee – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force unanimously voted to eliminate the Contract Review Committee in its July 16th meeting, as part of a vote to accept staff recommendations to eliminate 31 inactive bodies.

Next step: ordinance

Justice Tracking Information System (JUSTIS) Committee Governance Council – Eliminate, functions overlap with City staff

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Justice Tracking Information System (JUSTIS) Committee Governance Council, which coordinates information technology systems across participating criminal justice agencies in San Francisco. Technology has evolved in the twenty-five years since this body was created, with the ongoing management of integrated justice-related technology infrastructure now addressed within the Department of Technology (DT's) operational structure. The Council meets infrequently—just once in 2024—and much of its work relies on ongoing coordination among departmental IT staff outside of the Council.

Next step: ordinance

Law Library Board of Trustees – Remove from Charter

The Task Force recommends removing the Law Library Board of Trustees from the Charter, since it is a creature of state law and does not need to be established locally. Removing it would not affect the Law Library's existence but may clarify that the Board of Trustees is a state-governed entity rather than a City commission.

Next step: ballot measure

Local Business Enterprise Preference Program Working Group – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force unanimously voted to eliminate the Local Business Enterprise Preference Program Working Group in its July 16th meeting, as part of a vote to accept staff recommendations to eliminate 31 inactive bodies.

Next step: ordinance

Refuse Rate Board: Keep, modify structure, move to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|-----------------|---|---------|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Health Code Administrative Code | 3 | MYR, ADM, PUC | None 4 years | None 3 terms | At will | None |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Refuse Rate Board, which determines how much San Francisco residents and businesses pay for their trash and recycling services. Established by voters in 2022 (Prop F) in response to corruption charges against then Public Works Director Mohammed Nuru, the Refuse Rate Board holds public hearings to review and adopt refuse rates for trash collection. The body serves one clearly defined function yet is broadly impactful for the City; solid waste removal is a critical government service that impacts anyone who lives or works in San Francisco. Furthermore, the City's refuse collector, Recology,

functions as a monopoly in the City, which means that without a robust rate-setting process, it could overcharge San Franciscans with little City recourse. The Refuse Rate Board's work over the past three years has highlighted the body's value. The most recent rate-setting process resulted in over \$70 million in savings to ratepayers as compared to Recology's proposal and in 2024 its rate monitoring process helped uncover a \$24 million overcharge that Recology refunded to ratepayers, according to estimates from the Refuse Rates Administrator.

Next step: ballot measure

State Legislation Committee: Keep, minor cleanup

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|---------------------|------------------------|---------|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------|
| Staff Working Group | Administrative Code | 7 | BOS (2), MYR, ASR, CAT, CON, TTX | None | None | At will | None |

The Task Force recommends keeping the State Legislation Committee, which is a staff working group that takes positions on proposed state laws on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco. By bringing together staff from several elected and appointed offices, the State Legislation Committee ensures the City takes informed, unified, and strategic positions on state bills. Departments present proposed state legislation for review, share their subject matter expertise, and answer questions before the Committee votes on whether to recommend that the City support, oppose, or monitor a bill.

Since this section of Administrative Code has not been amended since 1939, the City Attorney's Office proposes some minor clean-up and modernization of language.

Next step: ordinance

Subcontracting Goals Committee: Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force unanimously voted to eliminate the Subcontracting Goals Committee in its July 16th meeting, as part of a vote to accept staff recommendations to eliminate 31 inactive bodies.

Next step: ordinance

Sweatfree Procurement Advisory Group: Keep, modify structure, move to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|----------|---|---------|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Advisory | Labor and Employment Code Administrative Code | 11 | BOS (5), MYR (5), CON | None 3 years | None 4 terms | At will | None 3 years |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Sweatfree Procurement Advisory Group (SPAG), which advises the City on enforcement of its sweatfree procurement laws. Although the Task Force questioned whether SPAG has outlived its usefulness, members narrowly supported keeping it, deferring to a recent Board of Supervisors decision not to eliminate the body. In light of that decision, the Task Force urges the Mayor and Board to fill the group's many vacancies to help it meet quorum. Since SPAG's establishment two decades ago, City staff have developed substantial expertise in sweatfree procurement, and if SPAG were eliminated in the future, it would not materially affect the City's sweatfree procurement efforts.

Next step: ordinance

Treasury Oversight Committee: Eliminate, transfer functions to City staff

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Treasury Oversight Committee, which advises the Treasurer on the investment of public funds held in the City and County Treasury. While oversight of public funds remains important, the committee meets infrequently, draws little public participation, and has limited impact. Its meetings are based on monthly investment reports produced by the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector, which will continue to be published regardless of the committee's existence.

Next step: ordinance

Workers' Compensation Council: Eliminate, may continue as passive meeting body

The Workers' Compensation Council is a staff working group that advises on matters pertaining to workers' compensation and safety regarding City employees. The Department of Human Resources can handle this work internally, collaborating with other departments as needed. A codified public body is no longer necessary for this work to be performed.

Next step: ordinance

Working Group on Local Business Enterprise Preference Program for City Leases and Concession Agreements: Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force unanimously voted to eliminate the Working Group on Local Business Enterprise Preference Program for City Leases and Concession Agreements in its July 16th meeting, as part of a vote to accept staff recommendations to eliminate 31 inactive bodies.

Next step: ordinance

Working Group to Investigate Barriers to LBE Participation – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force unanimously voted to eliminate the Working Group to Investigate Barriers to LBE Participation in its July 16th meeting, as part of a vote to accept staff recommendations to eliminate 31 inactive bodies.

Next step: ordinance

Public Integrity

The Task Force discussed and recommended changes to public integrity bodies at its November 5 meeting (“General Administration and Finance”). For more information, please refer to the [meeting minutes](#) and accompanying materials ([memo](#) and [presentation](#)).

Ethics Commission – [TBD]

[Recommendations in development]

Next step: TBD

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force – Keep, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|-----------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Administrative Code | 11 voting 2 non-voting | BOS | 2 years | None 6 terms | At will | None |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, which hears violations of public records and open meeting laws.

Next step: ballot measure

Homelessness

The Task Force discussed and recommended changes to homelessness bodies at its October 15 and December 3, 2025, meetings (“Public Health and Wellbeing” and “Deferred Decisions.”). For more information, please refer to the [October 15th](#) and December 3rd meeting minutes and accompanying materials (Public Health and Wellbeing [memo](#) and [presentation](#), Deferred Decisions [presentation](#)).³¹

Homelessness Oversight Commission – Keep, combine with LHCB, modify structures and responsibilities, move to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|---|---|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Decision-making Advisory | Charter Administrative Code | 7 | MYR (4) BOS (3) | 4 years | None 3 terms | At will | None |
| Changes to responsibilities | | | | | | | |
| Remove department head hiring and firing authority, remove budget and contract approval authority | | | | | | | |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Homelessness Oversight Commission (HOC) and revising structures and responsibilities so that it will play an advisory role and can subsume some responsibilities and functions of other homelessness-related bodies. This also includes subsuming a modified Local Homelessness Coordinating Board as a subcommittee, as described in more detail in the next section.

The goal of this new proposed structure is to more effectively elevate and coordinate public input into the City’s homelessness response. Having a singular dedicated advisory body ensures that recommendations and input from both members and the public are made within the larger context of the numerous programs and funding streams that support the City’s coordinated homelessness response. For example, staff will continue to present on the Our City, Our Home needs assessment and annual report, but the body’s input and recommendations will take into consideration all of HSH’s budget, not just the 30% from that funding stream. Having a dedicated forum will also help elevate and coordinate public input, strengthening the impact of public input on the City’s work around homelessness.

Recommended changes to the body include amending responsibilities to reflect its advisory role, renaming it as the “Homelessness Advisory Board,” and editing the qualifications to the following:

- Two “people who have personally experienced homelessness” (Mayor and BOS each appoint one).
- Five “people who represent relevant organizations or projects serving one or more homeless subpopulations in San Francisco.” Desirable to have at least one member who represents each primary component of the homelessness response system, such as temporary shelter, housing, and prevention.

While the legislation should include broader language, the Task Force recommends that the appointing authorities work with HSH and current members to identify a process for consolidating bodies that leverages the experiences and expertise members have built serving on all homelessness bodies.

Next step: ballot measure

³¹ All materials can be found at <https://www.sf.gov/commission-streamlining-task-force>

Local Homeless Coordinating Board – Keep as subcommittee of HOC, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|----------|------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Advisory | Administrative Code | 11 <i>Up to 13</i> | Homelessness Oversight Commission | 4 years <i>1 year</i> | None <i>12 terms</i> | At will | None |

The Local Homeless Coordinating Board (LHCB) advises HSH around participation in the Continuum of Care (CoC) program, which is the program the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) runs to fund community responses to homelessness. LHCB fulfills the HUD requirement that each CoC has a governance board and there are three primary considerations in making changes to this body in a way that better meets the federal requirements:

- 1) HUD requires that the CoC governance board be representative of the services and projects that the CoC provides and funding is dependent on the board's composition meeting that requirement. However, uncertainty and changes at the federal level have led to uncertainty about what composition best meets those goals. So, the CoC board must have nimble structures to meet changing requirements.
- 2) CoC members should have some role in determining who sits on the CoC board.
- 3) The CoC board should be able to make decisions on behalf of the CoC.

However, because CoC funding comprises approximately 10% of HSH's budget, it is more efficient for decisions and advice around HUD-funded activities to be made in the context of HSH's full portfolio of funding streams and programs.

As a result, the Task Force recommends combining HOC and LHCB such that there is one body advising on all homelessness work and a CoC subcommittee that is more flexible to meet federal requirements. In this structure, LHCB becomes the CoC Subcommittee and there are proposed structural changes to help best fulfill the federal requirements. These include one year terms, flexible membership numbers, and having the CoC members nominate members for the subcommittee. The Task Force recommends that qualifications also support meeting the federal requirements, with having two "Homelessness Advisory Body" members sit on the subcommittee as co-chairs while the CoC members nominate up to 11 additional members that fulfill the requirements as outlined in the funding applications, which may change year over year. HSH should work with existing members of current homelessness bodies and recipients of CoC funding to implement this new membership model and structure.

Next step: ordinance

Our City, Our Home Oversight Committee – Eliminate, transfer functions to City staff/other body

The Our City, Our Home Oversight Committee (OCOH) provides recommendations on the uses of the Our City, Our Home fund to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor. The Task Force recommends eliminating OCOH so that public members may make budget recommendations more efficiently, in the context of HSH's full portfolio of funding streams and programs. The Task Force noted that the uses and allocations of the fund are legally restricted and that there will be continued oversight of the fund through HSH's mandated annual reporting on the fund and regular triennial assessments. The City can ensure continued public oversight by having staff provide updates on fund expenditures, the annual report, and the needs assessments to the consolidated homelessness advisory committee and Health Commission.

Next step: ballot measure

Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee – Eliminate, transfer functions to City staff/other body

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee. This Committee predates the existence of the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) and provides input on the Shelter Grievance Policy, which the City has since codified in the Administrative Code. HSH administers the policy, which includes providing clients who wish to appeal denials of service with HSH-funded client advocates. An independent volunteer arbitrator hears these appeals. The many oversight structures now cemented in place suggest that this Advisory Committee may have outlived its useful purpose. Currently, the body reviews quarterly reports on denial-of-service and arbitration data; HSH staff should continue regularly reporting on that data to the consolidated homelessness advisory committee.

Next step: ordinance

Shelter Monitoring Committee – Eliminate, functions overlap with City staff

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Shelter Monitoring Committee. This Committee predates the existence of Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) and was instrumental in pushing the City to provide appropriate standards of care and oversight of City-funded shelters. However, the Committee may have outlived its useful purpose. Standards of Care are codified and HSH conducts ongoing oversight of shelters through standard contract monitoring practices, including regular site visits. To continue enabling public oversight of the shelter system, HSH staff should continue regularly reporting on shelter conditions to the consolidated homelessness advisory committee and the advisory committee may choose to establish a shelter-focused subcommittee.

Next step: ordinance

Housing and Community Development

The Task Force discussed and recommended changes to Housing and Community Development bodies at its July 16 and October 1, 2025, meetings (“Inactive Bodies,” “Housing and Economic Development”). For more information, please refer to the [July 16](#) and [October 1](#) meeting minutes, and accompanying materials (Housing and Economic Development [memo](#) and [presentation](#), Inactive Bodies [memo](#) and [presentation](#).)³²

Area Loan Committee – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Area Loan Committee, which is a defunct body related to 1970s-era redevelopment program.

