



# Approved Minutes

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

**Daniel Lurie**  
**Mayor**

**Wednesday, October 15, 2025**  
**1:00 pm**

City Hall, Room 263  
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/ycka94ke> 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) 2661 826 8158 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

Ed Harrington, Chair	seat 4 - Board of Supervisors designee (public sector labor representative)
Andrea Bruss, Vice Chair	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)

Hannah Kohanzadeh, the clerk, called roll. With all five members present, a quorum was established.

#### 3. Announcements (Informational Item)

Chair Harrington and Hannah Kohanzadeh, the clerk, made several logistical announcements at the start of the meeting. Ms. Kohanzadeh informed attendees that an overflow viewing area was available in the North Light Court. Chair Harrington added that printed copies of the agenda and meeting materials were limited, but QR codes were posted inside and outside the room to access materials online.

#### 4. Approve Minutes – October 1, 2025 meeting (Action Item)

Chair Harrington reminded the Task Force that they would be voting on the revised version of the October 1, 2025 meeting minutes.

Public comment was received from one speaker:

- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:  
I've repeatedly complained that the Task Force's motions are often unclear about what you are actually voting on. So it's somewhat shocking the Task Force's draft October 1 meeting minutes indicated four problems with the motions made during that meeting. This Task Force must begin following *Robert's Rules of Order* more closely when it comes to making motions before voting on them, because those four problems **weren't** isolated examples.

Under Robert's Rules of Order, a motion to adopt a recommendation **without stating its contents** is generally improper, and can create procedural confusion. Chair Harrington, another Task Force member, or Support Staff should clearly restate the actual motion made before voting begins, and not simply make a motion that merely states "*to accept the staff's recommendation.*"

Also, motions must clearly state which functions of a body being eliminated, or combined. are being transferred to another body, or to departmental City staff.

Chair Harrington acknowledged the importance of clear motions and asked Chief Assistant City Attorney Jon Givner whether there were any legal issues with the revised minutes. Mr. Givner confirmed there were none.

Natasha Mihal moved to approve the revised minutes. Vice Chair Bruss seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### 5. Children and Youth Bodies (Action Item)

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

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 fourth of five meetings focused on reviewing public bodies by policy area.

After clarifying the agenda order, she then presented the staff recommendations for eight bodies in the Children and Youth policy area:

- Child Care Planning and Advisory Council (CPAC)
- Children and Families First Commission (CFFC)
- Early Childhood Community Oversight and Advisory Committee (EC COAC)
- Children, Youth and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee (DCYF OAC)
- Our Children, Our Families Council (OCOF)
- Service Provider Working Group (SPWG)
- Free City College Oversight Committee
- Youth Commission

Ms. Alonso explained that the landscape of children and youth bodies in San Francisco is shaped by a mix of state mandates and local initiatives, which limits the Task Force's ability to redesign the system. She provided an overview of the two departments involved—Department of Early Childhood (DEC) and Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families (DCYF)—and outlined the bodies under review, identifying which are required by state law (CPAC and CFFC) or voter-approved (OCOF and SPWG). She highlighted that DEC was created after the CFFC and EC COAC, which had previously been administered by a different agency. She also pointed out that the main body for DCYF is the OAC, which was created in 2000 and given more decision-making authority by voters in 2015.

Ms. Alonso noted that while some bodies could be aligned with governance or advisory templates, others—particularly those created by state law like CPAC and CFFC—require many exceptions. For the children's committees that staff recommend keeping, she presented two options: combining the EC COAC and DCYF OAC while limiting the scope of the CFFC, or expanding the CFFC scope to include the EC COAC. She also clarified that the Task Force cannot merge departments but may include commentary to that effect in its final report. To conclude her presentation, she overviewed the staff recommendations for the Free City College Oversight Committee and the Youth Commission. Refer to the detailed staff recommendation for each body in the [Public Health and Wellbeing Bodies Memo](#).

Once the floor opened for the Task Force's initial comments and questions, Sophia Kittler asked why the Youth Commission is under the Board of Supervisors rather than another department. BART Director Bevan Dufty, who also serves on the City's Homeless Oversight Commission and was a member of SF's Board of Supervisors, answered that former Board of Supervisors President Angela Alioto, who championed the Youth Commission, was more comfortable keeping the body with the Board rather than the Mayor's Office at the time.

Public comment was received from 40 speakers:

- Doug Engmann, former Planning Commissioner, commented generally on the Task Force's public comment process, stating that the number and complexity of commissions under review made it difficult for the public to provide meaningful input in the time allotted.
- Gabbie Listana, District 6 Youth Commissioner and Chair, opposed moving the Youth Commission out of the Charter, reducing its seats, or adding a sunset date. She thanked the Task Force for recommending removal of the prohibition on stipends.
- Téa Lonné Amir, Vice Chair of the Youth Commission, opposed term limits and a sunset date, citing the natural turnover of commissioners. She thanked the Task Force for recommending removal of the prohibition on stipends.
- Josie Dominguez-Chand, San Francisco resident and advocate for youth, supported the Youth Commission and called for more staff and funding, which will increase overall accountability at City Hall.
- Joshua Rudy Ochoa, Community Partnership Specialist for the Youth Commission, urged the Task Force to retain the Commission in the Charter; reject term limits, seat reductions, and sunset provisions; and remove the stipend prohibition.
- Nadi Balboa, former Youth Commissioner, emphasized the importance of youth representation and credited the Youth Commission with shaping City policies as well as her own civic engagement and life trajectory. She also clarified that the Youth Commission is under the Board of Supervisors because it directly advises the Board.

