



# Approved Minutes

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

**Daniel Lurie**  
**Mayor**

**Wednesday, September 17, 2025**  
**1:00 pm**

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

Meeting will also be broadcast online and remote public comment will be available via WebEx event. To view the online presentation, join the meeting using the link <https://tinyurl.com/2vz9yc73> and password PropE. Members of the public may use email address [CommissionStreamlining@sfgov.org](mailto:CommissionStreamlining@sfgov.org) to join the WebEx meeting if needed. To join by phone, dial 415-655-0001 and enter access code (webinar ID) 2662 483 5353 followed by ##. See page 3 for additional remote public comment instructions.

It is possible that the Task Force may experience technical challenges that interfere with the ability of members of the public to participate in the meeting remotely. If that happens, the Task Force will attempt to correct the problem but may continue with the hearing as long as people attending in-person are able to observe and offer public comment.

### Agenda

#### 1. Call to Order

Chair Harrington called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.

#### 2. Roll Call

Chair Harrington opened the meeting by asking Project Director Rachel Alonso whether all the necessary documentation is in place to formalize former Task Force member Jean Fraser's resignation and the appointment of new Task Force member Sophia Kittler. Ms. Alonso confirmed that Ms. Fraser's resignation letter and Ms. Kittler's appointment letter and oath of office are documented in writing and saved in staff's files.

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

Angela Yip, the clerk, called roll. With all five members present, a quorum was established.

### 3. Announcements (Informational Item)

Chair Harrington thanked Jean Fraser for her work on the Task Force and welcomed Sophia Kittler as the new member. He noted that the meeting may run until 5:30 p.m. and future meetings may be relocated within City Hall to reduce time constraints due to back-to-back public meetings. In addition, Chair Harrington stated that the Task Force will be voting to select a new Vice Chair during its next meeting.

### 4. Approve Minutes – September 3, 2025 meeting (Action Item)

The Task Force considered approval of the draft minutes for the September 3, 2025 meeting. No public comments were received. The Task Force unanimously approved the meeting minutes for September 3, 2025.

### 5. Sheriff's Department Office of Inspector General Bodies (Action Item)

*Materials: [presentation](#) and [memo](#)*

Chair Harrington opened by noting that the Task Force would begin by continuing its discussion of public safety bodies not addressed at the previous meeting. Project Director Rachel Alonso introduced the item with a brief overview of the Task Force's process and timeline and explained that this was the second of five meetings focused on reviewing public bodies by policy area.

#### Sheriff's Department Oversight Board (SDOB)

Ms. Alonso presented on the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board (SDOB), which oversees the Office of Inspector General (OIG). She pointed out that the SDOB does not fit neatly into the Task Force's existing categories of governance, advisory, appeals, or regulatory bodies. She concluded by stating that the Task Force's first decision should be whether to keep or eliminate the SDOB.

Public comments were received from three speakers:

- Spencer Brenasow expressed support for eliminating the SDOB, stating that it has struggled to function since its creation and has persistent vacancies that leave it unable to fill its mandate and a duplicative role with the Department of Police Accountability (DPA). He asserted that maintaining a board that cannot operate properly wastes resources, and that eliminating the SDOB will ensure residents get results, not just duplicated bureaucracy.
- Julie Soo, SDOB President, spoke in support of maintaining the SDOB, emphasizing its role in preventing jail system abuses and building accountability and trust. She argued that merging the SDOB with the DPA would not resolve staffing issues, highlighted that filling vacancies is the responsibility of the Board of Supervisors and Mayor, and submitted 72 pages of documentation outlining the board's recent work.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:  
The BLA costs report asserted the SDOB costs just \$1.3 million — just eight-one-thousandths of one percent, (0.008176%) of the City's \$15.9 billion budget. Importantly, that \$1.3 million is a ridiculously small price to pay for oversight of the Sheriff's jails, and other functions. And doesn't factor in the benefits to incarcerated people, who deserve adequate accountability from Sheriff's staff. Saving \$1.3 million from \$15.9 billion isn't an "efficiency."

Saving just \$1.3 million in costs by eliminating the SDOB would be a laughable legacy for this Task Force, and stain your credibility!

The “Public Safety Recommendation” reported the SDOB could NOT reasonably be combined with another body because no other body covers similar functions. Further, page 37 documented the Police Commission can NOT take on the work of other bodies in the Public Safety category. This Task Force should stop attempting to transfer the Sheriff’s Department Oversight Board to the DPA!