Citizens Committee on Community Development – Eliminate, transfer functions to City staff

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Citizens Committee on Community Development (CCCD), which 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).³³ However, HUD does not specifically require an advisory committee and the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) could implement a more effective and engaging public process to meet these requirements.

The Task Force supports eliminating CCCD with the understanding that MOHCD will continue to meet public engagement requirements through an alternative process.

Next step: ordinance

Housing Code Enforcement Loan Committee– Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Housing Code Enforcement Loan Committee, which is a defunct body related to 1970s-era redevelopment program.

Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board, which advises the Mayor’s Office of Housing & Community Development (MOHCD) on the use of the Housing Stability Fund. Except for a one-time supplemental appropriation to the Housing Stability Fund in March 2021, there have been no appropriations to the Fund, and the HSFOB has ceased meeting.

Next step: ordinance

Inclusionary Housing Technical Advisory Committee – Keep, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|----------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|--|-------------|----------------|--------|
| Advisory | Administrative Code | 8 | MYR (4), BOS (4) | None One report cycle ³⁴ | None | At will | None |

³² All materials can be found at <https://www.sf.gov/commission-streamlining-task-force>

³³ These include the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME), Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA), and Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG).

³⁴ Clarify that terms expire upon the issuance of the IHTAC’s final report.

The Task Force recommends keeping the Inclusionary Housing Technical Advisory Committee (IHTAC), which helps the City analyze whether its affordable housing requirements are financially feasible, with only minor changes to clarify term lengths and meeting cadence.³⁵

Next step: ordinance

Residential Rehabilitation Area Citizen Advisory Committees – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Residential Rehabilitation Area Citizen Advisory Committees, which relate to a former redevelopment era loan program. The State of California has since dissolved all redevelopment agencies and, to the best of the Planning Department's knowledge, the state or federal funding associated with this loan program has likely long since evaporated. It is unknown when this body last met.

Next step: ordinance

Residential Rehabilitation Area Rent Committees – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Residential Rehabilitation Area Rent Committees for the same reasons as the Residential Rehabilitation Area Citizen Advisory Committees.

Next step: ordinance

Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board (Rent Board) – Keep, no changes

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|-----------------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Administrative Code | 5 | MYR | 4 years | None | At will | None |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board (Rent Board) with no changes, citing its effectiveness, balance, and overwhelming public support. The Rent Board implements and administers the City's residential rent control ordinance, protecting tenants from excessive rent increases and unjust evictions while assuring landlords fair and adequate rents. They also hear and decide appeals of decisions issued by the Rent Board's Administrative Law Judges.

Next step: none

San Francisco Residential Hotel Operators Advisory Committee – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force recommends eliminating the San Francisco Residential Hotel Operators Advisory Committee, which has not been active for years.

Next step: ordinance

SOMA Community Stabilization Fund Community Advisory Committee – Keep, modify structure

³⁵ Eliminate the Administrative Code requirement that IHTAC meet quarterly, given that the Economic Feasibility Analysis only occurs once every three years.

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|----------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Advisory | Administrative Code | 7 | BOS | 4 years | 2 consecutive terms | At will | 2035 3 years |

The Task Force recommends keeping the SOMA Community Stabilization Fund Community Advisory Committee, which advises the Mayor's Office of Housing & Community Development (MOHCD) on the use of the SOMA Community Stabilization Fund.

Next step: ordinance

Southeast Community Facility Commission – Keep, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|----------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Advisory | Administrative Code | 7 | MYR | 4 years 3 years | None 4 terms | At will | None |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Southeast Community Facility Commission, which oversees programming and operations for the Southeast Community Facility, which was constructed by the City to mitigate the Southeast Treatment Plant expansion projects' adverse environmental and social impacts to the Bayview–Hunters Point community in the 1970s and 1980s.

Next step: ordinance

Supportive Housing Services Fund Committee – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Supportive Housing Services Fund Committee, which was created to coordinate and review funding applications, make funding recommendations to the Mayor, and monitor implementation of proposals. However, dollars were never appropriated to the Supportive Housing Services Fund and the Supportive Housing Services Fund Committee was never formed. Staff recommend eliminating this body since it oversees a fund which does not and has never had any dollars money appropriated to it.

Next step: ordinance

Human Rights

The Task Force discussed and recommended changes to human rights bodies at its July 16 and October 15, 2025, meetings (“Inactive Bodies” and “Public Health and Wellbeing”). For more information, please refer to the [July 16](#) and [October 15](#) meeting minutes and accompanying materials (Public Health and Wellbeing [memo](#) and [presentation](#); Inactive Bodies [memo](#), and [presentation](#)).³⁶

Advisory Council on Human Rights – Eliminate, inactive

The Task Force unanimously voted to eliminate this body in its July 16th meeting, as part of a vote to accept staff recommendations to eliminate 31 inactive bodies. Based on available information, the Advisory Council on Human Rights has not met in over 15 years, and staff at the Human Rights Commission do not have information on why it was discontinued.

Next step: ordinance

Commission on the Status of Women – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities, move to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|--|---|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Decision-making Advisory | Charter Administrative Code | 7 11 | MYR | 4 years | None 3 terms | For cause At will | None |
| Changes to responsibilities | | | | | | | |
| Remove department head hiring and firing authority, remove budget and contract approval authority. | | | | | | | |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Commission on the Status of Women (COSW), having it take on an advisory role, and moving it from the Charter to the Administrative Code. The Mayor included a proposal in the 2025-2026 budget cycle to consolidate the Department on the Status of Women under the Human Rights Commission in an agency model. This change needs to go to the voters, but these proposed changes illustrate that the Commission should be in the Administrative Code to allow for flexibility to adapt its functions and structure based on new needs. The Commission on the Status of Women has done important work for the City and as an advisory body, it can continue to be a space for meaningful public input on issues impacting women. Its mission will always be relevant, so the body should not have a sunset date.

Next step: ballot measure

Family Violence Council – Keep, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---|---|---|----------------|----------|
| Staff Working Group | Administrative Code | 28 15 | 28 15 appointing authorities | None 3 years for public members | None 4 terms for public members | At will | 5/1/2027 |

The Family Violence Council (FVC) is a hybrid staff working group/advisory committee that consists of 25 City employees and 3 members of the public that act as tri-chairs for the body. Despite typically recommending that Staff Working Groups be removed from code/charter, the Mayor’s Office for Victim’s Rights (MOVR)

³⁶ All materials can be found at <https://www.sf.gov/commission-streamlining-task-force>

values the current tri-chair structure and so the Task Force recommends keeping this body but making modifications to align with advisory body standards, including reducing the number of members from 28 to 15. Staff worked with MOVR to identify which seats to recommend removing.

Next step: ordinance

Human Rights Commission – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities, move to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|--|---|---------|---------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Decision-making Advisory | Charter Administrative Code | 11 | Mayor | 4 years 3 years | None 4 terms | At will | None |
| Changes to responsibilities | | | | | | | |
| Remove department head hiring and firing authority, remove budget and contract approval authority. | | | | | | | |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Human Rights Commission, having it take on an advisory role, and moving it from the Charter to the Administrative Code. The Mayor included a proposal in the 2025-2026 budget cycle to consolidate the Department on the Status of Women under the Human Rights Commission in an agency model. This change needs to go to the voters, but these proposed changes illustrate that the Commission should be in the Administrative Code to better adapt functions and structures based on new needs. The Task Force discussed that its recommendations are intended to speak to the body's larger role in advising on human rights citywide, and that the body adds more value in advising the City rather than focusing on oversight of a relatively small department. Given the ongoing importance of human rights, the Task Force recommends not imposing a sunset date.

Next step: ballot measure

Immigrant Rights Commission – Keep, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|----------|------------------------|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Advisory | Administrative Code | 15 | Mayor (4) BOS (11) | 2 years 3 years | None 4 terms | At will | None |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Immigrant Rights Commission, which advises the Mayor and Board of Supervisors on issues and policies affecting immigrants in San Francisco. It recommends making minor changes to term lengths and limits.

Next step: ordinance

LGBTQI+ Advisory Committee – Keep, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|----------|------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Advisory | Administrative Code | 25 15 | Human Rights Commission | None 3 years | None 4 terms | At will | None |

The Task Force recommends keeping the LGBTQI+ Commission, which plays an important advisory role to the Human Rights Commission, focusing on discrimination and issues affecting the LGBTQI+ community. Recommended changes include reducing the number of members to 15 and adding term lengths and limits. While the Task Force believes it is important to keep this Commission, it meets infrequently and has unclear

requirements around membership and appointments. By reducing membership, the Committee may be able to meet quorum more easily and meet more frequently.

Next step: ordinance

DRAFT

Human Services

The Task Force discussed and recommended changes to human services bodies at its July 16 and October 15, 2025, meetings (“Inactive Bodies” and “Public Health and Wellbeing”). For more information, please refer to the [July 16](#) and [October 15](#) meeting minutes and accompanying materials (Public Health and Wellbeing [memo](#) and [presentation](#); Inactive Bodies [memo](#), and [presentation](#)).³⁷

Adult Day Health Care Planning Council – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force unanimously voted to eliminate this body in its July 16th meeting, as part of a vote to accept staff recommendations to eliminate 31 inactive bodies. The Task Force recommends eliminating the Adult Day Health Care Planning Council. This body was established to oversee Adult Day Health Care, a program that the State replaced in 2012. As a result, the Council oversees a defunct program and has not met in over a decade.

Next step: ordinance

Advisory Council to the Department of Disability and Aging Services – Combine with DF-OAC, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|----------|------------------------|---------|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Advisory | Administrative Code | 22 | BOS (11), DASC (11) (7), MYR (3) | 2 years 4 years | None 3 terms | At will | None |

The Department of Disability and Aging Services (DAS) acts as San Francisco’s Area Agency on Aging (AAA) under the federal Older Americans Act and the Older Californians Act. Both laws require each AAA to have an Advisory Council. The Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee (DF-OAC) is the other primary advisory body for DAS and provides recommendations and input to the department regarding the Dignity Fund, a baseline guaranteeing funding for disability and aging services.

The Task Force recommends combining the two bodies into a single advisory body. This merger will help streamline input into the City’s strategy for serving older adults and adults with disabilities and support a unified department strategy across funding sources. Having one body that makes recommendations regarding the department’s activities with the full context of the department’s strategy, programs, and funding sources will lead to more coordinated, valuable, and impactful public input. The Task Force recommends renaming the Advisory Council to the “Disability and Aging Services Advisory and Oversight Council” and making modifications to the structure per advisory committee standards. The Task Force recommends deviating from standards by not adding a sunset date, because it is legally required, and retaining 22 members to allow one member per supervisorial district and based on the input from advocates on the value of having 22 members. Additionally, the Task Force recommends amending qualifications to more explicitly require participation of people with disabilities, to meet the spirit and intent of the Dignity Fund, and to require the appointing authorities to identify appointees through consultation with organizations representing the disability community, older adults, and service providers.

³⁷ All materials can be found at <https://www.sf.gov/commission-streamlining-task-force>

DAS should coordinate with advocates and the current members of the DF-OAC and the Advisory Council to determine the best approach to implementation, including assessing which members to retain in which seats and establishing the process for identifying appointees.

Next step: ordinance

Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee – Combine with the Advisory Council, modify structure

The Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee (DF-OAC) helps administer the Dignity Fund, a voter-approved revenue stream that funds specific services for older adults and adults with disabilities that passed in 2016. While community involvement is an important part of the Dignity Fund legislation, there are some overlapping requirements with the Advisory Council to the Department of Disability and Aging Services (Advisory Council) such as providing input into a community needs assessment and strategic planning. Combining these bodies will help streamline input into the City's strategy for serving older adults and adults with disabilities and support a unified department strategy across funding sources. The detailed description of the proposed structure for the combined body is in the prior section on the Advisory Council to the Department of Disability and Aging Services.

Next step: ballot measure

Dignity Fund Service Providers Working Group – Eliminate (not needed in code), transfer functions to City staff

The Dignity Fund Service Providers Working Group (DF-SPWG) is the second body that Dignity Fund legislation created and its purpose is to get input and advice from service providers. The Dignity Fund is a voter-approved revenue stream that funds specific services for older adults and adults with disabilities that passed in 2016. The DF-SPWG operates much differently than other public meeting bodies and is out of compliance with the Brown Act, the California law governing how public bodies operate. Two external advocacy groups jointly host and facilitate meetings, there is no standard member appointment structure, and meetings are open to any service providers who may attend and participate. Creating strong and dedicated pathways for service provider input is valuable to DAS and to the Task Force, however, a public meeting body is likely not the best venue for gathering that input. For that reason, the Task Force recommends eliminating the DF-SPWG and ensuring that DAS continues to gather input from service providers as part of regular operations by adding language requiring that regular engagement to the Administrative Code. DAS should work with service providers to determine the best approach to continue meaningful engagement.