- Joy Zhan, Youth Commission staff, supported retaining all 17 Youth Commission seats and opposed moving the body to the Administrative Code or adding a sunset date.
- Alondra Esquivel Garcia, Director of the Youth Commission, opposed reducing seats, adding a sunset, moving to the Administrative Code, or imposing term limits. She supported removing the stipend prohibition.
- Dr. Edward De Asis, Deputy Director of Finance and Administration with the Clerk of the Board and speaking on behalf of the Clerk of the Board, supported keeping the Youth Commission unchanged.
- Madison, member of the SPWG, opposed eliminating or converting the group to a passive meeting body and emphasized its importance in identifying systemic issues. She also opposed combining DCYF OAC with the EC COAC.
- Ryan Hazelton, member of CPAC, DCYF OAC, and SPWG, supported keeping CPAC and somehow retaining the functions of SPWG. He recommended merging EC COAC with CFFC rather than DCYF OAC due to their oversight of aligned funding streams.
- Quinn Chung, member of Parent Voices, supported combining EC COAC with CFFC, not DCYF OAC.
- Hailey Lopez, SPWG volunteer, supported keeping the SPWG and DCYF OAC and noted the latter's essential role when fully appointed.
- Sally Jenkins-Stevens, Executive Director of the SF Beacon Initiative, spoke in support of the SPWG and OAC, emphasizing their distinct roles and opposing consolidation.
- The co-president of SF Democrats supported removing the stipend prohibition and opposed seat reductions and a sunset date for the Youth Commission.
- Eddie Kaufman, Mission Graduates CEO and SPWG member, supported keeping the group and making it Brown Act compliant. He also supported retaining DCYF OAC as a separate governance body.
- Anya Worley-Ziegmann with the People's Budget Coalition supported keeping the SPWG and maintaining separate oversight bodies and opposed a sunset date for the Youth Commission.
- Natalie Gee, Chief of Staff for Supervisor Walton and former Youth Commissioner, opposed changes to the Youth Commission.
- A City College of San Francisco (CCSF) instructor supported retaining the Free City College Oversight Committee, citing its role in transparency and access.
- Win, CCSF student and Free City College Oversight Committee member, supported retaining the committee and emphasized its role in student advocacy.
- Eddie Escoto, CCSF biology student, supported retaining the Free City College Oversight Committee, underscoring its importance for student access and affordability.
- Alisa Messer, CCSF English instructor and Free City College Oversight Committee member, supported retaining the body, noting its diverse membership and collaborative structure.
- Anita Martinez, President of the CCSF Board of Trustees, supported retaining the Free City College Oversight Committee, citing its value for student engagement.
- Chanel Marie Green, District 7 Youth Commission member and CCSF student, supported retaining the Free City College Oversight Committee and Youth Commission and opposed term limits or removal from the Charter.
- Margaret Brodtkin, co-convener of the Children's Fund planning process, supported keeping DCYF OAC in the Charter and opposed combining it with EC COAC. She also supported elevating EC COAC to a governance body and retaining SPWG.

- Girlie Vadet, former Youth Commissioner, supported retaining the Youth Commission and emphasized its role in civic education and leadership development.
- Rocio Molina with the SF Human Services Network supported combining EC COAC where it will be most effective and preserving SPWG.
- Maria Jandres supported combining EC COAC with CFFC and opposed combining it with DCYF OAC.
- Alex Maykowski with the SF Early Care and Education Advocacy Coalition, supported combining EC COAC with CFFC and opposed combining it with DCYF OAC.
- Maria Luz Torre, Parent Voices organizer, opposed reducing the number of commissions and supported elevating EC COAC to a governance body.
- A Chinatown-based advocate opposed combining EC COAC with DCYF OAC.

During public comment, Chair Harrington asked Chief Assistant City Attorney Jon Givner to define passive meeting bodies. Mr. Givner explained that passive meeting bodies have not been formally established and thus are not subject to the Brown Act. However, they must still provide public notice of meetings and allow public observation. He also clarified that, by contrast, policy bodies established in the Charter or Code must follow stricter public meeting rules, including members of the public only being able to speak during designated public comment periods.

In addition, Chair Harrington confirmed with Margaret Brodtkin that her initial comments referred to the DCYF OAC and noted her recommendation to elevate the EC COAC to a governance body.

Next, Chair Harrington opened the Task Force discussion by inviting general comments on the options for grouping the bodies. Ms. Kittler stated her general preference for having as few bodies in the Charter as possible and noted that the number of bodies in this policy area made it difficult to discern a clear structure. She confirmed with staff that the CFFC must exist and that the CPAC fulfills legal requirements, but the body itself is not required.

The Task Force then discussed specific bodies, at times jumping between bodies. Below is a summary of its discussion and decisions organized by body.

#### Child Care Planning and Advisory Council (CPAC)

Chair Harrington clarified the appointment structure of CPAC with staff and noted that reducing the number of seats would require changes to how appointments are made by the Board of Supervisors and Board of Education. Vice Chair Bruss and Sophie Hayward agreed that CPAC should be retained as-is and that aligning it to the advisory committee template was unnecessary. Ms. Hayward also noted that the Task Force should not apply a sunset date since the body is required by law.

Ms. Hayward moved to keep CPAC, retain the number of seats, not add a sunset date, and remove outdated code references to DCYF. Vice Chair Bruss seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### Our Children, Our Families Council (OCOF)

Chair Harrington noted that OCOF had not met since 2019 or 2020 and that its functions could be carried out by City staff or through a passive meeting body. Ms. Kittler moved to eliminate the OCOF. Vice

Chair Bruss seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Before the vote, Mr. Givner noted that in order to effectuate the deletion of OCOF, any Charter references to the Council would need to be replaced with references to the DCYF “initiative” (a group of City staff) in the Charter amendment.

#### Service Provider Working Group (SPWG)

Chair Harrington emphasized the importance of SPWG as a model for community engagement and proposed that the City Administrator convene a process to determine how best to support provider groups across departments. Ms. Hayward and Vice Chair Bruss agreed that SPWG should not be codified and that it should continue its valuable work as a passive meeting body. Vice Chair Bruss also raised the significant challenges that would be involved in making the 295-member body compliant with the Brown Act if kept in the Charter. Natasha Mihal highlighted that converting a body to a passive meeting body or advisory body does not limit what government can do and suggested including language in the Administrative Code encouraging departments to consult with service providers. Task Force members requested that staff ensure decisions regarding service provider working groups are consistent at the end of the commission streamlining process.

Ms. Kittler motioned to eliminate the SPWG from code to allow it to be reconvened as a passive meeting body, with the understanding that staff would return with proposed language encouraging departments to consult with service providers and that the City Administrator would explore how to engage provider groups in lieu of a public meeting body. Ms. Hayward seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### Children and Families First Commission (CFFC) and Early Childhood Community Oversight and Advisory Committee (EC COAC)

The Task Force discussed whether to combine the CFFC and EC COAC. Vice Chair Bruss noted that CFFC has a state-mandated role in overseeing Prop 10 funds but also performs broader functions in practice. She expressed concern about maintaining two bodies with overlapping responsibilities. Ms. Mihal asked how these structures look in other counties. DEC Director Mezquita explained that San Francisco’s dual-department structure is unique due to the jurisdiction being both a city and county, and that CFFC’s composition and functions are shaped by state law.

Given legal constraints around membership and staffing, Ms. Kittler raised the central question of how the two bodies could be usefully combined when the CFFC focuses on a narrow slice of funding. Ms. Alonso reviewed the combination options: expanding the CFFC and combining it with the EC COAC (which would potentially have City staff and BOS members inappropriately overseeing a department) or reducing the CFFC to only its required functions and retaining the EC COAC as the main DEC body (which would keep three bodies for one department).