Chair Harrington opened the Task Force’s discussion by inviting new Task Force member Sophia Kittler to offer remarks. Ms. Kittler framed her comments around two guiding questions: whether law enforcement accountability is important (which she affirmed) and whether the City is currently doing an adequate job (which she questioned). She expressed concern about the SDOB’s persistent vacancies and recent resignations, noting that they undermine the board’s effectiveness. She also wondered how to separate the SDOB from the departments it oversees, as DPA is a department and not an oversight body. She questioned whether the SDOB provides true accountability or merely serves as a venue for community input. While she acknowledged the value of community engagement, she suggested that if the SDOB’s functions could be fulfilled elsewhere, the Task Force should consider elimination.

Natasha Mihal echoed Ms. Kittler’s thoughts, noting the tension between legal limitations on oversight of the elected sheriff and the importance of maintaining a venue for public input on sensitive criminal justice issues. Ms. Mihal stated that the work of investigating police misconduct must continue and raised the question of where it should go. She proposed converting the SDOB into an advisory body with a three-year sunset clause to allow time for structural improvements and membership stability.

The Task Force then deliberated over the SDOB’s advisory role. Ms. Kittler raised the question of who the SDOB would advise if converted to an advisory body, and whether the Sheriff’s Department would be receptive to such advice. In response to Chair Harrington’s inquiry, Julie Soo, SDOB President, clarified that the body engages in policy work primarily through the Sheriff’s legal staff. She described the board as a hybrid body with governance, advisory, and regulatory elements, and noted that it has subpoena power and takes complaints. Andrea Bruss remarked that the SDOB’s work aligns more closely with an advisory role than a governance one, and suggested that the Task Force allow time and space for the board to evolve. She cited the board’s unique structure and the limitations imposed by state law as reasons to support a conversion to advisory status. To further clarify its advisory role, Julie Soo explained that the SDOB has authority over the Inspector General but advises the Sheriff.

Chair Harrington invited Task Force members to make a motion. Ms. Kittler noted that the consensus appeared to support retaining the body in some form. Sophie Hayward added that while the SDOB does not fit existing Task Force templates and cannot provide direct oversight of the Sheriff under state law, it remains important for public input. She underscored the need for transparency and stated that the current structure does not adequately support it. She stated that the SDOB has not had a fair chance to become fully operational and, while not supporting elimination, leaned toward classifying it as advisory rather than governance.

After some discussion among Task Force members, Ms. Kittler made a motion to convert the SDOB into an advisory body and requested that staff return with recommendations on how to align it with the advisory template. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

## **6. Required Infrastructure Bodies (Action Item)**

*Materials: [presentation](#) and [memo](#)*

Project Director Rachel Alonso introduced the item with a summary of staff's recommendations for the 20 Infrastructure, Climate, and Mobility bodies: keeping 12 and combining or eliminating eight. She then moved on to the recommendations for the first two bodies: the Port Commission and the Treasure Island Development Authority (TIDA) Board of Directors, both of which are legally required.

Public comment was invited, but none was received.

Sophie Hayward made a motion to keep both bodies and accept the recommendations in the staff report. Andrea Bruss seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

## **7. Department of Public Works Governance Bodies (Action Item)**

*Materials: [presentation](#) and [memo](#)*

Project Director Rachel Alonso presented the staff recommendations for three bodies: the Public Works Commission (PWC), Sanitation and Streets (SAS Commission), and Committee for Utility Liaison on Construction and Other Projects (CULCOP).

Public comments were received from seven speakers:

- Lauren Post, Chair of the Public Works Commission, spoke in her personal capacity and reiterated her view that the commission should be eliminated, arguing its oversight is unnecessary and delays capital projects. She urged bold reform, supported Proposition E, and suggested alternative transparency measures through the Board of Supervisors or temporary committees.
- Spencer Brenasow thanked Lauren Post for her candor and echoed her comments in support of eliminating the Public Works Commission. He encouraged the task force to take this opportunity to make government more efficient.
- Sylvia expressed support for eliminating the Sanitation and Streets Commission, stating that it duplicates the work of the Public Works Commission, wastes resources, and creates confusion around accountability. She advocated for consolidating oversight responsibilities under the Public Works Commission.
- Robbie Grisso strongly supported consolidating the Public Works and Sanitation and Streets Commissions, noting that the Sanitation and Streets Department was never created and that maintaining two overlapping bodies wastes resources and diverts staff attention. He emphasized that streamlining government increases effectiveness rather than cutting corners.
- Justin S. supported eliminating the Sanitation and Streets Commission, arguing it was created to oversee a department that no longer exists and lacks real authority. He stated that maintaining it wastes taxpayer money and delays projects, and urged consolidating oversight under the Public Works Commission.
- John Monson referenced his involvement in a Civil Grand Jury report from two years ago that recommended eliminating the Sanitation and Streets Commission, which he supports. However, he expressed concern about eliminating all oversight of the Public Works Department, noting its history of underperformance. Monson suggested that oversight could be reduced, modified, or made advisory.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:  
Appendix 4 in the BLA analysis shows neither the Public Works Streets Commission nor Sanitation and Streets Commission have full-time staff "hard costs," and the two Commissions combined cost just \$891,710 in so-called "soft costs" for part-time support from Department of Public Works to support both Commissions. That \$891,710 is a mere