Next step: ballot measure

Disability and Aging Services Commission (DASC) – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities, move to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|--|---|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Charter Administrative Code | 7 | MYR | 4 years | None 3 terms | For cause At will | None |
| Changes to responsibilities | | | | | | | |
| Remove department head hiring and firing authority | | | | | | | |

The Disability and Aging Services Commission (DASC) serves as the governing body of the Department of Disability and Aging Services (DAS) and fulfills the legal requirement under the Older Californians Act that each Area Agency on Aging (AAA) must have a governance board. For that reason, the Task Force recommends keeping DASC and making modifications aligned with governance body standards. It also recommends moving it to the Administrative Code from the Charter to provide flexibility in the body's structure and responsibilities moving forward. Additionally, the Task Force recommends some minor language clean-up to clarify which responsibilities fall under the Commission versus the Department.

Next step: ballot measure

Human Services Commission – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities, move to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|--|---|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Charter Administrative Code | 5 | MYR | 4 years | None 3 terms | For cause At will | None |
| Changes to responsibilities | | | | | | | |
| Remove department head hiring and firing authority | | | | | | | |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Human Services Commission and moving it from the Charter to the Administrative Code to provide flexibility in the body's structure and responsibilities moving forward.

Next step: ballot measure

In-Home Supportive Services Public Authority Governing Body – Keep, no changes

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|-----------------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Administrative Code | 13 | BOS | 3 years | 3 terms | At will | None |

The In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) Public Authority's Governing Board is the oversight body for San Francisco's IHSS Public Authority; it is a quasi-governance body and is legally required. Due to its unique nature, the Task Force does not recommend any modifications to the body.

Next step: none

Long Term Care Coordinating Council – Eliminate (inactive)

The Long Term Care Coordinating Council (LTCC) voted to disband in March 2024 due to the overlap with other policy bodies and difficulty meeting quorum. However, it was unable to fully sunset due to specific duties that the Charter and Administrative Code require it to perform. The Task Force recommends eliminating the body and removing or replacing the references to it in the Charter.

Next step: ballot measure

Veterans' Affairs Commission – Keep, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------|
|------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------|

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|------------------------|----|------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|---------|----------------------------|
| Advisory | Administrative Code | 13 | BOS (9), MYR (4) | 4 years 3 years | None 4 terms | At will | None 3 years |
|----------|------------------------|----|------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|---------|----------------------------|

The Task Force recommends keeping the Veterans' Affairs Commission and making modifications to the structure, including minor changes to the required qualifications, removing the reporting requirements, and adding a sunset date, so that there is a regular interval for evaluating the body's utility.

Next step: ordinance

DRAFT

Justice System

The Task Force discussed and recommended changes to justice system bodies at its July 16 and September 3, 2025, meeting ("Inactive Bodies," "Public Safety"). For more information on each body and a summary of the Task Force's discussion, please refer to the [July 16th](#) and [September 3rd](#) meeting minutes and accompanying materials (Public Safety [memo](#) and [presentation](#); Inactive Bodies [memo](#) and [presentation](#).)³⁸

Close Juvenile Hall Working Group – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force unanimously voted to eliminate this body in its July 16th meeting, as part of a vote to accept staff recommendations to eliminate 31 inactive bodies. On June 18, 2019, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed legislation to close Juvenile Hall by December 31, 2021. The Close Juvenile Hall Working Group met between 2019 and 2021 to develop a closure plan and issued a final report in 2021. It has since ceased meeting.

Next step: ordinance

Community Corrections Partnership – Keep, modify structure, add to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|---------------------|--|---------|---------------------|---|---|----------------|--------|
| Staff Working Group | None Administrative Code | 14 | APD, BOS | None 4 years for public members | None 3 terms for public members | At will | None |

Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) is a State-mandated hybrid staff working group comprised of both City staff and members of the public. The Task Force recommends making minor modifications, primarily adjusting membership terms for public members. The State requires it to exist as long as the County receives state CCP incentive funds, therefore the Task Force recommends adding it to the Administrative Code and not including a sunset date.

Next step: ordinance

Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council – Keep, modify structure, add to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|---------------------|--|---------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Staff Working Group | None Administrative Code | 20 | JPD Chief Probation Officer | None 4 years | None 3 terms | At will | None |

The Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) is a hybrid staff working group comprised of both City staff and members of the public. It is legally required to exist as long as the County receives state funds from the Juvenile Crime Enforcement and Accountability Challenge Grant. The Task Force recommends adding it to the Administrative Code and adding term lengths and limits for public members.

Next step: ordinance

Juvenile Probation Commission – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities

³⁸ All materials can be found at <https://www.sf.gov/commission-streamlining-task-force>

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|-----------------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Charter | 7 | MYR | 4 years | None 3 terms | For cause At will | None |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Juvenile Probation Commission. The Commission oversees the Juvenile Probation Department and plays an important role in youth justice system reform as a bridge between community stakeholders and the City.

Next step: ballot measure

Reentry Council – Keep, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|----------|------------------------|---------|------------------------------|-------------|---|----------------|--------------|
| Advisory | Administrative Code | 24 | MYR and 14 other authorities | 2 years | None 6 terms for public members | At will | June 2, 2029 |

The Reentry Council is a hybrid staff working group and advisory body, comprised primarily of heads of justice-system related departments and seven public members who have been formerly incarcerated. This group provides a venue for valuable collaboration and brings in expertise from those with lived experience with the justice system, so the Task Force recommends keeping it.

Next step: ordinance

Sentencing Commission – No action (allow to sunset in June 2026)

The Sentencing Commission is a hybrid staff working group and advisory body, comprised primarily of heads of justice-system related departments and four public members. The Task Force recommends that the body sunset at its current sunset date, June 30, 2026, around when the Task Force's ordinance would take effect. The Sentencing Commission could continue to meet as a passive meeting body to continue coordination after it sunsets.

Next step: none

Parks and Environment

The Task Force discussed and recommended changes to parks and environment bodies at its July 16 and September 17, 2025, meetings ("Inactive Bodies," "Infrastructure, Climate, and Mobility"). For more information, please refer to the [July 16th](#) and [September 17th](#) meeting minutes and accompanying materials (Infrastructure, Climate, and Mobility [memo](#), and [presentation](#) and Inactive Bodies [memo](#), and [presentation](#)).³⁹

Commission on the Environment – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities, move to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|---|---|---------|---------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Decision-making Advisory | Charter Administrative Code | 7 | MYR | 4 years 3 years | None 4 terms | At will | None 3 years |
| Changes to responsibilities | | | | | | | |
| Remove department head hiring and firing authority, remove budget and contract approval authority | | | | | | | |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Commission on the Environment, moving it to the Administrative Code, and modifying its structure and responsibilities. The Commission on the Environment currently oversees the Department of the Environment and provides Citywide policy recommendations that support the City's sustainability efforts. The Task Force discussed that this role of making recommendations is best suited to an advisory committee structure and that modifying the Commission to primarily focus on Citywide environmental policy and recommendations may help strengthen its role. As part of this expanded advisory role and as a result of the recommendation to eliminate the Urban Forestry Council, the Task Force recommends moving oversight of the urban forest to the Commission on the Environment. This would include hearing reports on policy and activities related to the urban canopy, so that there continues to be a forum for public input and information sharing on street trees. *Next step: ballot measure*

Joint Zoo Committee – No action

The Joint Zoo committee is in scope because the Recreation and Park Commission established it, however it is not in code and a management agreement between the City and the Zoological Society determines its structure. Due to ongoing negotiations between the City and Zoological Society and the unique nature of this body, the Task Force voted to not recommend changes and allow the City and Zoological Society to determine the best ongoing structure and responsibilities for this body.

Next step: none

Park, Recreation, And Open Space Advisory Committee – Keep, modify structure, move to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|----------|---|---------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Advisory | Charter Administrative Code | 13 | BOS (11), MYR (1), BOS President (1) | 2 years 3 years | None 4 terms | At will | None 3-years |

³⁹ All materials can be found at <https://www.sf.gov/commission-streamlining-task-force>

The Task Force recommends keeping the Park, Recreation, and Open Space Advisory Committee (PROSAC), moving it to the Administrative Code, and making minor modifications to the structure. The Task Force discussed that PROSAC's functions may be duplicative with the Recreation and Park Commission, but that PROSAC provides an additional forum to hear from residents in an organized fashion. The Task Force recommendation allows for future flexibility and an opportunity to reevaluate the ongoing utility of the body upon the sunset date.

Next step: ballot measure

Recreation and Park Commission – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|--|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Charter | 7 | MYR | 4 years | None 3 terms | For cause At will | None |
| Changes to responsibilities | | | | | | | |
| Remove department head hiring and firing authority | | | | | | | |

The Recreation and Park Commission oversees the Recreation and Park Department, a large department that oversees the City's expansive parks system and touches the lives of many San Franciscans. The Task Force recommends keeping the Commission and making minor modifications based on governance commission standards.

Next step: ballot measure

Urban Forestry Council – Eliminate, functions overlap with City staff

The Urban Forestry Council is an example of an advisory body that has fulfilled its original mandate. The City adopted and is implementing an Urban Forest Plan and voters passed a 2016 proposition creating StreetTreeSF, an ongoing program that maintains all street trees. As a result, oversight and care for the urban canopy is now integrated into everyday City operations. The Task Force recommends eliminating the Urban Forestry Council in recognition that its work has been successful. The Commission on the Environment may hear reports on policy and activities related to the urban canopy, so that there continues to be a forum for public input and information sharing on street trees.

Next step: ordinance

Planning and Land Use

The Task Force discussed and recommended changes to Planning and Land Use bodies at its July 16, September 17, and October 1 meetings (“Inactive Bodies”, “Infrastructure, Climate, and Mobility”, and “Housing and Economic Development”). For more information on each body and a summary of the Task Force’s discussion, please refer to the [July 16th](#), [September 17th](#) and [October 1st](#) meeting minutes and accompanying materials (Infrastructure, Climate, and Mobility [memo](#) and [presentation](#); Housing and Economic Development [memo](#) and [presentation](#); and Inactive Bodies [memo](#), and [presentation](#)).⁴⁰

Bayview Hunters Point Citizens Advisory Committee – Eliminate, functions overlap with other body

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Bayview Hunters Point Citizens Advisory Committee (Bayview CAC), which was established in 2013 to provide community input on planning and land use in the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area following the dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency. Over a decade later, the City’s land use processes have evolved, and the Bayview CAC’s role now overlaps with other bodies, including the OCII Hunters Point CAC, SFPUC CAC, Planning Commission, and Historic Preservation Commission. In recent years, the Bayview CAC has struggled with effectiveness, often failing to reach quorum due to inconsistent membership and ongoing vacancies.

Next step: ordinance

Historic Preservation Commission – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|---|--|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Charter, Planning Code or <i>Administrative Code</i> ⁴¹ | 7 | MYR | 4 years | None 3 terms | For cause At will | None |
| Changes to responsibilities | | | | | | | |
| Remove role in Legacy Business application review and requirement to approve a Preservation Element of the General Plan | | | | | | | |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC), which advises the City on historic preservation matters and approves certain permits to alter historically or culturally significant buildings. In addition, the Task Force recommends moving most of HPC’s technical duties from the Charter to the Planning Code and removing rigid seat qualifications that make it difficult to recruit candidates. In lieu of specific professional experience or certifications for each seat, the Task Force suggests codifying desirable qualifications for all members of the body. The Task Force recommends eliminating the requirement for HPC to approve a Preservation Element of the General Plan. This element has never been produced, isn’t required by the state, and is duplicative with preservation planning elsewhere in the General Plan and department policies. Finally, the Task Force recommends removing HPC’s role in the legacy business application review process, consistent with the HPC’s own suggestions in its written comment letter.

Next step: ballot measure

Interagency Planning and Implementation Committee – Eliminate, keep as passive meeting body

⁴⁰ All materials can be found at <https://www.sf.gov/commission-streamlining-task-force>

⁴¹ Keep in Charter, but move most detailed responsibilities to either the Planning Code or Administrative Code

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Interagency Planning and Implementation Committee (IPIC), which is responsible for overseeing the implementation of eleven Area Plans where growth from new housing and jobs is planned. In practice, IPIC functions as a staff working group and has not operated as a public meeting body. It should be deleted from the Administrative Code so that staff may continue to collaborate without being subject to Brown Act requirements.