Chair Harrington asked whether CFFC could be a subcommittee of EC COAC. Mr. Givner confirmed that overlapping membership was possible but noted that it would effectively result in two bodies. Ms. Kittler initially moved to move the CFFC to the Administrative Code and eliminate the EC COAC but the motion died for lack of a second.

The Task Force then discussed the respective functions, roles, and requirements of the CFFC and EC COAC. DEC Director Mezquita clarified for Task Force members that the CFFC performs expanded functions beyond state requirements; although it does not approve the department's budget, it ensures that sound research and policy inform the budget.

Vice Chair Bruss then moved to keep the CFFC, remove all references to it in the Charter, maintain its current functions (including expenditure authority over Prop 10 funds and advisory authority over the department's broader budget), and remove its role in department head selection. The motion also included eliminating the EC COAC. Ms. Kittler seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### Children, Youth and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee (DCYF OAC)

Chair Harrington noted that DCYF OAC functions as a governance body and was intentionally placed in the Charter by voters.

Ms. Kittler and Ms. Hayward expressed a preference for retaining the body's governance status but moving it to the Administrative Code to allow for future flexibility. Mr. Givner noted that, due to Charter references that tie the body to the spending of baseline funds, moving it out of the Charter would entail more extensive edits than for other bodies. Ms. Mihal asked what would be required to change the body if it were moved to the Administrative Code, and Mr. Givner explained that the Board of Supervisors could amend it by ordinance through a majority vote or the Mayor could amend it through departmental reorganization, subject to Board veto procedures. He also confirmed that the Task Force's Charter amendment could raise the threshold to a supermajority vote for the Board of Supervisors to change the body. After the Task Force reviewed the OAC's functions, Chair Harrington argued that it should remain a permanent governance body named in the Charter but that its duties could be moved to the Administrative Code.

With some Task Force deliberation informing the ultimate motion, Ms. Kittler moved to move the DCYF OAC from the Charter to the Administrative Code and align it with the governance commission template, with exceptions for retaining the current number of seats, split appointments, and existing term lengths and limits. Seat qualifications were made desirable at the body-level. Appointment confirmations, for-cause removal, and hiring and firing authority were removed. Ms. Hayward seconded the motion.

Chair Harrington asked to divide the question. The motion to move the DCYF OAC to the Administrative Code passed 4–1, with Chair Harrington opposed. The remaining changes passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### Free City College Oversight Committee

Ms. Hayward confirmed with staff that the Free City College Oversight Committee is not legally required. Ms. Kittler moved to retain the body and align it with the advisory committee template. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### Youth Commission

Ms. Kittler reiterated her preference for moving most bodies out of the Charter and expressed support for moving the Youth Commission to the Administrative Code while retaining its current size and structure. She confirmed with staff that new members must be 12-23 years old and that the body currently has one-

year terms with no term limits. Ms. Kittler proposed imposing a three-term limit. Ms. Mihal and Ms. Hayward both supported the proposal, and Ms. Hayward emphasized the importance of maintaining access for new youth participants.

Ms. Kittler moved to move the Youth Commission from the Charter to the Administrative Code, retain 17 seats, impose a three-term limit (with one-year terms), retain the status quo of no sunset date, and remove the prohibition on stipends. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion.

Chair Harrington asked to divide the question. The motion to move the Youth Commission to the Administrative Code passed 4–1, with Chair Harrington opposed. The remaining changes passed unanimously by voice vote.

## **6. Human Services Agency Bodies (Action Item)**

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

After a brief recess, Project Director Rachel Alonso presented the staff recommendations for the eight bodies within the Human Services Agency:

- Human Services Commission (HSC)
- Disability and Aging Services Commission (DASC)
- Advisory Council to the Disability and Aging Services Commission (DASC Advisory Council)
- Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee (Dignity Fund OAC)
- Dignity Fund Service Providers Working Group (Dignity Fund SPWG)
- In-Home Supportive Services Public Authority Governing Board (IHSS Governing Board)
- Long-Term Care Coordinating Council (LTCCC)
- Veterans' Affairs Commission (VAC)

Ms. Alonso explained that the Human Services Agency (HSA) is the City's prototypical agency model, with two departments or divisions—Benefits and Family Support (BFS) and Disability and Aging Services (DAS)—each overseen by its own commission. She noted that the HSC was established 90 years ago and functions more as an advisory body in practice, despite its formal budget and contract approval authorities. The DASC, by contrast, fulfills state requirements to serve as the oversight body for the City's Area Agency on Aging (AAA).

Ms. Alonso also explained that the AAA must also have an advisory council, which is currently the Advisory Council to the DASC. She then reviewed the Dignity Fund OAC and SPWG, both of which were created in 2017 alongside the voter-approved Dignity Fund. She noted that the Dignity Fund OAC could potentially be merged with the DASC Advisory Council, and that the Dignity Fund SPWG is not compliant with the Brown Act and may be better suited to function as a department-led or community-led group outside of the Charter. She also noted that the LTCCC had voted to disband, the IHSS Governing Board fulfills a state requirement and is considered an outlier, and finally that the VAC should be retained and aligned with the advisory committee template. For more information, refer to the detailed staff recommendation for each body in the [Public Health and Wellbeing Bodies Memo](#).

Public comment was received from 9 speakers:

- Dr. Allen Cooper, President of the DAS Advisory Council and member of the Dignity Fund OAC, emphasized the diversity and expertise of the DAS Advisory Council and opposed merging

the two bodies. He noted that while some meetings had been canceled, most had occurred, and vacancies were due in part to the ongoing review process.

- Marie Jobling, Co-chair of the Dignity Fund Coalition, supported retaining the Dignity Fund OAC as-is. She described the body as a hard-fought community victory and emphasized its role in implementing the Dignity Fund ordinance and elevating the voices of older adults and people with disabilities.
- Flo Kelly expressed concern that the Task Force was not hearing enough public comments due to the length of the agenda. She had come to speak about homelessness but noted that the meeting was running hours behind schedule.
- Norman Degelman, a longtime San Francisco resident, opposed combining the DASC Advisory Council with any other body. He said the word “combined” felt like a loss of effectiveness and made him feel like the Task Force did not care about him.
- Margaret Graff, District 4 representative to the DASC Advisory Council, emphasized the importance of maintaining Board of Supervisors appointments to the Council. She described her role in reporting back to her Supervisor and educating them about the DAS system.
- Ramona Davies highlighted that the DASC Advisory Council, Dignity Fund SPWG, and Dignity Fund OAC work together to surface and resolve frontline service delivery issues. She urged the Task Force to preserve all channels of community input.
- Anya Worley-Ziegmann with the People’s Budget Coalition urged the Task Force to retain the DASC Advisory Council and Dignity Fund OAC as separate bodies. They argued that the current system reflects the complexity of the community and should be preserved.
- Art Christico, California Alliance for Retired Americans, opposed the proposed streamlining. He argued that the changes would not save money or improve efficiency and would instead silence community voices.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:  
The “*Staff Discussion*” states that “the Advisory Council ... *can absorb some functions of the Dignity Fund OAC,*” but *doesn’t* mention what functions *can’t* be “*absorbed,*” or who would perform them!