0.005608% of the City's current \$15.9 billion City budget. Yes, **just fifty-six ten-thousandths of one percent**.

Eliminating or combining both the Public Works Commission or Streets and Sanitation Commission won't result in actual "hard cost" savings for the City, according to the BLA cost analysis report, precisely because neither commission have full-time staff "hard costs."

Appendix 7 in the BLA's analysis shows that the cost of combining the Public Works Commission with another, unnamed Commission would result in a paltry \$87,535 in savings (just 0.0005505% — a ridiculously **insignificant fifty-five hundred-thousandths of one percent** of the City's current budget!

Sophia Kittler opened the Task Force discussion by making a motion to eliminate both the Public Works Commission and the Sanitation and Streets Commission, and to keep CULCOP with updated language according to staff recommendations. Sophie Hayward seconded the motion. Ms. Kittler referenced the Civil Grand Jury report and her experience with complaints about DPW's costs, timelines, and transparency. She stated that residents' priority is project delivery, but the commissions do not reduce costs, expedite projects, or attract significant public participation, while adding at least six weeks to contracting timelines. She noted that the Board of Supervisors can provide oversight and transparency through its committees, and concluded that the two commissions are duplicative, whereas CULCOP serves a functional purpose.

Andrea Bruss opposed retaining CULCOP, arguing that codifying staff working groups in the Administrative Code reduces flexibility and may not improve participation from external stakeholders like PG&E. She stated her preference to eliminate all three bodies. Chair Harrington proposed a vote on the first two bodies (Public Works Commission and Sanitation and Streets Commission), and then a separate vote on CULCOP.

Ms. Hayward supported eliminating the first two bodies, noting staff findings that most capital projects are already reviewed by client department commissions. She acknowledged street projects as an exception and requested annual DPW reporting on them to the Government Audit and Oversight Committee. Chair Harrington agreed, emphasizing the importance of public engagement, and directed staff to work with DPW and return with recommendations for alternative methods of public input. In response to Ms. Kittler's follow-up question on removing CULCOP from the code, Ms. Alonso clarified that it would not change the ability to hold public meetings, though the body is not currently complying with Brown Act requirements, and added that codification mainly gives DPW leverage for discussions with utilities.

Ms. Kittler then stated she would like to revise her motion and separate the vote, and Chair Harrington summarized her revised motion: to eliminate the Public Works Commission and the Sanitation and Streets Commission, and to direct staff to work with the department on maintaining public-facing functions. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

The Task Force considered a motion on CULCOP. Ms. Kittler rescinded her original motion to retain it, and Ms. Bruss moved to eliminate it, seconded by Ms. Kittler. Chair Harrington stated that, in general, staff working groups should not be codified. Members and staff clarified that while removing CULCOP from code would formally eliminate it, the department could and should still convene the group informally. The motion to eliminate CULCOP passed unanimously by voice vote.

## 8. Department of Environment Bodies (Action Item)

Materials: [presentation](#) and [memo](#)

Project Director Rachel Alonso presented the staff recommendations for three bodies: the Commission on the Environment (CoE), Municipal Green Building Task Force (MGBTF), and Urban Forestry Council (UFC). Ms. Alonso summarized the staff recommendations to keep the first two and either combine or eliminate the latter.

Public comments were received from six speakers:

- Lila Holzman expressed support for the Commission on the Environment, noting her professional background in climate change and recent attendance at commission meetings. She described the meetings as a valuable public forum for discussion and emphasized that the Department of the Environment remains relatively small given the scope of its mission.
- Karla Nagy, member of the San Francisco Urban Forestry Council, spoke on behalf of the international Urban and Community Forestry Society and submitted a letter supporting the Council. She highlighted San Francisco's global leadership in urban forestry, the Council's critical role in that success, and its instrumental work in passing Proposition E in 2016.
- Doug Engmann, representing the Yes on E campaign committee, expressed strong support for retaining the Commission on the Environment as a governance body. He highlighted its role in San Francisco's national recognition for environmental leadership and cautioned against diminishing its visibility or authority.
- Igor Lacan, Chair of the Urban Forestry Council, strongly supported retaining the Council, noting its unique advisory and coordination role, expertise of its members, and programs like the Landmark Tree Program that cannot be easily transferred. He argued that dissolving the Council would be a significant setback and submitted written comments.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:  
The \$336,277 in combined soft costs across the Commission on the Environment, Municipal Green Building Task Force, and the Urban Forestry Council bodies rolled into one for this category represents just 0.002115% **twenty-one ten-thousandths** of one percent — of the City's \$15.9 **billion** City budget.