Next step: ordinance

Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee – No action (allow to sunset as planned)

The Task Force does not issue a recommendation for the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee, choosing instead to defer to a [September 30, 2025](#) Board of Supervisors vote to sunset the body within six months.

Next step: none

Planning Commission – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|--|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Charter | 7 | MYR, BOS | 4 years | None 3 terms | For cause At will | None |
| Changes to responsibilities | | | | | | | |
| Remove department head hiring and firing authority | | | | | | | |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Planning Commission, which oversees the Planning Department and has authority over most land use decisions regulated by the Planning Code. However, the Task Force deviated from general Governance Commission practice by maintaining split appointments between the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

Next step: ballot measure

South of Market Community Planning Advisory Committee – Keep, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|----------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Advisory | Administrative Code | 11 | MYR (4), BOS (7) | 3 years | None 4 terms | At will | 2035 3 years |

The Task Force recommends keeping the South of Market Community Planning Advisory Committee (SoMa CPAC), which 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.

Next step: ordinance

Street Design Review Committee – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Street Design Review Committee, which was created to advise the Mayor on proposed improvements in the public right of way. The committee has been inactive for years and may never have convened. Its intended role is now fulfilled by a passive meeting body known as the

Street Design Advisory Team (SDAT). While the original committee was to be composed of high-ranking City officials, SDAT consists of less senior staff and is facilitated by the Planning Department.

Next step: ordinance

Treasure Island Development Authority Board of Directors – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|--|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Administrative Code | 7 | MYR | 4 years | None | At will | None |
| Changes to responsibilities | | | | | | | |
| Remove department head hiring and firing authority | | | | | | | |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Treasure Island Development Authority Board of Directors (TIDA BOD), which governs the Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA). TIDA is a City agency and nonprofit corporation that oversees long-range planning and development of Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island. TIDA BOD is legally required to exist as long as TIDA is incorporated as a nonprofit organization.

Next step: ordinance

Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island Citizens Advisory Board – Eliminate, Fulfilled purpose

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island Citizens Advisory Board (CAB), which was established in the late 1990s to advise the Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) on a draft base reuse plan. Since the adoption of the plan in 2011, the CAB's relevance has declined, and engagement with the TIDA Board of Directors has diminished. While the CAB has become a forum for residents to raise quality-of-life concerns, this role does not align with TIDA's core mission of long-term development. As the Island transitions into a more established residential community with a future master HOA, this is an appropriate time to sunset the CAB. A dedicated residents' organization would be better positioned to engage with City departments—such as SFPD and MTA—on neighborhood issues, allowing TIDA to refocus on its primary mandate.

Next step: Ordinance

Port

The Task Force discussed and recommended changes to Port bodies at its at its August 20 and September 17, 2025, meetings (“Borderline Inactive Bodies,” “Infrastructure, Climate, and Mobility”). For more information on each body and a summary of the Task Force’s discussion, please refer to the [August 20th](#) and [September 17th](#) meeting minutes and accompanying materials (Infrastructure, Climate, and Mobility [memo](#), and [presentation](#) and Borderline Inactive Bodies [memo](#) and [presentation](#)).⁴²

Port Commission – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|--|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|--|--------|
| Decision-making | Charter | 5 | MYR | 4 years | None 3 terms | For cause, recall election At will | None |
| Changes to responsibilities | | | | | | | |
| Remove department head hiring and firing authority | | | | | | | |

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

Next step: ballot measure

Waterfront Design Advisory Committee – Eliminate (functions overlap with other bodies), may continue as passive meeting body

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Waterfront Design Advisory Committee (WDAC), which currently advises the Port Commission and Planning Commission on the design of waterfront development projects. This advisory function could be more appropriately fulfilled by a passive meeting body. The WDAC meets infrequently,⁴³ does not issue permits, and provides only non-binding design recommendations. Should the Port Commission or Planning Commission require design input on waterfront projects, they could convene a passive advisory group as needed.

Next step: ordinance

⁴² All materials can be found at <https://www.sf.gov/commission-streamlining-task-force>

⁴³ 1 meeting in 2024

Public Utilities

The Task Force discussed and recommended changes to public utilities bodies at its July 16 and September 17, 2025, meetings (“Inactive Bodies,” “Infrastructure, Climate, and Mobility”). For more information on each body and a summary of the Task Force’s discussion, please refer to the [July 16th](#) and [September 17th](#) meeting minutes and accompanying materials (Infrastructure, Climate, and Mobility [memo](#), and [presentation](#) and Inactive Bodies [memo](#), and [presentation](#)).⁴⁴

Public Utilities Citizens’ Advisory Committee – Keep, modify structure, move to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|----------|---|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Advisory | Charter Administrative Code | 17 15 | MYR, BOS | 4 years 3 years | 2 terms | At will | None 3 years |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Public Utilities Citizen’s Advisory Committee, moving it to the Administrative Code, making modifications to term lengths, and adding a sunset date.

Next step: ballot measure

Public Utilities Commission – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|--|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Charter | 5 | MYR | 4 years | None 3 terms | For cause At will | None |
| Changes to responsibilities | | | | | | | |
| Remove department head hiring and firing authority | | | | | | | |

The Public Utilities Commission is an important decision-making body that oversees an enterprise department of the same name. The department administers San Francisco’s water, power, and sewer systems. The Task Force recommends keeping the Public Utilities Commission in the Charter. Currently, four out of five seats have required qualifications. The Task Force recommends making these desirable qualifications for all members of the body, rather than required qualifications for individual appointees.⁴⁵

Next step: ballot measure

Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board – Keep, modify structure, move to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|----------|---|---------|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Advisory | Charter Administrative Code | 7 | ADM, CON, MYR, BOS | None 3 years | None 4 terms | At will | None |

The Rate Fairness Board helps the Public Utilities Commission maintain transparency and accountability in setting utility rates. The Task Force recommends keeping the body, moving it to the Administrative Code, and

⁴⁴ All materials can be found at <https://www.sf.gov/commission-streamlining-task-force>

⁴⁵ Experience in environmental policy and environmental justice, ratepayer or consumer advocacy, project finance, water systems, power systems, or public utility management

making minor modifications to term lengths and limits. The Task Force recommends not including a sunset date given the ongoing need for transparency in rate setting.

Next step: ballot measure

PUC Small Firm Advisory Committee – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force unanimously voted to eliminate this body in its July 16th meeting, as part of a vote to accept staff recommendations to eliminate 31 inactive bodies. The committee stopped meeting during the COVID-19 shutdown and never resumed activities. The Public Utilities Commission has continued the work with staff and contractors and so the Task Force recommend eliminating the Committee.

Next step: ordinance

Public Protection

The Task Force discussed and recommended changes to public protection bodies at its July 16, September 3, and September 17 2025, meetings (“Inactive Bodies,” “Public Safety”). For more information, please refer to the [July 16th](#), [September 3rd](#), and [September 17th](#) meeting minutes and accompanying materials (Public Safety [memo](#) and [presentation](#); Inactive Bodies [memo](#), and [presentation](#).)⁴⁶

Delinquency Prevention Commission – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force unanimously voted to eliminate this body in its July 16th meeting, as part of a vote to accept staff recommendations to eliminate 31 inactive bodies. Based on available information, it seems that this body has not met in at least 15 years and its purpose overlaps significantly with several active bodies focused on juvenile justice and delinquency. Therefore, the Task Force recommends eliminating it.

Next step: ordinance

Disaster Council – Keep, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|---------------------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------|
| Staff Working Group | Administrative Code | 13 | MYR, BOS President | None | None | At will | None |

The Disaster Council is a unique body; it is hybrid staff working group that the Mayor chairs and primarily Board of Supervisors and key department heads sit on the Council. The Task Force recommends keeping the Disaster Council and making minor modifications to update qualifications. While the Task Force typically recommends eliminating staff working groups from code, the director of the Department of Emergency Management sees value in retaining the body in code and is in the process of updating details of the body. The Task Force supports these updates.

Next step: ordinance

Fire Commission – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|-----------------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Charter | 5 | MYR | 4 years | None 3 terms | At will | None |

Changes to responsibilities

Remove department head hiring and firing authority, changes to role in employee discipline

Fire Commissions are standard oversight bodies in cities across the country so San Francisco’s Fire Commission is an important mechanism of oversight and accountability. The Task Force recommends keeping the Fire Commission in the Charter and making some modifications to the structure and responsibilities, including removing the Commission’s ability to nominate candidates for Fire Chief. The Task Force also recommends changing the employee discipline process to create citywide consistency. In the current process, the Fire Commission renders disciplinary decisions for anything longer than ten days, which is inconsistent with other commissions’ employee discipline powers and is not required by state law. The Task

⁴⁶ All materials can be found at <https://www.sf.gov/commission-streamlining-task-force>

Force recommends placing authority for employee discipline with the Fire Chief and having the Commission serve as an appellate body that hears appeals to the Fire Chief's decisions, which aligns with the State's appeals requirement.

Next step: ballot measure

Police Commission – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|--|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Charter | 7 | MYR (4), BOS (3) | 4 years | None 3 terms | BOS Approval At will | None |
| Changes to responsibilities | | | | | | | |
| Remove department head hiring and firing authority, changes to role in employee discipline | | | | | | | |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Police Commission in the Charter, given its critical role in law enforcement oversight. The commission should retain split appointments by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to help insulate it from political pressures and preserve its neutrality. Given its split appointment structure, the Task Force also recommends removing the Board of Supervisors' ability to veto Mayoral appointments. Similarly, the Task Force recommends having all appointees serve at will. Each appointing authority should be able to appoint and remove members independently.

Finally, as with the Fire Commission, the Task Force recommends changing the employee discipline process to create citywide consistency. In the current process, the Police Commission renders disciplinary decisions for anything longer than ten days, which is inconsistent with other commissions' employee discipline powers and is not required by state law. The Task Force recommends placing authority for employee discipline with the Police Chief and having the Commission serve as an appellate body that hears appeals to the Police Chief's decisions, which aligns with the State's appeals requirement.

Next step: ballot measure

Real Estate Fraud Prosecution Trust Fund Committee – Keep, minor cleanup

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|---------------------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------|
| Staff Working Group | Administrative Code | 3 | DAT, CAT, ADM | None | None | None | None |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Real Estate Fraud Prosecution Trust Fund Committee. This body is legally required, comprised of the District Attorney, the City Attorney, and the City Administrator, and its sole function is to award funds to deter real estate fraud, per the California Government Code. Because the body has established the allocation of the fund, it does not need to meet unless the District Attorney calls a meeting to revisit the allocation percentages. The Task Force, per conversations with the City Attorney's Office, recommends adding language to the Administrative Code clarifying that this is the only trigger for meeting.

Next step: ordinance

Sheriff's Department Oversight Board – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities, move to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|--|---|---------|---|-------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| <i>Decision-making</i> | Charter Administrative Code | 7 | MYR (3) (4), BOS (4) (3) | 4 years | 3 terms | For cause At will | None |
| Changes to responsibilities | | | | | | | |
| Remove subpoena power, budget and contract approval. | | | | | | | |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board (SDOB) and moving it to the Administrative Code. Voters approved SDOB and the department it oversees, the Sheriff's Department Office of Inspector General (SDOIG), in response to deeply upsetting incidents of Sheriff's Department misconduct. While oversight of law enforcement agencies is critical, this body has complex considerations. Both SDOB and SDOIG have struggled with operational challenges in the five years since approval and the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) has taken responsibility for the majority investigations into Sheriff's misconduct. Furthermore, California law prohibits oversight bodies for county Sheriff agencies, so the powers of SDOB will always be inherently limited. Despite these challenges, oversight of law enforcement is an important function and SDOB has deeply passionate supporters and advocates who highlight the need for public oversight into Sheriff's Department staff conduct.

The Task Force recommends making modifications to SDOB so that it can grow to better serve as a mechanism for oversight, public input, and transparency. Under the Task Force's recommendations, SDOB will provide public transparency and oversight over the SDOIG, including the authority to hire and fire the Inspector General. The Inspector General has the authority to conduct investigations and issue subpoenas. The Task Force's goal is that these recommended changes balance the operational/legal challenges with appropriate oversight. The addition of a three-year sunset date means that when the body comes up for renewal, there will be another opportunity to assess how this body may best serve San Franciscans.

Next step: ballot measure

Public Works

The Task Force discussed and recommended changes to Public Works bodies at its July 16 and September 17, 2025, meetings ("Inactive Bodies," "Infrastructure, Climate, and Mobility"). For more information on each body and a summary of the Task Force's discussion, please refer to the [July 16th](#) and [September 17th](#) meeting minutes and accompanying materials (Infrastructure, Climate, and Mobility [memo](#), and [presentation](#) and Inactive Bodies [memo](#) and [presentation](#)).⁴⁷

Graffiti Advisory Board – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Graffiti Advisory Board, which was established to advise the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor on graffiti prevention and abatement, but has not met in several years.