The Dignity Fund Coalition has urged you to keep the Dignity Fund OAC in its current role as an advisory body.

**Go ahead. Eliminate these two Dignity Fund bodies at your own peril.** That will add fuel to the fire to entice voters To reject any Charter Change ballot measure you place in November 2026!

Also, as gerontologist Ann Colichidasin, from the Board of San Francisco Gray Panthers urged you, the Long-Term Care Coordinating Council (LTCCC) is needed more than ever, because numerous long term care beds are being eliminated and facilities closing. The LTCCC’s duties to recommend policy changes to increase long-term care institutional settings, should be explicitly added to core duties of the Department of Public Health.

During public comment, Chair Harrington asked Ms. Jobling to explain why the Dignity Fund OAC should not be merged with the DASC Advisory Council, given their budgetary overlap. Ms. Jobling responded that the Dignity Fund OAC focuses on outreach and identifying gaps in services, not wholesale budget oversight. She emphasized the distinct roles and expertise of each body and asked,

“Why fix it if it’s not broken?” Chair Harrington also confirmed with her that the body functions in an advisory capacity.

Vice Chair Bruss opened the Task Force discussion by confirming with staff that the DASC seat qualifications were a local requirement, not state or federal.

Sophia Kittler reiterated her general preference for reducing the number of bodies and emphasized the need for a strong group focused on Benefits and Family Support (BFS) issues—such as eligibility, employment, and food access. She stated that this work requires a dedicated body, whether advisory or governance. She expressed strong support for removing both the HSC and DASC from the Charter to allow for greater flexibility.

The Task Force then discussed the structure and functions of the bodies within the Department of Disability and Aging Services (DAS). Deputy Director Cindy Kauffman was invited to clarify the Area Agency on Aging (AAA) structure. She explained that the AAA sits within a specific DAS program and that both a governance body and an advisory council are required by state and federal law. She noted that the DASC currently fulfills the governance role, while the Advisory Council fulfills the federal advisory requirement. She also clarified that the Advisory Council advises the AAA, not the DASC. Chief Assistant City Attorney Jon Givner added that the DASC must designate a process for appointing members to the Advisory Council and establish qualifications for the AAA director.

Ms. Kittler asked about the overlap between the DASC Advisory Council and the Dignity Fund OAC. Ms. Kauffman explained that the Advisory Council ensures representation of the people served by DAS and provides input on the area plan, while the OAC focuses specifically on the Dignity Fund and helps identify gaps in services through the community needs assessment. She noted that while there is some overlap, the OAC has a distinct focus on a specific funding stream. Natasha Mihal asked whether the community needs assessment informs only Dignity Fund allocations or all funding decisions. Ms. Kauffman confirmed that it informs all funding decisions and is used to guide both the Dignity Fund and other departmental resources. She described the planning process as complex but effective, with strong collaboration between planning, AAA, and budget teams.

Chair Harrington asked whether the Advisory Council’s size (currently 22 members) should be reduced. Ms. Kauffman responded that all members bring value and that the right size depends on the need for diverse representation. She appreciated the Task Force’s earlier conversation about how to thoughtfully engage service providers and noted that she had served on bodies with both too many and too few members.

Task Force members confirmed that the Human Services Commission (HSC) serves as the governing body for BFS, while the DASC governs DAS. Ms. Kittler noted that the HSC also oversees the shared administrative budget and that the two commissions function independently despite being part of the same agency. Task Force members generally agreed on retaining both the HSC and DASC as separate bodies. Vice Chair Bruss praised the work of HSA and DAS staff and noted that any proposed changes were not a reflection of the importance of their work.

The Task Force then discussed specific bodies, at times jumping between bodies. Below is a summary of its discussion and decisions organized by body.

#### In-Home Supportive Services Public Authority Governing Board (IHSS Governing Board)

Vice Chair Bruss moved to retain the IHSS Governing Board without changes due to its uniqueness as a required quasi-governance body. It was seconded by Ms. Kittler and passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### Long Term Care Coordinating Council (LTCCC)

Chair Harrington noted that the LTCCC had already voted to disband itself, but staff confirmed that it remains codified. Vice Chair Bruss moved to eliminate the LTCCC. Sophie Hayward seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### Dignity Fund Service Provider Working Group (Dignity Fund SPWG)

Vice Chair Bruss moved to eliminate the Dignity Fund SPWG, noting that, while valuable, it cannot function as a Brown Act-compliant body and should be removed from code. She directed staff to develop language encouraging the department to continue working collaboratively with service providers. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### DASC Advisory Council and Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Council (Dignity Fund OAC)

Task Force members clarified the structure of HSA and its two divisions with staff and discussed how a new governance structure could look, with clarifying information from DAS Deputy Director Kauffman.

Chair Harrington opposed combining the DASC Advisory Council and Dignity Fund OAC into a single advisory body and acknowledged the emotional and historical significance of the Dignity Fund. Dr. Allen Cooper, who serves on both bodies, was invited to speak. He explained that the Advisory Council focuses on services while the Dignity Fund OAC focuses on a specific funding stream and that members have deep expertise. He warned that merging the bodies could dilute expertise and make it harder for a new body to understand the nuances of the Dignity Fund.

Ms. Kittler proposed creating one advisory body with two subcommittees: one focused on the Dignity Fund and one on broader services. She emphasized the need for a single body that can provide end-to-end input on services and funding. Ms. Mihal agreed, raising the importance of streamlining for public understanding and noting that the current structure is difficult to navigate, even for experts.

Vice Chair Bruss moved to direct staff to return with a proposal that combines the DASC Advisory Council and Dignity Fund OAC into a single advisory body under DAS, with flexibility to deviate from the advisory committee template as needed. Ms. Kittler seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### Human Services Commission (HSC)

The Task Force returned to its earlier discussion of the HSC, and Ms. Alonso reviewed the body's current alignment with the governance and advisory body templates.