As the bar chart in my Public Correspondence letter titled "BLA Cost Analysis Monette-Shaw" posted on today's agenda shows — which I hope this Task Force has read — the entire \$33.9 **million** the BLA identified in total Commissions and Boards hard- and soft costs represents just 0.213836% —zero, point twenty-one, **OF ONE PERCENT** — of the City's \$15.9 **billion** City budget. Is this Task Force worried about saving 0.21% of the City Budget?

If so, you're on a fool's errand, with your panties tied in a knot, attempting to eliminate just **twenty-one ten-thousandths of one percent** trying to combine these Department of the Environment oversight bodies. Get real!

- Kristina Pappas, a San Francisco resident speaking on behalf of the San Francisco League of Conservation Voters, expressed strong support for maintaining the Commission on the Environment's governance authority. She stated that the Commission would be toothless and ineffective without it, emphasizing its critical role in coordinating environmental priorities like sustainable transportation and environmental justice and ensuring they are not overlooked.

Natasha Mihal asked about rules for passive meeting bodies, and Chief Assistant City Attorney Jon Givner explained they are not fully subject to the Brown Act but must post meeting notices and allow public attendance. Chair Harrington then asked about the Urban Forestry Council's relationship to other agencies; Ms. Alonso stated there is little active coordination, while Urban Forestry Council chair Igor Lacan emphasized the Council provides recommendations and a forum for interdepartmental coordination.

The Task Force deliberated on the Commission on the Environment. Sophia Kittler highlighted the Mayor's Office interest in strengthening the Department of the Environment's policy-making role given the climate emergency and questioned the Commission's current governance role. Senior Performance Analyst Joanna Bell noted the Commission has formal oversight powers, though their use in practice is unclear. Chair Harrington and Ms. Kittler emphasized that commissions should be evaluated for their potential as policy forums, with Ms. Kittler suggesting that converting the Commission to an advisory body could free it to focus more on broad environmental issues.

The Task Force then discussed the policymaking role of environmental bodies. Ms. Kittler questioned whether the Municipal Green Building Task Force's waiver function could transfer to the Commission on the Environment, but Ms. Alonso clarified it is a technical body advising the Director, and not a policymaking entity. Ms. Mihal noted that governance bodies typically oversee specific departments, while environmental issues are citywide, and suggested that converting the CoE to an advisory body could strengthen its policy role. She also observed that the Urban Forestry Council has fulfilled its original purpose and should be celebrated as a success. Sophie Hayward agreed, citing progress in tree management, and underscored the value of advisory bodies in shaping policy, pointing to the Commission on the Environment as a candidate for an expanded advisory scope. Andrea Bruss noted that the Commission is a governance body because it is in the Charter and appoints the Department head, but aligning it to the governance template would reduce its authority and membership. She suggested that converting it to advisory could expand participation and policy engagement, and argued that the MGBTF's functions could be handled internally. Ms. Alonso confirmed that the CoE advises on policy and makes resolutions to the Board of Supervisors. Chair Harrington emphasized the symbolic importance of keeping the Commission in the Charter, while Ms. Kittler favored minimizing Charter provisions and stressed that policymaking should remain with the department. Ms. Bruss concluded that environmental policy is already governed by the Environment Code and legislative process.

Ms. Kittler made a motion to:

1. Retain the Commission on the Environment but make it an advisory body;
2. Eliminate the Urban Forestry Council, with the understanding that its work could be absorbed by the Commission; and
3. Eliminate the Municipal Green Building Task Force, with the understanding that its functions can and should be carried out by staff.

The motion was divided into two parts.

Ms. Bruss emphasized that San Francisco's environmental values can be upheld without placing commissions in the Charter and suggested instead adding a statement affirming the City's commitment to environmental leadership. Chair Harrington noted that supporters of the Commission on the Environment were active in the Proposition E campaign and viewed its inclusion in the Charter as symbolic. He cautioned that removing CoE from the Charter could signal a reduced City commitment to environmental priorities, which he did not want to convey.