Next step: ordinance

Industrial Waste Review Board – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Industrial Waste Review Board, which was established to hear appeals of wastewater discharge permits, but has not previously been utilized.

Next step: ordinance

Newsrack Advisory Committee – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Newsrack Advisory Committee, which was established to advise the Department of Public Works (DPW) on its pedmount news rack program. However, this body is inactive and DPW's contract for pedmount news racks expired in November 2024.

Next step: ordinance

Public Works Commission – Eliminate, functions overlap with City staff/other bodies

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Public Works Commission (PWC), which was created by Proposition B (2020) to oversee the Department of Public Works after the planned spin-off of its Operations Division into the Department of Sanitation and Streets. Proposition B (2022) reversed that plan, combining all Public Works contract and budget approvals under the Public Works Commission. Since then, public engagement has significantly declined. The Commission received 107 and 54 public comments in its first two years, respectively, but only a handful in the most recent year. Notably, even after the Commission President [recommended](#) the body's elimination, no members of the public attended the following week's meeting.

The PWC's role overlaps with other City commissions overseeing departments that rely on DPW's services. These commissions typically approve capital projects – including their scope, budget, design, and other factors – while PWC approves the contracts to deliver them.

In addition, several other forums exist for public engagement and oversight of DPW.

- All contract awards and supporting materials are published online with external oversight provided by the City's Office of Contract Administration, Controller, and state auditors

⁴⁷ All materials can be found at <https://www.sf.gov/commission-streamlining-task-force>

- Public hearings (4-5 per month) to discuss ongoing work and take public comment
- Annual public budget hearing
- Annual town hall with Public Works Director and senior staff six months after budget hearing
- Annual reporting on capital project scope, schedule, and budget to the Capital Planning Committee
- Annual Budget and Legislative Analyst audit of DPW budget

Next step: ballot measure

Sanitation and Streets Commission – Eliminate, has fulfilled purpose

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Sanitation and Streets Commission, which was established by Proposition B (2020) to oversee the newly created Department of Sanitation and Streets. Two years later, Proposition B (2022) reversed that plan, merging the new department back into the Department of Public Works while retaining the commission. As a result, the commission now oversees only a division within Public Works, rather than an independent department. This structure is inconsistent with standard practice, where governance commissions typically oversee entire departments. Additionally, the commission lost its budget and contract approval authority in 2022, leaving only general oversight duties and the responsibility to set cleanliness standards. Public participation is very low, with typically just one public commenter per meeting.

Next step: ballot measure

Transportation

The Task Force discussed and recommended changes to transportation bodies at its September 17 meeting (“Infrastructure, Climate, and Mobility”). For more information, please refer to the [meeting minutes](#) and accompanying materials ([memo](#) and [presentation](#)).

Bicycle Advisory Committee – Eliminate, functions overlap with City staff

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC), which was created in 1990 to advise the City on bicycle safety and accessibility. At that time, the Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) did not exist, and bicycle planning was limited. Today, the MTA has a dedicated Sustainable Streets Division with full-time bike planners and engineers who regularly engage the public on bicycle-related projects.

For example, the 2025 San Francisco Biking and Rolling Plan was developed through extensive outreach, including over 250 events, 10 open houses, and 1,000+ survey responses. The BAC was one of more than 80 groups consulted. In contrast, BAC meetings typically draw two or fewer public commenters. While the BAC provides a venue for input, it duplicates functions already embedded in MTA’s planning and engagement processes.

Next step: ordinance

Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation (ISCOTT) – Keep, modify structure, move to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|---------------------|---|---------|---|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------|
| Staff working group | Transportation Code Administrative Code | 7 | MYR, CPC, DPW, POL, FIR, and Entertainment Commission | None | None | At will | None |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation (ISCOTT), which reviews temporary street closure permits for special events like neighborhood block parties or street fairs. This body is quite active, approving over 450 permits in the last year.

Next step: ordinance

Mission Bay Transportation Improvement Fund Advisory Committee – Eliminate, fulfilled purpose

The Task Force recommends eliminating the Mission Bay Transportation Improvement Fund Advisory Committee (MBTIFAC), which advises the City on the allocation of funds to support transportation services and infrastructure improvements related to events at the Chase Center. While the committee played a key role in early planning and coordination around traffic mitigation, transit investments, and infrastructure improvements linked to the arena’s opening, the Mission Bay Transportation Improvement Fund was zeroed out in the FY2025-26 & FY2026-27 budgets. With allocations expended, there is little remaining for the committee to advise on.

Next step: ordinance

Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors – Keep, modify structure and responsibilities

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|--|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Decision-making | Charter | 7 | MYR | 4 years | 3 terms | For cause At will | None |
| Changes to responsibilities | | | | | | | |
| Remove department head hiring and firing authority | | | | | | | |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors (MTAB), which oversees the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA).

Next step: ballot measure

Municipal Transportation Agency Citizens' Advisory Committee – Keep, modify structure, move to Administrative Code

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|----------|---|---------|----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Advisory | Charter Administrative Code | 15 | MYR (4), BOS (11) | 4 years 3 years | None 3 terms | At will | None 3 years |

The Task Force recommends keeping the Municipal Transportation Agency Citizens' Advisory Committee, which provides advice and recommendations to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA).

Next step: ballot measure

Workforce Development

The Task Force discussed and recommended changes to workforce development at its July 16 and October 1, 2025, meetings ("Inactive Bodies," "Housing and Economic Development"). For more information, please refer to the [July 16](#) and [October 1](#) meeting minutes, and accompanying materials (Housing and Economic Development [memo](#) and [presentation](#), Inactive Bodies [memo](#) and [presentation](#).)⁴⁸

Committee on City Workforce Alignment – Keep, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|---------------------|------------------------|---------|--|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| Staff Working Group | Administrative Code | 17 | MYR (3), BOS (3), other departments (11) | 3 years | None 4 terms | At will | None 2030 |

The Committee on City Workforce Alignment is a hybrid staff working group and advisory committee that supports cross departmental coordination on workforce development. Due to the addition of public members, the Task Force recommends keeping this body and adding a 2030 sunset date to align with the conclusion of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development's five-year plan.

Next step: ordinance

Industrial Development Authority Board – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force unanimously voted to eliminate this body in its July 16th meeting, as part of a vote to accept staff recommendations to eliminate 31 inactive bodies. This body is defunct and the Task Force recommends removing it from code.

Next step: ordinance

Workforce Development Advisory Committee – Eliminate (inactive)

The Task Force unanimously voted to eliminate this body in its July 16th meeting, as part of a vote to accept staff recommendations to eliminate 31 inactive bodies. The Committee has not been active in many years and the Workforce Investment Board now does any functions this body previously performed. The City Attorney's Office has already introduced an [ordinance](#) which, if passed, would eliminate this body.

Next step: ordinance

Workforce Investment Board – Keep, modify structure

| Type | Establishing Authority | Members | Appointing officers | Term length | Term limits | Member removal | Sunset |
|----------|------------------------|---------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|
| Advisory | Administrative Code | 28 | MYR | 2 years | None 6 terms | Member vote At will | None |

The Workforce Investment Board (WISF) is federally required so that the City can receive federal funding. The Task Force recommends keeping WISF and retaining the current number of members, due to the unique

⁴⁸ All materials can be found at <https://www.sf.gov/commission-streamlining-task-force>

composition of the group (two Supervisors sit on WISF), and not adding a sunset date, because it is legally required.

Next step: ordinance

DRAFT

Conclusion

The Commission Streamlining Task Force's work represents a significant step toward modernizing San Francisco's commission system to better serve residents. Through a year-long public process, the Task Force evaluated 152 bodies and recommended changes that will make government more transparent, accountable, and responsive. By consolidating overlapping commissions, eliminating inactive bodies, and standardizing structures, these recommendations aim to strengthen public engagement while reducing complexity and inefficiency. Moving most bodies to the Administrative Code will provide the flexibility needed to adapt as the City's priorities evolve, ensuring that commissions remain relevant and effective over time.

By **March 1, 2026**, the Task Force will submit proposed legislation to the Board of Supervisors, including ordinances for bodies established in the Municipal Codes and a Charter amendment for changes requiring voter approval. The Board must hold a hearing on these proposals by **April 1, 2026**. Ordinances will take effect automatically within 90 days unless rejected by a two-thirds vote of the Board (8/11 members). For Charter changes, the Board may choose to place the measure on the **November 3, 2026 ballot**, where voters will decide whether to adopt these reforms.

The commission system should continue to improve beyond these legislative changes. The Task Force identified key operational improvements to strengthen commission effectiveness. The City should identify the relevant staff to implement these suggestions and assess the next steps needed to adopt them.

Finally, the City should institutionalize a regular review process for its Charter and commission system, ensuring that governance structures continue to evolve alongside the needs of San Franciscans.

Appendix A: Proposition E

[will include as separate pdf with full text of Proposition E]

<https://www.sf.gov/sites/default/files/2024-08/Legal%20Text%20--%20Creating%20a%20Task%20Force%20to%20Recommend%20City%20Commission%20Reform.pdf>

DRAFT

Appendix B: Meeting Schedule

The Task Force met twice per month in City Hall, starting January 31, 2025. A full list of meeting dates and topics through January, 2026 is in the table below.

| Date | Meeting Topic |
|--------------------|--|
| January 31, 2025 | Introductions, Proposition E overview, establishing the Chair and Vice Chair |
| February 26, 2025 | Adopt bylaws, Task Force work plan |
| March 19, 2025 | Expert presentation on public engagement, SPUR presentation on Designed to Serve, stakeholder engagement, data gathering |
| April 2, 2025 | Presentation from Yes on E campaign, financial analysis, templates |
| April 16, 2025 | Civil Grand Jury presentation, public body purposes and templates |
| May 7, 2025 | Expert presentation on public engagement, presentation by Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, governance bodies |
| May 21, 2025 | Commission attributes and data, proposal for commissions |
| June 4, 2025 | Stakeholder engagement, proposal for commissions |
| June 18, 2025 | Work planning |
| July 16, 2025 | Inactive bodies, templates & criteria for advisory bodies |
| August 6, 2025 | Templates & criteria for governance, appeals, and regulatory bodies |
| August 20, 2025 | Borderline inactive bodies, templates close-out |
| September 3, 2025 | Public safety |
| September 17, 2025 | Infrastructure, climate, and mobility |
| October 1, 2025 | Housing and economic development |
| October 15, 2025 | Public health and wellbeing |
| November 5, 2025 | General administration and finance |
| November 19, 2025 | Operational improvements, deferred decisions and consistency checks |
| December 3, 2025 | Deferred decisions and consistency checks |
| December 12, 2025 | Deferred decisions and consistency checks |
| December 18, 2025 | Draft report v.1, Deferred decisions and consistency checks |
| January 14, 2026 | Draft report v.2, discuss legislation, remaining deferred decisions |
| January 28, 2026 | Approve final report |

Appendix C: Standard Responsibilities and Structures

Advisory Committee Standards

This template is intended to provide standard functions, processes, and operations for Advisory Committees. The intention is to align currently existing bodies to these standards, where it makes sense, and to memorialize this work such that it may inform the creation of future bodies.

| Advisory Committees | | |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Definition | The purpose is to contribute expertise and advise City departments, elected officials, or decision-making bodies. | |
| Applies to | Bodies with no decision-making authority | |

| Category | Component | Description |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Member Attributes and Processes | Appointing Authority | No recommendations on appointing authorities. Should be determined in the authorizing legislation and based on the need of the body. |
| | Appointment Confirmations | No confirmations |
| | Member Removal | At will |
| | Term Lengths | 3 years. Cannot exceed the initial or remaining term of the advisory body. Any staggering should be handled on a case-by-case basis if the body is re-authorized. |
| | Term Limits | Any limits on consecutive terms should be handled on a case-by-case basis if the body is re-authorized. In general, one member should not serve for more than 12 years. |
| | Qualifications | Specific requirements should be decided on an individual body basis. In general, qualifications should be desirable and body-level. If there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority should submit information on why a candidate is qualified. |
| Body Operations and Attributes | Establishing Authority | Administrative code |
| | Sunset Dates | 3 years |
| | Re-Authorization | Body should not be automatically re-authorized; the Board of Supervisors must take affirmative action to re-authorize the body. |
| | Commission Size | 15 members |

Governance Commission Standards

This template is intended to provide standard functions, processes, and operations for governance commissions. The intention is to align currently existing bodies to these standards, where it makes sense, and to memorialize this work such that it may inform the creation of future bodies.

| Governance Commissions | |
|------------------------|--|
| Definition | The purpose is to provide additional oversight and direction to the work of a City department. |
| Applies to | Bodies that oversee departments and have the authority to make some binding decisions. |

| Category | Component | Description |
|--|------------------------------------|---|
| Commissioner Attributes and Processes | Appointing Authority | Mayoral appointments |
| | Appointment Confirmations | No confirmations; appointments are effective immediately, however BOS may veto with a 2/3 majority within 30 days (standardize to language under § 3.100.18). |
| | Commissioner Removals | At will |
| | Term Lengths | 4 year term lengths |
| | Term Limits | 3 terms maximum |
| | Qualifications | Specific qualifications should be determined by the authorizing legislation of the body. In general, qualifications should be desirable and body-level. The appointing officer should include a statement indicating why an appointee is qualified. |
| Commission Operations and Attributes | Establishing Authority | Should be determined on a case-by-case basis |
| | Sunset Dates | None |
| | Commission Size | 5 – 7 members |
| Role in Department Oversight | Hiring and Firing Authority | No authority to hire and fire department heads |
| | Contract Approval | No changes to current state; Commissions currently have no legal authority to approve contracts, however, the Board of Supervisors has authority to delegate responsibility via ordinance. |
| | Budget Approval | Yes |
| | Employee Discipline | No role, unless currently legally required. |

The Task Force explicitly notes that exceptions to standard components are allowable for bodies that may need to be insulated from political pressures, specifically allowing for split appointments and for-cause removals.