Ms. Kittler expressed interest in removing the HSC from the Charter to allow for greater flexibility. Ms. Hayward agreed, noting that advisory bodies allow for more community input and less focus on budget review. Vice Chair Bruss, however, suggested retaining the HSC as a governance body but moving it to the Administrative Code. She argued that the commission has evolved over time and that its structure warrants an exception.

Vice Chair Bruss moved to retain the HSC at its current size (5 members), maintain all-Mayoral appointments, move to the Administrative Code, and conform to the governance template (including Board of Supervisor by ordinance). Ms. Mihal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### Disability and Aging Services Commission (DASC)

Ms. Kittler moved to apply a similar structure as the HSC to the DASC: retain it as a governance body, move it to the Administrative Code, and replace specific seat qualifications with body-level desired qualifications. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### Veterans Affairs Commission (VAC)

Chair Harrington moved to retain the VAC and align it with the advisory committee template per the staff recommendations. Ms. Hayward seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

### **7. Homelessness Bodies (Action Item) – to be heard no earlier than 3:30pm**

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

Ms. Alonso presented staff recommendations for five bodies: Homelessness Oversight Commission; Local Homeless Coordinating Board; Our City, Our Home Oversight Committee; Shelter Monitoring Committee; and Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee. See the detailed staff recommendation for each body in the [Public Health and Wellbeing Bodies Memo](#).

She noted that the City created the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) in 2016 and that three of the five homelessness bodies pre-dated HSH's establishment. Ms. Alonso walked through three consolidation options.

Chair Harrington asked for clarification about the Our City, Our Home Oversight Committee (OCOH). Other Task Force members and staff stated that OCOH advises the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor on the OCOH fund spending plan as part of the annual budget process, which informs HSH's and the Department of Public Health's budget plans.

Public comments were received from ten speakers:

- Flo Kelly, volunteer with the Coalition on Homelessness, expressed support for maintaining the Commission on Homelessness, OCOH, and Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee.
- A member of the Coalition on Homelessness advocated to keep OCOH as-is and supported keeping the Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee to ensure a space for people experiencing homelessness to have their concerns addressed.
- Lupe, a member of the Coalition on Homelessness, stated that the elimination of the homelessness bodies erodes participatory democracy and puts more power with the Mayor's Office. She supported keeping all homelessness bodies.
- Anya Worley-Ziegmann of the People's Budget Coalition supported maintaining all homelessness bodies. They stated that commissions should serve the will of the people. They also stated that commissions should not become tools in political agendas, which could happen if more power is consolidated under the Mayor's Office.

- Bevan Dufty, former member of the Board of Supervisors, provided an overview of his experience working on homelessness issues. Mr. Dufty expressed support for Homelessness Oversight Commission (HOC).
- Jordan Postoleski, who served on the defunct SRO Task Force, expressed support for HOC and OCOH. They expressed general displeasure with the Task Force's process and compared its work to DOGE.
- Griffin Lee, staff of ConnectedSF, urged the Task Force to eliminate as many bodies as possible. He supported consolidating power in the Mayor's Office.
- Abel Cronk, current COH member and formerly unhoused person for over 10 years, advocated for the Task Force to keep all homelessness bodies. She noted that if the Task Force must consolidate bodies, then they should keep HOC and place iterations of the other bodies under it. She recommended merging the Shelter Monitoring Committee and Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee into one body, retaining the Local Homeless Coordinating Board (LHCB) to meet federal requirements, and retaining OCOH.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:  
I just want to say I was shocked to see that of the five bodies in the Homelessness Bodies category, that the Staff memo recommended to eliminate or combine all five bodies. That seemed to be both arbitrary and very misguided. At a minimum, you need to keep the Homelessness Oversight Body, since the previous caller was correct that there is no licensing of shelters or group housing facilities.
- A public commenter expressed dismay about the mayoral control over the recommendations.

During Public Comment, Chair Harrington asked some commenters questions. He asked Anya Worley-Ziegmann whether volunteers for the Shelter Monitoring Committee and Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee would be necessary if HSH staff were doing their jobs. They agreed that if staff were doing their jobs, then these committees would not be necessary. They also stated that these bodies are necessary because HSH is directed by the Mayor, so if the Mayor does not direct action, then the action does not occur. Chair Harrington asked Mr. Dufty for his thoughts on the staff recommendations for the homelessness bodies. Mr. Dufty supported keeping HOC and OCOH and acknowledged some commonality between the LHCB and the HOC.

Ms. Kittler began the Task Force's discussion on the homelessness bodies. She appreciated advocates participating in the Task Force's discussion and stated that any consolidation of bodies would aim to improve service delivery and increase accountability and coordination.

#### Homelessness Oversight Commission (HOC) and Local Homeless Coordinating Board (LHCB)

Vice Chair Bruss noted that HSH was created less than ten years ago and stated that HOC should have a holistic picture of the homelessness landscape to make decisions, from discussing OCOH fund plans to monitoring shelters. Ms. Mihal wondered whether OCOH fund oversight would have been assigned to HOC had it existed when the OCOH legislation passed, rather than creating a separate body. Ms. Mihal acknowledged the intersectionality of the issues at hand, stating that people experiencing homelessness receive services from multiple City departments.

The Task Force discussed the minimum membership requirements for the LHCB and noted that there is no specific number of service providers required. Ms. Bell stated that the LHCB serves as the City's Continuum of Care (CoC) body and that the federal Notice of Funding Opportunity for CoC funds

awards points based on representation reflective of the people providing services in that area. Chair Harrington asked if the LHCB's membership requirements limited its ability to be merged into HOC. Mr. Givner recommended that staff provide more research if the Task Force sought to maintain HOC as a governance body and assume the CoC role from LHCB to ensure federal requirements could be met. Staff noted that it would be easier to fulfill the CoC requirements with HOC as an advisory body rather than a governance body. Chair Harrington expressed hesitation in making HOC an advisory body because it would limit its decision-making authority. Ms. Hayward stated support for combining the LHCB into HOC if possible.

Vice Chair Bruss motioned to eliminate LHCB and keep HOC, partially aligned to the advisory committee template and fulfilling CoC requirements. She explained the template alignment details: no sunset date, no hiring/firing authority, no contract approval authority, and advisory budget authority. She requested staff investigate how many seats and which qualifications would need to be added to HOC to satisfy U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development's requirements. Ms. Kittler seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-1 by voice vote with Chair Harrington voting in opposition.

#### Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee and Shelter Monitoring Committee

Ms. Hayward motioned to eliminate the Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee and the Shelter Monitoring Committee with the expectation that HOC should assume responsibility for the oversight. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. Ms. Bell confirmed that HSH holds a contract to support shelter clients with grievances. She noted that the Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee reviews and discusses data quarterly. Ms. Bell also reported that shelter monitoring should occur through regular contract monitoring. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### Our City, Our Home (OCOH)

Ms. Hayward motioned to eliminate OCOH, citing that oversight and allocation of the fund are already restricted by law. Vice Chair Bruss seconded the motion. Ms. Mihal noted that OCOH's reporting work would need to be referred to HOC and the Health Commission to maintain oversight functions. Ms. Kittler stated HOC and the Health Commission already perform an oversight role during the normal budget process. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

### **8. Human Rights Bodies (Action Item) – to be heard no earlier than 5pm**

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

Ms. Alonso presented the staff recommendations for five bodies: Human Rights Commission, LGBTQI+ Advisory Committee, Commission on the Status of Women, Immigrant Rights Commission, and Family Violence Council. See the detailed staff recommendation for each body in the [Public Health and Wellbeing Bodies Memo](#).

She noted that in the most recent budget, the Mayor's Office proposed an agency model in which the Department on the Status of Women would be folded into the Human Rights Commission (department) with the intention to combine the departments pending voter approval of a Charter amendment.

Public comments were received from 28 speakers:

- Rebecca Jackson advocated to keep the Commission on the Status of Women (COSW) a governance body. She noted that making COSW an advisory body strips women of making decisions and limits them to providing their opinion.

- Diane Jones Lowrey, President of San Francisco COSW, advocated the Task Force to keep the COSW as a governance body in the Charter on behalf of the commission.
- Sarah Souza, Chair of the Immigrants Rights Commission (IRC), supported keeping the body, not adding the proposed three-year sunset date, and maintaining the membership qualifications to make sure that the body reflects the city's immigrant community with lived experience.
- Sofia Andary, a commissioner of the COSW speaking on her own behalf, advocated to keep COSW a governance body to maintain its community influence and power, to keep the body's hiring authority, and to not provide the Mayor neither sole commissioner appointment authority nor the ability to remove commissioners without cause.
- Kudrat Chaudhary, IRC Vice Chair, supported the staff recommendation to keep the body but disagreed with imposing a three-year sunset, emphasizing that the city's immigrant community deserves stability in this time of uncertainty with the federal government. She also advocated to keep the COSW as a governance body.
- Evan Sirchuck noted the significance of work the COSW has completed and advocated that it be kept as a governance commission.
- Kailin Chou, Director of Community Engagement at the Alliance for Girls, spoke on behalf of her organization. She expressed support for maintaining COSW as a governance body with hiring and firing authority and strong opposition to granting the Mayor power to remove commissioners without cause.
- Susan Anthony, a representative of Stanton International-Bay Area Club, advocated to keep COSW as a governance commission in the Charter.
- Beverly Upton, representative of San Francisco Domestic Violence Consortium and one of the original tri-chairs of the Family Violence Council, supported keeping the Family Violence Council. She appreciated the staff recommendation to keep COSW but advocated that it be maintained as a governance body in the Charter.
- Yu Pok "Jose" Ng, Immigrant Rights Commissioner, spoke on behalf of the Chinese for Affirmative Action and Language Access Network of San Francisco and urged the Task Force maintain the IRC without a sunset date. He advocated for the Task Force to strengthen the body given the federal government's policies towards immigrants.
- Annette Wong, Managing Director of Programs at Chinese for Affirmative Action (CAA), spoke on behalf of the CAA to urge the Task Force to maintain the IRC and not impose a sunset date.
- Celine Kennelly, Executive Director of the Irish Immigration Pastoral Center and member of the Immigrant Rights Commission, spoke on behalf of the IIPC. She expressed support to keep the IRC. She also clarified that the body advises the Board of Supervisors and Mayor's Office, not the Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs.
- Alondra Esquivel Garcia, Co-President of the San Francisco Women's Political Committee, spoke on behalf of her organization and expressed support for COSW, Family Violence Council, and IRC. She advocated keeping COSW as is and noted opposition to giving the mayor sole authority over commissioner membership. She also advocated for the Task Force not to impose a sunset date on or change the membership qualifications for the IRC.
- Caryl Ito, former COSW commissioner, expressed support for COSW as a governance body in the Charter.
- Dr. Kathryn Kenley Johnshon, former COSW commissioner, advocated to keep COSW as is. She urged the Task Force to consider that their decision on COSW's fate could have ripple effects across the country since San Francisco's COSW is one of the largest in the country.

- Michaela Leonarte, former Commission on the Status of Women staff, supported keeping COSW as a governing body in the Charter.
- Karen Fleshman supported the COSW, IRC, and Family Violence Council. She advocated to keep COSW a governance commission and retain the body's hiring and firing authority and opposed granting the mayor sole commissioner appointing authority and at-will member removal authority.
- Zachary Frial, representative of SOMCAN, expressed support for the IRC to remain an independent body without a sunset date.
- Jennifer Viegas and Dr. Betty Sullivan, Co-Publishers of the San Francisco Bay Times, expressed support to keep COSW as is – particularly as a governance commission.
- Dr. Anne Moses, COSW Commissioner, strongly recommended COSW remain a governance commission and opposed granting the mayor sole commissioner removal authority.
- Mario Paz, IRC Commissioner, expressed support for the body.
- Dr. Raveena Rihal, COSW Commissioner, advocated to maintain COSW as a governance body with budget authority.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:  
It is astonishing that the Staff Memo recommendation for the LGBTQI+ Advisory Committee is listed as having a very NARROW focus of serving a relatively narrow demographic group (gay and lesbian folks), and recommended keeping it at a cost of just \$42,000 in part-time "soft costs," while at the same time the Staff Memo recommendation on the Dignity Fund O.A.C. body also has a very NARROW focus of serving a relatively narrow demographic group of elderly San Franciscans, and costs an almost-identical similar \$43,000 in part-time staff "soft costs," but recommended "combining or eliminating" the Dignity Fund O.A.C., and you in fact actually eliminated the Dignity Fund OAC.

In fact, there are significantly more San Franciscans who are elderly and disabled, than there are LGBTQI+ San Franciscans! Why keep one body, but eliminate the other body? It sends the message that this Streamlining Task Force is being prejudicially ageist.