The first vote—on eliminating the Urban Forestry Council and the Municipal Green Building Task Force—passed unanimously by voice vote. The second vote—on retaining the Commission on the Environment as an advisory body—passed 4–1 by voice vote, with Chair Harrington opposed.

## 9. Municipal Transportation Agency Bodies (Action Item)

Materials: [presentation](#) and [memo](#)

Project Director Rachel Alonso presented the staff recommendations for five bodies: the MTA Board of Directors (MTAB), MTA Citizens' Advisory Council (CAC), Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC), Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation (ISCOTT), and Mission Bay Transportation Improvement Fund Advisory Committee (MB TIF-AC).

Public comments were received from seven speakers:

- Sarah Bertram, Vice Chair of the MB TIF-AC, supported retaining the committee, noting that it represents a promise made during the neighborhood's redevelopment. She emphasized the importance of balancing growth with livability and asserted that now is not the time to eliminate the body.
- Alice Rogers, President of the South Beach-Rincon-Mission Bay Neighborhood Association, supported keeping the MB TIF-AC, stressing its role as a long-term mechanism for managing development impacts and quality of life. She recommended shifting oversight to the Controller's Office and instituting a five-year review with performance metrics.
- Aaron Leifer, Chair of the SFMTA CAC, opposed a sunset provision and emphasized the CAC's role in ensuring public engagement on public-facing transit service. He noted that its work aligns with the MTAB calendar, provides valuable input, and strengthens MTAB's decision-making.
- Doug Engmann, representing the Yes on E campaign committee, also supported retaining the MTA CACs, arguing that it addresses issues affecting all San Franciscans and provides valuable public input that MTAB relies on.
- Bruce Agid, Chair of the MB TIF-AC, urged keeping the committee, highlighting its role in ensuring development supports quality of life and fulfills commitments tied to the development of the Chase Center. He expressed concern that staff's recommendation focused solely on transportation, while 30–40% of the fund is appropriated to other departments, including the Police Department and Public Works.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:  
The staff memo asserts the SFMTA Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC) "slows down MTA actions" and "overlaps" with the MTA's Board of Director functions and meetings. Former SFMTA CAC members have disputed this claim as incorrect. The staff assessment claims the CAC costs \$178,000 annually, so the Task Force should consider **combining** the CAC with the larger MTA Board — **or worse, assigning the SFMTA's CAC's function to SFMTA staff** — or eliminating the CAC entirely. CAC members have disputed this assertion, too.

If the Task Force recommends combining the CAC with the STMTA Board, or SFMTA staff, the 11 CAC members appointed by each of the Board of Supervisors would disappear, leaving MTA oversight to only Mayoral appointees.

**This Task Force should leave the SFMTA's Citizens' Advisory Committee just as it is, and take no action today. You certainly should not transfer this CAC's functions to SFMTA staff!**

- Kathy Setian advocated for retaining the MTA CAC as an independent body, emphasizing its unique role in ensuring community input on service changes. She cited the CAC's role in preserving the J Church line and warned that eliminating it could jeopardize public trust, especially ahead of any future funding measures requiring voter approval.

Chair Harrington acknowledged the complexity of the MTA's governance and cautioned against changes that could complicate a 2026 revenue measure. While he generally supports removing advisory bodies from the Charter, he was willing to make an exception in this case. Sophia Kittler reiterated her perspective that fewer items should be in the Charter and that CACs duplicate commission functions but acknowledged that she would not push to eliminate the MTA CAC in this instance.

On the MB TIF-AC, Chair Harrington noted the Administrative Code already sunsets the committee when the fund expires. Ms. Kittler confirmed the fund currently has no money, and Chief Assistant City Attorney Jon Givner clarified that the Board of Supervisors would need to remove the body by ordinance. Ms. Kittler observed that public commenters wanted a venue to discuss transportation impacts in Mission Bay and asked about other CACs in the area. Ms. Alonso responded that none are codified, though Andrea Bruss pointed to a Mission Bay CAC exists under the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII). Ms. Alonso also explained the makeup of the MB TIF-AC with varied appointment requirements. Ms. Bruss questioned the need for the committee given the absence of funds, and Natasha Mihal agreed it should sunset consistent with its original legislation. Ms. Bruss added support for retaining ISCOTT while urging consistency in applying governance templates to MTAB.