Appendix D: Evaluation Criteria

This is intended to be a tool to fairly and systematically generate a recommendation for what the outcome should be for each public body. The criteria will lead to a set of potential outcomes:

- Keep
- Combine
- Eliminate

Evaluation Criteria Tables

| Legal Requirements | | |
|---|--|--------------------------|
| Goal is to assess if State/Federal government requires either the body itself or the functions of the body. | | |
| Criteria | If yes | If no |
| 1a) Does state or federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body? | Keep | Go to 1b) |
| 1b) Does this body currently fulfill some function required by state or federal law? | Go to 1c) | Continue to next section |
| 1c) Could either another body or City staff fulfill this legal requirement? | Consider consolidating or eliminating. Continue to next section. <i>Note that if the Task Force later chooses to combine or eliminate, those functions would need to be reassigned.</i> | Keep |

| Activity | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--|
| Determines if the body is active, inactive, or borderline inactive. | | |
| Inactivity | | |
| Goal is to determine if this body is inactive | | |
| Criteria | If yes | If no |
| 2a) Has the body met at least once in the past year? (exception for periodic meeting bodies). | Continue to 2b | Body does not meet our definition of inactive. Continue to next section. |
| 2b) Does the department provide a clear rationale for keeping this body, or are there any other relevant considerations for deferring decision-making on this body? | Continue with to next section. | Eliminate |
| Borderline Inactivity | | |
| Goal is to assess at its most basic level if the body is actively working to meet their mandate | | |
| Criteria | If yes | If no |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 3a) Did the body meet fewer than 4 times in the past year and/or are more than 25% of seats vacant? | Investigate why, continue to 3b. | Body is not borderline inactive. Continue to next section. |
| 3b) Could these issues be addressed by applying templates to this body? (E.g., templates may reduce the number of seats). | Consider keeping but aligning to template. Continue to next section. | Consider combining or eliminating. Continue to next section. |

Overlap With Other Bodies

Goal is to assess if multiple bodies cover similar topics or policy areas and whether or not they could reasonably be combined.

| Criteria | If yes | If no |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| 4a) Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area? | Go to 4b | Body is unique in policy area. Continue to next section. |
| 4b) Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area? | Consider combining or eliminating | Continue to 4c |
| 4c) Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area? | Consider keeping and expanding scope | Continue to next section |

Breadth of Focus

Goal is to assess if the commission is serving broader City interests, or if it is serving the interests of one specific group or population.

| Criteria | If yes | If no |
|--|----------------------|-------------------|
| 5a) Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic? | Continue to 5b | Finish evaluation |
| 5b) Could these interests be adequately represented by City staff or other public bodies with a broader scope and mandate? | Consider eliminating | Consider keeping |

Definition

- Narrow policy topic:
 - Topic area or policy area that impacts a minority of San Francisco residents and does not directly impact the health, housing, or financial security of San Franciscans.

If the answer is “no” to all criteria, consider keeping the body.

Type-Specific Considerations

These considerations did not inform the criteria-based outcome, however, staff used these questions to inform analysis of specific bodies when other criteria point to eliminating or combining the body. Each of these questions are intended to help the Task Force understand whether the body adds value that the evaluation criteria does not adequately capture.

Advisory Committee Considerations

- 1) Based on a review of available information, are there other active pathways for public input regarding this policy area? If not, consider keeping the body.
- 2) According to a review of available information and relevant department input, does this body bring in outside expertise that would otherwise be missing from the City's work on the body's target topic area? If not, continue with recommendation to combine or eliminate the body.

Staff Working Groups Considerations

- 3) Do staff or departments see any additional value in ensuring this body is in charter or code?

Appendix E: Record of Task Force Member Votes

The table below is a record of all Task Force votes related to specific bodies. Any highlighted rows illustrate where a vote was not unanimous.

Please note this represents all votes in order. This table includes all vote results, including those that were later revised.

| Meeting Date | Topic | Motion Content | Vote Result |
|--------------|---|--|--|
| 7/16/2025 | Inactive Bodies | Adopt staff's recommendation to eliminate 31 inactive bodies and defer decision-making on 3 bodies: Board of Examiners; Long-Term Care Coordinating Council; Our Children, Our Families Council. | Unanimous |
| 8/20/2025 | Borderline Inactive Bodies | Eliminate the following five bodies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justice Tracking Information System (JUSTIS) Committee Governance Council; • Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island Citizens Advisory Board; • Treasury Oversight Committee; • Waterfront Design Advisory Committee; • Workers' Compensation Council. | Passed 3–1 (Vice Chair Fraser opposed) |
| 9/3/2025 | Adult Probation, District Attorney, Emergency Management & Fire | Keep the Community Corrections Partnership (CCP). Eliminate the Reentry Council. Keep the Real Estate Fraud Prosecution Trust Fund Committee and add code language clarifying it only needs to meet if the District Attorney calls a meeting to reevaluate funding allocations. Provide no recommendation for the Sentencing Commission; leave as-is and state that the Task Force expects it not to be re-authorized. Keep the Disaster Council; do not impose term lengths/limits or a sunset date; update member qualifications. Keep the Fire Commission; add three-year term limits; remove the Commission's ability to remove the department head; move disciplinary functions to the department head; allow the appeals process to occur at the commission. | Unanimous |
| 9/3/2025 | Fire Commission | Keep the Fire Commission in the Charter. | Passed 3–1 (Vice Chair Fraser opposed) |
| 9/3/2025 | Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council | Defer membership reduction; adopt remaining elements: add four-year term lengths; add three-term limits for public members; add establishing authority language to the Administrative Code; opt out of a sunset date. | Unanimous |
| 9/3/2025 | Juvenile Probation Commission (JPC) | Align JPC to the governance commission template (member removal at-will; add three term limits; hiring/firing becomes consultative; other alignment decisions as applicable). | Unanimous |

| Meeting Date | Topic | Motion Content | Vote Result |
|--------------|--|--|--|
| 9/3/2025 | JPC | Keep JPC in the Charter. | Passed 3–1 (Vice Chair Fraser opposed) |
| 9/3/2025 | Police Commission | Retain split appointments (Mayor 4 / BOS 3) with no Board of Supervisors veto/vote power over mayoral appointments. | Passed 3–1 (Chair Harrington opposed) |
| 9/3/2025 | Police Commission | Adopt package: Mayoral appointees removable by the Mayor without BOS consent; add three term limits; have the Police Chief make disciplinary decisions with the Police Commission as the appellate body; clarify BOS appointment process to align the Charter with longstanding City Attorney guidance. (Note: decision on DPA-originated appeals deferred.) | Passed 3–1 (Chair Harrington opposed) |
| 9/3/2025 | Police Commission | Keep the Police Commission’s establishing authority in the Charter. | Passed 3–1 (Vice Chair Fraser opposed) |
| 9/17/2025 | Sheriff’s Department Oversight Board (SDOB) | Convert SDOB to an advisory body; staff to return with recommendations to align it with the advisory template. | Unanimous |
| 9/17/2025 | Port Commission & Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) Board | Keep both bodies and accept the recommendations in the staff report. | Unanimous |
| 9/17/2025 | Public Works Commission & Sanitation and Streets Commission | Eliminate both commissions; direct staff to work with DPW to maintain public-facing functions and recommend alternative methods of public input. | Unanimous |
| 9/17/2025 | Department of Public Works — CULCOP | Eliminate the Committee for Utility Liaison on Construction and Other Projects (CULCOP); department may convene informally as needed. | Unanimous |
| 9/17/2025 | Urban Forestry Council & Municipal Green Building Task Force | Eliminate both bodies (UFC and MGBTF); understanding that functions may be absorbed by the Commission on the Environment or staff, respectively. | Unanimous |
| 9/17/2025 | Commission on the Environment | Retain the Commission on the Environment as an advisory body (convert from governance). | Passed 4–1 (Chair Harrington opposed) |
| 9/17/2025 | Municipal Transportation Agency — MB TIF-AC | Eliminate the Mission Bay Transportation Improvement Fund Advisory Committee. | Unanimous |

| Meeting Date | Topic | Motion Content | Vote Result |
|--------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| 9/17/2025 | Municipal Transportation Agency — ISCOTT | Retain Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation in its current capacity; remove any Charter reference. | Unanimous |
| 9/17/2025 | Bicycle Advisory Committee | Eliminate the Bicycle Advisory Committee. | Unanimous |
| 9/17/2025 | MTA Citizens' Advisory Council | Retain CAC; move it to the Administrative Code; leave composition unchanged for now; align with advisory template. | Passed 4–1 (Chair Harrington opposed) |
| 9/17/2025 | MTA Board of Directors | Retain the MTA Board; align to the governance template; keep it in the Charter. | Unanimous |
| 9/17/2025 | Public Utilities Commission (PUC) | Retain PUC; align to the governance template; keep it in the Charter. | Unanimous |
| 9/17/2025 | Rate Fairness Board | Retain RFB; move to the Administrative Code; add three-year term lengths and term limits for public members; no sunset date. | Unanimous |
| 9/17/2025 | Southeast Community Facility Commission (SECFC) | Retain SECFC without applying a template; keep in Administrative Code; retain budget authority; reduce term lengths to three years; add four-term limits; retain hiring/firing authority; continue until the facility ceases to exist (no sunset date). | Unanimous |
| 9/17/2025 | PUC Citizens' Advisory Committee | Retain CAC as an advisory body and accept staff recommendations. | Unanimous |
| 9/17/2025 | Joint Zoo Committee | Retain in current form without codification. | Unanimous |
| 9/17/2025 | Recreation and Park Commission | Align RPC with governance template and retain in the Charter. | Unanimous |
| 9/17/2025 | PROSAC | Remove PROSAC from the Charter and place in the Administrative Code; apply staff recommendations; amend to set three-year terms and a four-term limit. | Unanimous |
| 10/1/2025 | Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Advisory Committee | Eliminate the Advisory Committee and authorize the Board of Supervisors to revise program elements by ordinance; preserve artist involvement via department processes. | Unanimous |
| 10/1/2025 | Asian Art Commission & Fine Arts Museums Board of Trustees | Accept staff recommendations for both bodies (nomination/appointment alignment, governance structure as recommended). | Unanimous |
| 10/1/2025 | War Memorial Board of Trustees | Align the War Memorial Board of Trustees with staff recommendations (including contracting alignment with Admin Code Chapter 6). | Unanimous |