- Evie Postmen Tier, member of Nuvea Esperanza Accompaniment Teams for Interfaith Movement for Human Integrity, opposed imposing a sunset date on the Immigrant Rights Commission and granting the mayor sole commissioner removal authority. She supported maintaining the body as is.
- A caller expressed support for all of the previous public comment provided and advocated that the Task Force make no changes to the bodies under consideration.
- Lauren Girardin spoke on behalf of the Women League of Voters of San Francisco. She expressed support to keep COSW as a Charter, governance body and opposition to diminish the body's independence or authority. She noted the organization's particular opposition to removing the body's hiring and firing authority and granting the mayor power to remove commissioners at will.
- Ashley Rojas, Policy Coordinator for Indigenous Justice, expressed support for keeping COSW as is.
- Sharon Johnson, former Executive Director of COSW, advocated to maintain an independent, chartered and governance body COSW.

Chair Harrington began the Task Force's discussion by remarking that the Task Force understands the significance of San Francisco's actions on the Human Rights bodies under consideration given the

public's concerns and ongoing federal policy shifts. Ms. Kittler stated that the Task Force should not impose sunset dates on any of the bodies under consideration, noting they act as hubs for community feedback. Ms. Kittler recommended that the Human Rights bodies should be advisory bodies because their purviews extend across departments and policy areas whereas governance bodies provide oversight of specific departments. She noted that IRC is already an advisory body and it effectively ensures that immigrant rights issues are considered across the City.

Ms. Mihal shared the Task Force's definition of an advisory body – to provide expertise and recommendations to the City – emphasizing its breadth of influence. She suggested the Task Force consider allowing COSW to keep its current name as a branding factor. Vice Chair Bruss agreed with Ms. Kittler's and Ms. Mihal's remarks that converting to advisory would not represent a diminishment of importance or stature. She stated that the Task Force should maintain the IRC's current seat qualifications. Ms. Hayward expressed support for advisory bodies as an effective method of public engagement with the City.

Chair Harrington stated that the Human Rights bodies hold powerful significance and expressed concern with changing bodies from governance in the Charter to advisory in the Code, especially given the current state of affairs and politics across the country.

Ms. Kittler asked staff to clarify why the LGBTQI+ Advisory Committee was designated borderline inactive. Ms. Alonso responded that the threshold for active status is at least four meetings in calendar year 2024, and the committee met only three times. She added that the body has a 24% vacancy rate, with six of 25 seats unfilled. However, according to the Human Rights Commission (department), the body's membership was recently reduced from 25 to 15, although it's unclear whether the change has been codified in the body's bylaws. In response to a question from Vice Chair Bruss about the committee's current status, Ms. Alonso confirmed that it is active, and the department finds it valuable.

Ms. Alonso also clarified that the Charter does not clearly distinguish which duties belong to the Human Rights Commission as a body versus the department, since both share the same name. She stated that staff recommend assigning specific duties to each entity to resolve this ambiguity.

#### Immigrant Rights Commission

Ms. Hayward motioned to keep the IRC as an advisory body, increase the term length from two to three years, add a four-term limit, and not impose a sunset date. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### LGBTQI+ Advisory Committee

The Task Force debated whether they should impose a sunset date on the LGBTQI+ Advisory Committee since the body met infrequently in 2024. Vice Chair Bruss motioned to set a maximum number of seats at 15, add three-year term lengths, add four-term limits, and no sunset date. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### Human Rights Commission

Vice Chair Bruss motioned to move the Human Rights Commission from the Charter to the Administrative Code. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-1 by voice vote with Chair Harrington in opposition. Vice Chair Bruss motioned to align the Human Rights Commission with the

advisory template by moving it from Charter to Code, reducing term lengths from four to three years, adding a four-term limit, and removing hiring/firing authority but not imposing a sunset date. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### Commission on the Status of Women

Ms. Kittler motioned moving the COSW from the Charter to the Administrative Code. Ms. Hayward seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-1 by voice vote with Chair Harrington in opposition. Ms. Kittler motioned to make the COSW advisory, increase the number of members to 11, have members serve at-will, add three-term limits, remove department oversight authority (hiring and firing, budget and contract approval), and not impose a sunset date. The number of seats was increased from 7 to 11 to align with the size of the Human Rights Commission and to strengthen the body's capacity to advocate for issues and provide policy advice. Ms. Hayward seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### Family Violence Council

Ivy Lee, Director of the Mayor's Office for Victims' Rights (MOVR), told the Task Force that the Family Violence Council already has legislation drafted to reduce its membership from 28 to 15 seats while maintaining its public member tri-chair structure. Vice Chair Bruss motioned to keep the Family Violence Council, make the aforementioned membership changes, keep the 2027 sunset date, and add three-year term lengths and four-term limits. She directed staff to work with MOVR on revised seat qualifications. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

### **9. Community Health Bodies (Action Item)**

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

Ms. Alonso presented staff recommendations for four bodies: Health Commission, Behavioral Health Commission, Food Security Task Force, and Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee. See the detailed staff recommendation for each body in the [Public Health and Wellbeing Bodies Memo](#).

Public comments were received from 17 speakers:

- Laura Urban, member of the Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee (SDDTAC), on behalf of 36 individuals and organizations urged the Task Force to keep the SDDTAC.
- Omar Flores, Co-Chair of SDDTAC, urged the Task Force to keep SDDTAC.
- Jamey Schmidt, medical researcher, nutritionist and member of SDDTAC, advocated for the Task Force to keep SDDTAC.
- Dr. Linda Kuo, dentist and member of the SDDTAC, urged the Task Force to keep SDDTAC.
- Frances Abigail Cabrera, medical researcher and Co-Chair of the SDDTAC, urged the Task Force to keep the SDDTAC.
- Roberto Vargas, a medical researcher, expressed support for SDDTAC. He cautioned the Task Force not to weaken the SDDTAC since it could signal to sugary drink distributors that there may be an opportunity to repeal the tax entirely.
- Blake Young, representative of the American Heart Association, expressed support for the SDDTAC and advised the Task Force not to consolidate it with the Food Security Task Force.
- Anya Worley-Ziegmann of the People's Budget Coalition urged the Task Force to keep SDDTAC and suggested that they think of the body as the "health families commission." They urged the Task Force to keep SDDTAC to help ensure that the General Fund dollars generated by SDDTAC are allocated to healthy drink and food programs rather than backfilling other programs.