In deliberations on other bodies. Ms. Mihal stressed consistency in applying criteria, supporting the MTA CAC but questioning why it should be treated as more important than the Commission on the Environment. Sophie Hayward praised ISCOTT and agreed the MB TIF-AC should sunset like the fund, while supporting moving the MTA CAC to the Administrative Code. On the Bicycle Advisory Committee, Ms. Kittler opposed retaining it, and Ms. Bruss agreed, noting it had fulfilled its purpose.

The Task Force then took the following actions:

1. Mission Bay Transportation Improvement Fund Advisory Committee (MB TIF-AC): Motion to eliminate made by Ms. Kittler, seconded by Ms. Mihal. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.
2. Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation (ISCOTT): Motion to retain in its current capacity made by Ms. Bruss, seconded by Ms. Kittler. Ms. Kittler added that any reference to ISCOTT in the Charter should be removed. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.
3. Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC): Motion to eliminate made by Ms. Kittler, seconded by Ms. Mihal. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.
4. Municipal Transportation Agency Citizens' Advisory Council (MTA CAC): Ms. Bruss moved to retain the CAC, move it to the Administrative Code, and require a Mayoral appointee to be a resident of Mission Bay or other neighborhoods impacted by Commission Streamlining Task Force decisions. The motion died for lack of a second. Some Task Force members expressed discomfort with prioritizing certain neighborhoods over others. Chair Harrington then moved to retain the CAC and keep it in the Charter, but that motion also died for lack of a second. Ms. Bruss then moved to retain the CAC, move it to the Administrative Code, and leave its composition unchanged for now, with the understanding that appointment qualifications may be revisited later. Ms. Hayward seconded. Ms. Alonso confirmed that the motion included all recommended changes to align the body with the advisory committee template. The motion passed 4–1 by voice vote, with Chair Harrington opposed.

5. Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors (MTAB): Ms. Bruss moved to retain the Board and align it to the governance template while keeping it in the Charter. Ms. Kittler seconded. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Givner clarified that the Director of Transportation is currently appointed by the MTA Board under an individual contract, as stipulated in the Charter. If the Task Force's recommendations are adopted, the authority would default to the Mayor.

## 10. Public Utilities Commission Bodies (Action Item)

Materials: [presentation](#) and [memo](#)

Project Director Rachel Alonso presented staff recommendations for four bodies: the Public Utilities Commission (PUC), Public Utilities Citizens' Advisory Committee (PU CAC), Rate Fairness Board (RFB), and Southeast Community Facility Commission (SECFC).

Public comments were received from three speakers:

- Erin Roach, a new CAC member, supported streamlining commissions but emphasized retaining CACs, noting their value in providing community insight that complements the limited capacity of the five-member PUC. She praised the expertise of CAC members and argued that while consolidation may be tempting, CACs are important and relatively inexpensive.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:  
Currently, the Public Utilities Commission's (SFPUC) Citizens' Advisory Committee's (CAC) members are appointed by the Board of Supervisors, including one from each Supervisorial District.

The BLA's financial analysis documented the SFPUC CAC only receives part-time employee "*soft costs*" of just \$58,307, that likely won't disappear, as the BLA report noted, if SFPUC's CAC is combined with the larger Public Utilities Commission.

That \$58,307 is a paltry 0.0003667% of the City's \$15.9 billion City budget — yes, just thirty-six hundred-thousandths of one percent. This Streamlining Task Forces seems to be on a penny wise, pound foolish fools errand!

I will be advocating with the Board of Supervisors that they should reject any recommendation the Streamlining Task Force may recommend to the Board of Supervisors to eliminate or combine the SFPUC CAC, if that's what this Task Force decides to recommend.

Leave the SFPUC's CAC as it is, and take no action today!

- Howard Ash, Vice Chair of the Rate Fairness Board, offered comments on the staff report, noting a typographical issue in which the word "fulfill" was spelled with one "l," which he identified as British English instead of American English. He also referenced footnote 91 in the staff report and expressed concern about the staff's characterization of the Board's purview as narrow and overlapping with other bodies, stating that its scope is not narrow.

Chair Harrington opened discussion by noting that the SECFC, though technically governance, functions more like an advisory body and provides community oversight similar to the MB TIF-AC. He described the RFB as a valuable check on PUC rate-setting that has never been overridden by the Board of

Supervisors, and asserted that these groups add value. Sophie Hayward described the SECFC as an anomaly that should not be forced into a governance or advisory role. On the RFB, she opposed a sunset date, noting that rate-setting is an ongoing function. Sophia Kittler likewise opposed a sunset date, calling the RFB a unique and important venue for reviewing whether rates are fair, particularly since the PUC both sets and spends its own revenue. On the CAC, Chair Harrington supported moving it from the Charter to the Administrative Code with a sunset date, while Ms. Kittler favored elimination or at minimum aligning it to the advisory template. Ms. Kittler expressed discomfort with the SECFC's authority to hire and fire its Executive Director but agreed that it does not fit neatly into any template. She supported retaining it as an advisory body with term limits. Andrea Bruss likewise supported classifying the SECFC as advisory without a sunset, given the facility's continued existence, and agreed its authority over the Executive Director was unnecessary. She supported removing the RFB from the Charter and retaining it without a sunset, keeping the PUC in the Charter under the governance template, and expressed openness to eliminating or moving the CAC to the Administrative Code for flexibility.