| Meeting Date | Topic | Motion Content | Vote Result |
|--------------|--|---|-------------|
| 10/1/2025 | Library Commission | Keep Library Commission as a governance body and align with the governance template (add term limits; remove hiring/firing authority). | Unanimous |
| 10/1/2025 | Film Commission | Keep in Administrative Code and partially align to the advisory template (no sunset; retain “Commission” name). | Unanimous |
| 10/1/2025 | Building & Permitting — Consolidation into Board of Appeals | Maintain split appointments; align confirmation to governance template; add three-term limit; set removal for-cause (definition to be finalized); keep Board of Appeals in Charter; consolidate Board of Examiners, Abatement Appeals Board, and Access Appeals Commission into the Board of Appeals (operate Access Appeals as subcommittee/committee to meet state requirements). | Unanimous |
| 10/1/2025 | Code Advisory Committee & Structural Advisory Committee | Eliminate both committees (can be convened as needed outside code). | Unanimous |
| 10/1/2025 | Airport Commission | Align with governance template; keep in Charter; remove voter recall; allow removal without cause. | Unanimous |
| 10/1/2025 | Downtown Revitalization & Economic Recovery Financing District Board | Retain as-is (new body that has not yet met). | Unanimous |
| 10/1/2025 | Small Business Commission | Move from Charter to Administrative Code; retain split mayor/BOS appointments; eliminate qualifications; impose advisory template terms & limits with a sunset; remove budget approval and hiring/firing authority; remove Legacy Business Program review from Commission duties. | Unanimous |
| 10/1/2025 | Entertainment Commission | Maintain split appointments; remove BOS veto of mayoral appointees; move to Administrative Code; eliminate qualifications; remove hiring/firing authority; align to governance template. | Unanimous |
| 10/1/2025 | Cannabis Oversight Committee | Remove the SFUSD non-voting seat to align with advisory template sizing. | Unanimous |
| 10/1/2025 | Rent Board | Retain with no changes (do not transfer appellate functions; no term limits added). | Unanimous |
| 10/1/2025 | Citizens Committee on Community Development (CCCD) | Eliminate the CCCD; MOHCD to continue federal outreach obligations via alternative public process. | Unanimous |

| Meeting Date | Topic | Motion Content | Vote Result |
|--------------|--|---|-------------|
| 10/1/2025 | Inclusionary Housing Technical Advisory Committee (IH TAC) | Retain IH TAC; clarify that member terms expire upon issuance of the Committee's final report. | Unanimous |
| 10/1/2025 | SOMA Community Stabilization Fund CAC | Retain the SOMA CAC; apply a three-year sunset per advisory template. | Unanimous |
| 10/1/2025 | Planning Commission | Retain; partially align to governance template; keep in Charter; maintain split appointments. | Unanimous |
| 10/1/2025 | Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) | Maintain in Charter; move certain technical duties to Administrative Code; make seat qualifications desirable (body-level); eliminate fallback provision allowing Board President to appoint if Mayor fails to act; otherwise align with governance template. | Unanimous |
| 10/1/2025 | Bayview Hunters Point Citizens Advisory Committee | Eliminate Bayview CAC. | Unanimous |
| 10/1/2025 | SOMA Community Planning Advisory Committee (SOMA CPAC) | Retain; apply advisory template including three-year sunset and four-term limit. | Unanimous |
| 10/1/2025 | Interagency Planning and Implementation Committee (IPIC) | Eliminate IPIC (staff working group; should not be codified). | Unanimous |
| 10/1/2025 | Committee on City Workforce Alignment (CCWA) | Retain CCWA at current size (possible seat reductions later); incorporate term limits for public seats; apply 2030 sunset (aligned with OEWD five-year plan). | Unanimous |
| 10/1/2025 | Workforce Investment San Francisco Board (WISF) | Retain WISF; maintain current number of seats; remove BOS confirmation of mayoral appointees; impose 12-year cumulative term limit; no sunset. | Unanimous |
| 10/15/2025 | Child Care Planning and Advisory Council (CPAC) | Keep CPAC; retain the number of seats; do not add a sunset date; remove outdated code references to DCYF. | Unanimous |
| 10/15/2025 | Our Children, Our Families Council (OCOF) | Eliminate OCOF; replace Charter references to the Council with references to the DCYF 'initiative' in Charter amendment language. | Unanimous |

| Meeting Date | Topic | Motion Content | Vote Result |
|--------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| 10/15/2025 | Service Provider Working Group (SPWG) | Eliminate SPWG from code to allow reconvening as a passive meeting body; staff to return with proposed language encouraging departments to consult with service providers; City Administrator to explore provider engagement across departments. | Unanimous |
| 10/15/2025 | Children & Families First Commission (CFFC) and Early Childhood COAC | Keep CFFC; remove all Charter references; maintain current functions — expenditure authority over Prop 10 funds and advisory authority over broader department budget; remove role in department head selection; eliminate EC COAC. | Unanimous |
| 10/15/2025 | DCYF Oversight & Advisory Committee (OAC) | Move DCYF OAC from the Charter to the Administrative Code. | Passed 4–1 (Chair Harrington opposed) |
| 10/15/2025 | Children & Youth — DCYF OAC | Align OAC with governance commission template with exceptions: retain current number of seats, split appointments, existing term lengths and limits; make seat qualifications desirable at the body level; remove appointment confirmations, for-cause removal, and hiring/firing authority. | Unanimous |
| 10/15/2025 | Free City College Oversight Committee | Retain the body and align with the advisory committee template. | Unanimous |
| 10/15/2025 | Youth Commission (Motion 1) | Move the Youth Commission from the Charter to the Administrative Code. | Passed 4–1 (Chair Harrington opposed) |
| 10/15/2025 | Youth Commission (Motion 2) | Retain 17 seats; impose a three-term limit (one-year terms); keep no sunset date; remove the prohibition on stipends. | Unanimous |
| 10/15/2025 | IHSS Public Authority Governing Board | Retain without changes (required quasi-governance body). | Unanimous |
| 10/15/2025 | Long-Term Care Coordinating Council (LTCCC) | Eliminate the LTCCC. | Unanimous |
| 10/15/2025 | Dignity Fund Service Provider Working Group (SPWG) | Eliminate the Dignity Fund SPWG; direct staff to develop language encouraging the department to continue collaborative work with service providers. | Unanimous |
| 10/15/2025 | DASC Advisory Council + Dignity Fund OAC | Direct staff to return with a proposal to combine the DASC Advisory Council and the Dignity Fund OAC into a single advisory body under DAS, with flexibility to deviate from the advisory template as needed. | Unanimous |

| Meeting Date | Topic | Motion Content | Vote Result |
|--------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| 10/15/2025 | Human Services Commission (HSC) | Retain HSC at 5 members; maintain all-Mayoral appointments; move to the Administrative Code; conform to the governance template (Board of Supervisors by ordinance). | Unanimous |
| 10/15/2025 | Disability & Aging Services Commission (DASC) | Retain as a governance body; move to the Administrative Code; replace specific seat qualifications with body-level desirable qualifications. | Unanimous |
| 10/15/2025 | Veterans Affairs Commission (VAC) | Retain and align with the advisory committee template per staff recommendations. | Unanimous |
| 10/15/2025 | Homelessness — HOC & LHCB | Eliminate the LHCB and keep HOC, partially aligned to the advisory template and fulfilling CoC requirements (no sunset date; no hiring/firing authority; no contract approval authority; advisory budget authority); staff to investigate seats/qualifications required to satisfy HUD CoC requirements. | Passed 4–1 (Chair Harrington opposed) |
| 10/15/2025 | Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee & Shelter Monitoring Committee | Eliminate both committees with the expectation that HOC assumes responsibility for oversight (note: HSH contracts support grievance services; shelter monitoring via contract monitoring). | Unanimous |
| 10/15/2025 | Our City, Our Home Oversight Committee (OCOH) | Eliminate OCOH; refer reporting/oversight functions to HOC and the Health Commission to maintain oversight. | Unanimous |
| 10/15/2025 | Immigrant Rights Commission (IRC) | Keep IRC as an advisory body; increase term length to three years; add a four-term limit; do not impose a sunset date. | Unanimous |
| 10/15/2025 | LGBTQI+ Advisory Committee | Set maximum seats at 15; add three-year term lengths; add four-term limits; no sunset date. | Unanimous |
| 10/15/2025 | Human Rights Commission (Motion 1) | Move the Human Rights Commission from the Charter to the Administrative Code. | Passed 4–1 (Chair Harrington opposed) |
| 10/15/2025 | Human Rights Commission (Motion 2) | Align with the advisory template: reduce term lengths from four to three years; add a four-term limit; remove hiring/firing authority; do not impose a sunset date. | Unanimous |
| 10/15/2025 | Commission on the Status of Women (COSW) (Motion 1) | Move COSW from the Charter to the Administrative Code. | Passed 4–1 (Chair Harrington opposed) |

| Meeting Date | Topic | Motion Content | Vote Result |
|--------------|---|--|-------------|
| 10/15/2025 | COSW (Motion 2) | Make COSW advisory; increase members to 11; members serve at-will; add three-term limits; remove department oversight authority (hiring & firing, budget and contract approval); do not impose a sunset date. | Unanimous |
| 10/15/2025 | Family Violence Council (FVC) | Keep FVC; reduce membership from 28 to 15 (retain public member tri-chair structure); keep 2027 sunset date; add three-year terms and four-term limits; direct staff to work with MOVR on revised seat qualifications. | Unanimous |
| 10/15/2025 | Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee (SDDTAC) | Keep SDDTAC with 16 seats; establish three-year terms with a four-term limit; remove the sunset date; state that the body should continue as long as the tax remains; designate Department of Public Health for administrative support instead of City Administrator/Controller; include flexibility to amend without returning to the ballot. | Unanimous |
| 10/15/2025 | Food Security Task Force (FSTF) | Eliminate the FSTF. | Unanimous |
| 10/15/2025 | Health Commission & Behavioral Health Commission | Keep the Health Commission as a governance body in the Charter aligning to the governance template; keep the Behavioral Health Commission as an advisory body in the Administrative Code without a sunset date and with at-will member removal; rename BHC later. | Unanimous |
| 11/5/2025 | State Legislation Committee (SLC) | Keep SLC and apply staff recommendations; do not apply sunset date or term lengths/limits (body is made up of City staff). | Unanimous |
| 11/5/2025 | Committee on Information Technology (COIT) | Keep COIT. | Unanimous |
| 11/5/2025 | Assessment Appeals Board (AAB) | Keep AAB as is. | Unanimous |
| 11/5/2025 | Law Library Board of Trustees (LLBT) | Remove LLBT from the Charter. | Unanimous |
| 11/5/2025 | City Hall Preservation Advisory Committee (CHPAC) | Eliminate CHPAC. | Unanimous |
| 11/5/2025 | Commission on Animal Control and Welfare (CACW) | Keep CACW; change its name; align with the advisory template; alter seat qualifications to make veterinarian seat desirable; modify quarterly reporting requirement. | Unanimous |

| Meeting Date | Topic | Motion Content | Vote Result |
|--------------|--|---|---|
| 11/5/2025 | Refuse Rate Board (RRB) | Keep RRB; move it from the Health to the Administrative Code; keep three members and the three-way split appointments; add four-year term length; add three-term limit for the public member. | Unanimous |
| 11/5/2025 | Sweatfree Procurement Advisory Group (SPAG) (Motion 1) | Keep SPAG. | 3-2 (Ms. Kittler and Ms. Hayward opposed) |
| 11/5/2025 | Sweatfree Procurement Advisory Group (SPAG) (Motion 2) | Adopt staff recommendations to align SPAG with the advisory template. | Unanimous |
| 11/5/2025 | Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF) | Keep SOTF; remove external nominations; apply qualifications at the body level; set a six-term limit; do not add a sunset date. | Unanimous |
| 11/5/2025 | Civil Service Commission (CSC) | Adopt a two-term limit and remove the seat-specific requirement for two women; rely on Charter provisions promoting diversity. | Unanimous |
| 11/5/2025 | Special Strike Committee (SSC) | Eliminate SSC and recommend the Board of Supervisors enable the City Attorney to remove Charter language rendered illegal by court decisions. | Passed 4–0 |
| 11/5/2025 | Health Services Board (HSB) (Motion 1) | Keep HSB and adopt all staff recommendations, except do not allow the Board to retain sole authority over hiring/firing its Executive Director. | Passed 4–0 |
| 11/5/2025 | Health Services Board (HSB) (Motion 2) | Allow HSB to retain sole authority to hire and fire its Executive Director. | Passed 4–0 |
| 11/5/2025 | Retirement Board | Adopt staff recommendations. | Passed 4–0 |
| 11/5/2025 | Retiree Health Care Trust Fund Board (RHCTFB) | Adopt staff recommendations with change to move RHCTFB from the Charter to the Administrative Code; include language allowing a future merger with the Retirement Board. | Passed 4–0 |
| 11/5/2025 | Elections — Elections Commission | Adopt staff recommendations; keep the Elections Commission in the Charter. | Unanimous |
| 11/5/2025 | Elections — Ballot Simplification Committee | Direct staff to return with revised language simplifying seat qualifications and the nomination process. | Unanimous |
| 11/5/2025 | Elections — Redistricting Task Force | Retain the Redistricting Task Force in the Charter with no structural changes. | Unanimous |