- Katie Jackson, Chief Nutrition Officer at Project Open Hand and member of the SDDTAC, expressed deep concern for eliminating or consolidating the SDDTAC. She overviewed the achievements of the SDDTAC, including strategizing how to improve school meals and reducing wait-times for home delivered meals.
- Zachary Frial, representative of SOMCAM, urged the Task Force to keep SDDTAC.
- Prasanthi Patel, a member of SDDTAC, voiced strong opposition to eliminating or consolidating SDDTAC into another body.
- Saeeda Hafiz, SFUSD member of SDDTAC, urged the Task Force to keep SDDTAC as long the tax imposed.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:  
Because you kept the Police Commission in the City Charter under the premise it deals with “public safety” of all San Franciscans, I believe you should similarly keep the Health Commission in the City charter because it deals with the overarching “public health” of every San Franciscan. Public Health is part and parcel of “Public Safety”! Don’t move the Health Commission to the Admin Code, sending a signal the Streamlining Task is implementing DOGE-style destruction, just as Trump and Bobby Kennedy, Jr. are dismantling the CDC.

City Charter §4.110 on the Health Commission contains a mere 125 words, taking up just five lines of text. It cannot be worth taking just 125 words out of the Charter to move to the Admin Code. That’s a pretextual scam!

Chair Harrington previously stated the only way to ensure a governance body remains a governance body, is to keep it in the Charter!

- Cissie Bonini, Executive Director of Vouchers 4 Veggies at UCSF and member of the Food Security Task Force (FSTF), spoke on behalf of the FSTF in support of retaining the body. She noted that no department is responsible for food security in San Francisco. She also stated the FSTF should not be consolidated into the Human Services Commission.
- Melinda Burrus, member of SDDTAC, urged the Task Force not to consolidate SDDTAC into SFTF or disband the body so department staff could take on the body’s work. She expressed concern that City staff and the Mayor’s Office staff are not culturally competent enough nor well connected enough in the impacted communities to adequately take on the body’s work.
- Melissa Akers, Associate Director of Vouchers 4 Veggies at UCSF, urged the Task Force to keep FSTF.
- Alex Raffanti, Policy & Advocacy Manager at San Francisco-Marin Food Bank, urged the Task Force to keep FSTF on behalf of the San Francisco-Marin Food Bank. She noted that FSTF’s focus on alleviating food insecurity is especially needed given federal policy changes.

Chair Harrington began the Task Force’s discussion by sharing his experience working with children’s health advocates in the 2010s to pass sugary drinks distributor taxes in San Francisco and neighboring cities. He explained that, in response, the soda industry lobbied the State of California to prohibit local governments from adopting similar taxes. The State enacted a ban and threatened to withhold sales tax revenue from jurisdictions that imposed such taxes. However, in 2023, a state appeals court ruled that withholding sales tax revenue in this manner would be unconstitutional. A new sugary drink distributor tax adopted by the City of Santa Cruz is now expected to face legal challenges under the state’s ban. Chair Harrington cautioned the Task Force against eliminating the SDDTAC, warning that doing so

could reinforce the soda industry's anti-tax narrative and discourage other jurisdictions from pursuing similar public health measures.

Ms. Hayward clarified that the money generated by the "soda tax" flows directly into the General Fund rather than a special fund. Ms. Alonso confirmed her understanding was correct. Ms. Hayward noted that the City budget is under stress and understood SDDTAC advocates' concern that the funds generated from the tax could be allocated to other programs.

Vice Chair Bruss supported keeping the SDDTAC as a distinct body since the tax revenue goes directly into the General Fund without specific allocation rules and no other body has a similar enough purview. She stated that the FSTF could be eliminated while the Health Commission should be preserved in the Charter as a governance body and aligned with the governance template since it oversees the Department of Public Health and large medical facilities. She supported applying 12-year cumulative term limits for Health commissioners. She also supported aligning the Behavioral Health Commission with the advisory template as much as possible.

Ms. Kittler expressed appreciation for the SDDTAC advocates and their recommendations on how the tax revenue should be spent. She noted their advocacy has encouraged the City to partner with and fund different organizations.

#### Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory

Ms. Hayward motioned to keep SDDTAC with 16 seats, establish three-year terms with a four-term limit, remove the sunset date, and add language stating that the body should continue to exist as long as the tax remains in place. She also proposed removing the Administrative Code language assigning administrative and clerical support responsibilities to the City Administrator's and Controller's Offices, and instead designating the Department of Public Health to reflect current practice. Ms. Kittler asked whether advisory bodies created by voters could be amended in the future without requiring voter approval. The Task Force agreed that such bodies should be amendable without returning to the ballot and directed staff to include any necessary language to ensure that flexibility. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### Food Security Task Force

Ms. Hayward expressed her preference to eliminate FSTF, noting that during the pandemic, the City created an in-house unit focused on food security that could assume the FSTF's responsibilities. Vice Chair Bruss motioned to eliminate FSTF. Ms. Hayward seconded the motion. Ms. Kittler requested staff to confirm whether the Human Services Commission currently addresses food security issues. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### Health Commission and Behavioral Health Commission

Ms. Kittler motioned to keep the Health Commission as a governance body in the Charter aligned to the governance template and to keep the Behavioral Health Commission as an advisory body in the Administrative Code without a sunset date and with at-will member removal and a new name to be determined at a future meeting. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

## 10. Future Agenda Topics (Discussion Item)

Ms. Alonso stated that the final set of staff recommendations for General Administration and Finance bodies would be shared at the next Task Force meeting scheduled for November 5, 2025.

Public comment was received from one speaker:

- Charlie Bodkin suggested the Task Force to secure SFGovTV coverage to broadcast the meetings. He urged the Task Force to ask their appointing bodies for funding for SFGovTV coverage.

## 11. General Public Comment

Chair Harrington opened the floor for general public comment on matters within the Task Force's purview but not on the day's agenda.

Public comment was received from one speaker:

- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:  
It's disturbing that between your 9/3/2025 meeting on "Public Safety Bodies" and your 10/1/2025 meeting, that despite the Staff Recommendations about keeping, eliminating, or **COMBINING** bodies, your "*Decision Log*" hasn't reported yet even one body that was "*combined*" with either another body, or combined by handing off their functions to a City Department. The failure to accurately report in the "*Decision Log*" which bodies are actually combined, and how combined, does a disservice to preserving the historical record of your deliberations.

I strongly urge this Task Force to require the City Administrator's support staff to go back and update the "*Decision Log*" to accurately list in the "*Score Card*" section of bodies heard by date in the "*Decision Log*" (starting on page 14, 10/2/2025), which bodies were actually "*combined*." Currently, the "*Score Card*" section essentially only reports binary choices of "*kept*" vs. "*eliminated*," (although there were two "*No Recommendations*"). That's misleading.

Chair Harrington and Ms. Alonso requested members of the public to share with staff any errors they believe are in the Decision Log.

## 12. Adjournment

Chair Harrington adjourned the meeting at 10:24 pm.

---

Minutes prepared by Hannah Kohanzadeh, Principal Project Analyst and Chelsea Hall, Senior Project Analyst.