The Task Force then took the following actions:

1. Public Utilities Commission (PUC): Motion made by Ms. Kittler to retain the PUC, align it to the governance template, and keep it in the Charter, seconded by Ms. Bruss. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.
2. Rate Fairness Board (RFB): Motion made by Ms. Hayward to retain the RFB, move it to the Administrative Code, add three-year term lengths and term limits for public members, and not include a sunset date. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.
3. Southeast Community Facility Commission (SECFC): Motion made by Ms. Hayward to retain the SECFC without applying a template, keep it in the Administrative Code, retain budget authority as-is, reduce term lengths to three years, add four-term limits, and retain its hiring and firing authority; seconded by Chair Harrington. Natasha Mihal added the provision that the body continue until the facility ceases to exist, rather than applying a sunset date. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.
4. Public Utilities Citizens' Advisory Committee (PUC CAC): Motion made by Chair Harrington to retain the CAC as an advisory body and accept all the staff recommendations, seconded by Ms. Mihal. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

## **11. Recreation and Parks Bodies (Action Item)**

*Materials: [presentation](#) and [memo](#)*

Project Director Rachel Alonso presented staff recommendations for three bodies: the Recreation and Park Commission (RPC), Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Advisory Committee (PROSAC), and Joint Zoo Committee (JZC).

Sophia Kittler asked why the JZC was before the Task Force if it was not codified and what authority the Task Force had to recommend changes. Ms. Alonso deferred to Chief Assistant City Attorney Jon Givner, who explained that the JZC was created by the Recreation and Park Commission and is therefore subject to the Task Force's jurisdiction. He added that any changes to the committee's structure would need to align with the terms of the management agreement. Chair Harrington asked whether the purpose of codifying the JZC was to put all bodies in one place. Mr. Givner confirmed that the Task Force had previously directed staff to prepare an ordinance to that effect for transparency reasons.

Public comments were received by four speakers:

- Lila Holzman expressed concern about the inclusion of three-year sunset clauses in staff recommendations, questioning their necessity and describing them as arbitrary.

- Doug Engmann disputed inaccuracies in the staff report on PROSAC, explaining its district-based representation and role in connecting residents to park issues. He opposed eliminating PROSAC, though he did not object to removing it from the Charter.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:  
Don't eliminate or combine PROSAC, or allow Parks Department staff to absorb PROSAC's functions.

The BLA report acknowledges PROSAC costs just \$25,110 annually in “*soft costs*” of part-time Parks staff who will still keep their jobs performing other duties. That won't save the City one red cent. That \$25,110 is laughably small, 0.000157925% — just **sixteen hundred-thousandths of one percent** — of the \$15.9 billion City Budget. That's chump change in the scheme of things. It's sheer nonsense **AND** plainly completely bonkers to eliminate PROSAC.

City Administrator staff asserted that because San Franciscans interact with the Parks Department through their local gardener, recreation center staff, or maintenance worker, it would be OK to eliminate or combine PROSAC with the larger Parks Commission.

My former *Westside Observer* columnist, Nancy Wuerfel, who worked so hard advocating for PROSAC, must be rolling over in her grave in a fit of laughter in the great beyond!

- Richard Rothman, District 1 PROSAC member, supported retaining the committee, noting its effectiveness in resolving resident, providing feedback on projects, and doing so with minimal resources.

Chair Harrington responded to Ms. Holzman's public comment about sunset clauses, explaining that many advisory bodies lack clear reevaluation processes and should be able to justify their continued existence. Reflecting on PROSAC, he remarked that it was the first advisory committee he encountered in San Francisco because of the challenges it generated, but noted a colleague's view that eliminating it would not remove the underlying problems, only the City's ability to hear from residents in an organized fashion. He supported removing PROSAC from the Charter but retaining it as an advisory group with a three-year sunset to allow for future evaluation.