| Meeting Date | Topic | Motion Content | Vote Result |
|--------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| 11/5/2025 | Capital Planning Committee | Retain the Capital Planning Committee as-is. | Unanimous |
| 11/5/2025 | EIFD Public Financing Authority No. 1 | Retain the EIFD PFA and align with all staff recommendations. | Unanimous |
| 11/5/2025 | Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee (GOBOC) | Retain GOBOC without a sunset date; impose four-term limits; align with staff recommendations. | Unanimous |
| 11/5/2025 | Capital Projects & Infrastructure — SFMTA Bond Oversight Committee | Recommend that the MTA Board of Directors eliminate the body. | Unanimous |
| 11/19/2025 | Deferred Decisions — Police Commission (DPA Discipline Process) | Adopt Option 2: require the Police Chief to implement the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) Director's recommendation for discipline; the Police Commission serves as the appellate body for appeals. | Passed 3–1 (Vice Chair Bruss opposed) |
| 11/19/2025 | Deferred Decisions — Police Commission (DPA Director Appointment) | Police Commission to directly appoint the DPA Director (remove Board of Supervisors confirmation role). | Passed 4–0 |
| 11/19/2025 | Deferred Decisions — Sheriff's Department Oversight Board (SDOB) Subpoena Powers | Remove SDOB's subpoena powers, with the understanding the Inspector General retains subpoena authority. | Passed 4–0 |
| 11/19/2025 | Deferred Decisions — SDOB Alignment to Advisory Template | Align SDOB to the advisory template: change member removal to at-will; reduce term length from 4 years to 3 years; implement 4-term limits; make qualifications desirable at the body level; move establishing authority to the Administrative Code; no sunset date; remove budget authority. | Passed 4–0 |
| 11/19/2025 | Deferred Decisions — SDOB Appointing Authority | Change appointing authority to 4 Mayoral and 3 Board of Supervisors appointments. | Passed 3–1 (Ms Mihal opposed) |

| Meeting Date | Topic | Motion Content | Vote Result |
|--------------|--|---|---------------------------------|
| 11/19/2025 | Deferred Decisions — SDOB Inspector General Appointing Authority | Designate SDOB as the appointing authority for the Inspector General. | Passed 3–1 (Ms Kittler opposed) |
| 11/19/2025 | Deferred Decisions — Film Commission | Maintain current term limits; remove hiring & firing authority from the Film Commission and transfer it to the Mayor. | Passed 4–0 |
| 11/19/2025 | Deferred Decisions — Family Violence Council (FVC) | Include language in the Task Force’s ordinance to reduce membership from 28 to 15 (keeping three public seats), retain the sunset date, and add three-year term lengths with a four-term limit. | Passed 4–0 |
| 11/19/2025 | Deferred Decisions — Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) — Qualifications | Retain professional qualifications but make them desirable at the body level rather than at the seat level. | Passed 4–0 |
| 11/19/2025 | Deferred Decisions — HPC — Preservation Element | Eliminate the Preservation Element of the General Plan. | Passed 4–0 |
| 11/19/2025 | Deferred Decisions — HPC — Move Duties to Planning Code | Move the following duties from the Charter to the Planning Code: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • landmark & historic district designations; • certificates of appropriateness; • significant/contributory building & conservation district designations in C-3 districts; • alteration of significant/contributory buildings or buildings in conservation districts in C-3; • Mills Act contracts; • referrals of certain matters; and other duties. | Passed 3–1 (Ms Hayward opposed) |
| 11/19/2025 | Reviewing & Revising Preliminary Decisions — Access Appeals Commission | Remove the Access Appeals Commission from the Charter and codify its functions under the Board of Appeals in the Administrative Code. | Unanimous |
| 11/19/2025 | BOS Veto for Split Appointments | Apply the two-thirds veto standard to the Police Commission and Entertainment Commission to align with similar bodies. | Passed 3–1 (Ms Kittler opposed) |

| Meeting Date | Topic | Motion Content | Vote Result |
|--------------|--|---|-------------|
| 11/19/2025 | Reviewing & Revising Preliminary Decisions — BOS Appointment Methods | Retain the current appointment structures for the Board of Supervisors. | Unanimous |
| 11/19/2025 | Reviewing & Revising Preliminary Decisions — Appointing Authorities for Appeals Bodies | Retain the existing appointing structures for appeals bodies (e.g., Rent Board; Civil Service Commission). | Unanimous |
| 11/19/2025 | Reviewing & Revising Preliminary Decisions — Board of Appeals Executive Director | Retain the Board of Appeals' authority to hire and fire its Executive Director. | Unanimous |
| 11/19/2025 | Reviewing & Revising Preliminary Decisions — Hiring/Firing (TIDA & Entertainment Commission) | Confirm prior decision to transfer hiring & firing authority for the Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) and Entertainment Commission to the Mayor. | Unanimous |
| 12/3/2025 | Deferred Decisions on Arts Commission | <p>Retain the Arts Commission's mission in the Charter while relocating other elements of its structure to the Administrative Code.</p> <p>Move the Commission's size, appointing authority, and member removal provisions as-is to code and modify member qualifications to apply at the body level.</p> <p>Transfer Charter sections 5.103(2) and 5.103(3) to code.</p> <p>Modify the Civic Design Review (Charter §5.103(1)) to be consultative.</p> <p>Revise the Commission's role in overseeing arts-related appropriations (Charter §5.103(4)) from "supervise and control" to an advisory role.</p> | Unanimous |

| Meeting Date | Topic | Motion Content | Vote Result |
|---------------------|--|---|---------------------------------|
| 12/3/2025 | Deferred Decisions on Building Inspection Commission — Abatement Appeals Board | Reverse the prior decision to transfer the Abatement Appeals Board (AAB) to the Board of Appeals; keep the AAB as its own distinct body made up of BIC commissioners. | Unanimous |
| 12/3/2025 | Deferred Decisions on Building Inspection Commission — Governance Template Alignment | Retain BIC with its current size and appointing authorities, and make the following changes: Align the confirmation process, hiring and firing authority, and contract approval authority with the governance template; Make members removable at will; Set four-year term lengths with a three-term limit; Make membership qualifications desirable at the body level; Move the Commission from the Charter to the Administrative Code. | Unanimous |
| 12/3/2025 | Deferred Decisions on Building Inspection Commission — Budget Approval Provision | Remove the Charter provision requiring five members of BIC to approve the DBI budget and align BIC's budget authority with the governance template. | Passed 4–1 (Ms Kittler opposed) |
| 12/3/2025 | Deferred Decisions on Building Inspection Commission — Code Advisory Committee (CAC) | Move the CAC to the Administrative Code with its current structure, except add a four-term limit—reversing the prior decision to eliminate the CAC and convert it to a passive meeting body. | Unanimous |
| 12/3/2025 | Deferred Decisions on Aging, Homelessness, and Children's Services — Homelessness Advisory Board (HAB) | Adopt the proposed structure for the Homelessness Advisory Board and its Continuum of Care Subcommittee as outlined on slide 21, keeping membership flexible with up to 13 seats; implementation details to be finalized with stakeholders and HSH. | Unanimous |

| Meeting Date | Topic | Motion Content | Vote Result |
|--------------|---|---|--|
| 12/3/2025 | Deferred Decisions on Aging, Homelessness, and Children's Services — Disability & Aging Services Advisory Council and Dignity Fund Oversight & Advisory Committee | Adopt staff recommendation to merge the two bodies, retaining a 22-member structure; final report to address transition and status of existing members. | Unanimous |
| 12/3/2025 | Deferred Decisions on Aging, Homelessness, and Children's Services — Service Provider Working Groups (Department of Disability & Aging Services) | Adopt staff language (slide 26) that codifies service provider engagement without creating a new advisory body. | Unanimous |
| 12/3/2025 | Deferred Decisions on Aging, Homelessness, and Children's Services — Service Provider Working Groups (Department of Children, Youth & Their Families) | Establish a formal Service Provider Working Group with seven members (per slide 27), with a sunset date set at three years. | Passed 3–2 (Vice Chair Bruss and Ms Kittler opposed) |
| 12/3/2025 | Deferred Decisions on Aging, Homelessness, and Children's Services — Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council | Make no changes to the council's membership (retain 20 seats). | Unanimous |
| 12/3/2025 | Deferred Decisions on General Administration and Finance — Ballot Simplification Committee | Accept staff recommendations: allow the SFUSD Superintendent to directly appoint the designated seat; adopt the changes to that seat's qualifications; and maintain no term limits. | Unanimous |

| Meeting Date | Topic | Motion Content | Vote Result |
|--------------|---|--|-------------|
| 12/3/2025 | Reviewing and Revising Preliminary Decisions — Seat Qualifications (Small Business Commission and MTA Citizens' Advisory Council) | Make qualifications desirable at the body level and applicable to all appointing authorities. | Unanimous |
| 12/3/2025 | Reviewing and Revising Preliminary Decisions — Immigrant Rights Commission | Retain the requirement that eight of the fifteen members be immigrants, split with two seats for the Mayor and six seats for the Board of Supervisors appointments. | Unanimous |
| 12/12/2025 | 4. Human Rights Commission | <p>Adopt staff recommendations as modified during discussion, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigate complaints of unlawful discrimination – remain in Charter as a department function; • Ensure civil rights of all persons – remain in Charter as a department function and add to Administrative Code as a commission function; • Create operational rules/draft legislation – department retains primary responsibility, Administrative Code will authorize the commission to make legislative recommendations; • Hold hearings, issue subpoenas, take testimony, administer oaths, issue orders – remain in Charter as department functions; Administrative Code will allow the commission to hold hearings and take testimony; subpoena authority stays with the department; • Affirmative action plans – remove from Charter; do not add to Administrative Code; • Promote understanding and cooperation – remain in Charter as a department function; add to Administrative Code as a commission function; • Study, investigate, mediate, and recommend solutions to community-wide problems – move to Administrative Code as a commission function; • Contract enforcement – remove from Charter; do not add to Administrative Code; • Adopt staff recommendations on slide 11 to delete certain obsolete functions from code. | Unanimous |

| Meeting Date | Topic | Motion Content | Vote Result |
|--------------|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| 12/12/2025 | 5. Deferred Decisions — Fine Arts Museum Board of Trustees | Set Board to no more than 20 members and clarify that the body will act by a majority vote of appointed members in office. | Unanimous |
| 12/12/2025 | 5. Deferred Decisions — Refuse Rate Board | Adopt a three-term limit for public members and allow holdover appointments. | Unanimous |
| 12/12/2025 | 5. Deferred Decisions — Committee on Information Technology (Motion 2) | Keep COIT as-is with two public members. | Passed 4–1, with Ms Kittler opposed |
| 12/12/2025 | 5. Deferred Decisions — Retiree Health Care Trust Fund Board | Adopt Option 2A — keep RHCTFB in the Charter and allow a future merger with the Retirement Board by majority vote of both bodies rather than by ordinance. | Unanimous |
| 12/12/2025 | 6. Reviewing and Revising Preliminary Decisions — Member Qualifications | Make qualifications desirable at the body level for Elections and PUC; remove the single seat qualification for Police Commission; make no changes for the MTA Board. | Unanimous |
| 12/12/2025 | Action on Reentry Council (Reopened from Item 6) | Reverse the prior decision and restore the Reentry Council to the Administrative Code in its current form; add a six-term limit for public members; retain two-year terms; keep the existing 2029 sunset date. | Unanimous |
| 12/18/2025 | Reviewing and Revising Preliminary Decisions — Bayview Hunters Point Community Advisory Committee (BHPCAC) | Reverse the decision to eliminate BHPCAC and keep the body; eliminate the City Administrator as an appointing authority and redistribute those appointments: two voting seats to the District 10 Supervisor and one voting seat to the Mayor; no term limits; no sunset date. | Unanimous |
| 12/18/2025 | Reviewing and Revising Preliminary Decisions — Arts Commission Term Limit | Adopt staff recommendation of four-year terms with a three-term limit. | Unanimous |

| Meeting Date | Topic | Motion Content | Vote Result |
|--------------|--|--|-------------|
| 12/18/2025 | Reviewing and Revising Preliminary Decisions — Arts Commission Department Head Authority | Remove the Arts Commission's hiring and firing authority of the department head and empower the Mayor with that authority. | Unanimous |
| 12/18/2025 | Reviewing and Revising Preliminary Decisions — Commission Streamlining Task Force (CSTF) | Include in the report a recommendation that the Charter, and its public meeting bodies, be reviewed regularly. | Unanimous |
| 12/18/2025 | Report Draft — Arts Commission Body Type and Budget Authority | Remove the Arts Commission's budget authority and categorize the body as advisory. | Unanimous |