On the Joint Zoo Committee, Andrea Bruss advised against changes while the body remains subject to a negotiated agreement between the City and a nonprofit partner. Sophia Kittler moved to retain it in its current form without codification. The motion, seconded by Sophie Hayward, passed unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Kittler moved to align the Recreation and Park Commission (RPC) with the governance commission template and retain it in the Charter. Chair Harrington seconded. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Chair Harrington moved to remove PROSAC from the Charter, placed it in the Administrative Code, and apply all six recommendations in the staff report. Natasha Mihal seconded the motion. Ms. Bruss reiterated her general view that governance commissions do not need separate advisory bodies but stated she was open to reconsidering in this case. Ms. Hayward supported the motion, noting that moving PROSAC to the Administrative Code with a sunset date would allow for a structured off-ramp.

Ms. Kittler offered a competing motion to eliminate PROSAC, arguing that advisory bodies placed in the Administrative Code with sunset dates often continue indefinitely and that the Task Force should make difficult decisions now.

Chair Harrington asked whether most advisory bodies include sunset dates, and Mr. Givner confirmed that nearly all created or updated in the past 12 years have them. Ms. Hayward acknowledged the difficulty of eliminating advisory bodies but said she valued sunset clauses as a way to prompt reevaluation. She emphasized the importance of keeping stakeholders engaged as the Task Force prepares a Charter amendment. Chair Harrington clarified that the Task Force's proposed sunset dates differ from traditional ones in that the body would expire unless renewed, whereas traditional provisions allow continuation unless explicitly eliminated. Ms. Kittler rescinded her competing motion.

Ms. Bruss asked whether Chair Harrington's motion on PROSAC included changes to term lengths and limits. Ms. Kittler moved to amend the motion to set three-year terms and a four-term limit. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote, as amended.

Mr. Givner clarified that while the motion included a recommendation to eliminate the Board of Supervisors confirmation process for PROSAC appointments, the Charter requires that the full Board—not individual Supervisors—make appointments. He stated that staff would interpret this vote and other applicable votes accordingly.

## **12. Future Agenda Topics (Discussion Item)**

Chair Harrington noted that, following the resignation of the Task Force's Vice Chair, the next meeting agenda would need to include an item for the election of a new officer.

Project Director Rachel Alonso added that the Task Force would also need to amend its bylaws to reflect a change in meeting location. She explained that while the Task Force would remain in City Hall, it would likely move from Room 408 to Room 263 beginning in mid-October. She recommended generalizing the bylaws to state that meetings occur in City Hall, without specifying a room number. Ms. Alonso confirmed that the next meeting would still take place in Room 408.

## **13. General Public Comment**

Two members of the public provided comment during the general public comment period:

- Anna, a San Francisco resident and open government advocate, opposed the self-appointment structure of the Fine Arts Museums (FAM) Board of Trustees, calling it uniquely and inherently unaccountable. She criticized the lack of oversight and transparency, alleging that the museums have operated without a formal agreement for over 30 years while COFAM has collected over \$200 million in non-general admission public revenues.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:  
I object to Sophia Kittler being appointed to replace Jean Fraser as the Mayor's appointee to Seat 5 to this Streamlining Task Force. Ms. Kittler doesn't meet the seat qualification requirements in §4.100.1.(b) cited in the **legal text** of "*Prop. E*" that voters passed last November, just as Jean Fraser had not met the member qualification requirements.

Ms. Kitler appears to have no previous experience, or expertise, in open and accountable government, or open government advocacy work, and has only been a long-time employee of the Mayor's Office.

It's very troubling Ms. Kitler was appointed to stack this Streamlining Task Force with current employees of the Mayor, to sway Task Force deliberations to award more power to a "*strong mayor*" form of governance.

This may be what backers of the defeated "*Prop. D*" wanted, but it's antithetical to the express wishes of San Francisco voters who passed "*Prop. E*," instead.

Following these comments, Project Director Rachel Alonso noted that public comment had not been taken on Item 12 (Future Agenda Topics) and invited any remaining speakers to comment on that item. On person provided public comment:

- Anna reiterated her concerns about the FAM Board of Trustees, noting the Director is the City's highest-paid employee with most of his \$1 million salary funded by COFAM but \$250,000 paid by the City. She added that other senior staff also receive high compensation from the private entity. She alleged misconduct, including ethics disclosure violations and reliance on an unexecuted lease in a bond application, and argued that a public City department should not be so heavily influenced by a private entity, adding that her public records requests remain unanswered.

#### **14. Adjournment**

Chair Harrington adjourned the meeting at 4:33 p.m.

---

Minutes prepared by Chelsea Hall, Senior Project Analyst.