



Approved Minutes

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

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

Wednesday, November 19, 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/599t6y5s> and password PropE. Members of the public may use email address 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 404 2784 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

Vice Chair Bruss called the meeting to order at 1:01 pm.

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 role. Chair Harrington had a planned absence. With four members present, a quorum was established.

3. Announcements (Informational Item)

The clerk announced that the Task Force completed its initial review of all bodies and has begun reviewing its preliminary decisions in preparation for the drafting of its final report. During this time, the Task Force may modify any of its previous decisions. The report is due to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor by February 1, 2026.

4. Approve Minutes – November 5, 2025 meeting (Action Item)

Public comment was received by one speaker.

- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:
The Streamlining Task Force’s 11/5/2025 meeting minutes are deficient in several places. First, on page 12 on the discussion and vote on the Civil Service Commission (CSC), the minutes don’t report whether or not you took action on removing the CSC’s nomination authority for hiring the Director of the Department of Human Resources and allowing the CSC to retain power to firing of the DHR Director with a super majority vote — as the Staff report had recommended. The minutes also don’t report whether the CSC retains sole authority to hire and fire the CSC’s Executive Director/Officer, with no changes as the Staff also recommended. Nor did the “*Decision Log*” report either outcome.

Second, regarding the SFMTA’s Revenue Bond Oversight Committee, (SFMTA RBOC) the minutes don’t report whether oversight of MTA revenue bonds will be absorbed by either the MTA Board of Directors, or by SFMTA staff. This isn’t acceptable.

Ms. Kittler motioned to approve the meeting minutes as drafted by staff. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0 by voice vote.

5. Deferred Decisions on Specific Bodies (Action Item)

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

Vice Chair Bruss noted the Task Force entered a new deliberation phase where they are revisiting particular instances that were left undecided or required further staff research to inform a final decision.

Chelsea Hall, Senior Project Analyst with the City Administrator’s Office, presented on deferred decisions for the Police Commission, Sheriff Department Oversight Board (SDOB), Film Commission, Family Violence Council (FVC) and Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). She began by providing an overview of the Task Force’s decisions to date. She noted that out of the 150 bodies reviewed, the Task Force opted to keep 78 bodies, eliminate 68 bodies, deferred decisions on two bodies, and provided no recommendation for two bodies.

Police Commission

Two outstanding topics related to the Police Commission were identified following the initial discussion and had not yet been addressed by the Task Force. The first required the Task Force to clarify the Police Commission’s role in employee discipline cases coming from the Department of Police Accountability (DPA). Ms. Hall reviewed four options and noted that staff did not recommend a particular option. The options were: (1) empower the DPA Director to impose discipline, with appeals taken to the Police Commission, (2) require the Police Chief to implement DPA’s recommendation for discipline, with the Police Commission hearing the appeal, (3) Follow the Police Commission’s existing procedures for DPA cases and add a separate post-Commission appeal process via an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) or private arbitrator, and (4) have an ALJ make the initial determination for charges filed by the DPA Director, which could then be appealed to the Police Commission. The second topic required the Task Force to clarify who has the authority to hire and fire the DPA Director. Staff recommended maintaining the status quo: the Police Commission nominates, the Mayor appoints, and the Board of Supervisors confirms. For removal, the Mayor may recommend dismissal to the Commission, which must act within 30 days, or the Commission may remove the Director independently.

Sheriff's Department Oversight Board (SDOB)

The Task Force previously expressed support for making the SDOB advisory but deferred a final decision pending further analysis from staff on how that change would affect the Board's functions. Ms. Hall noted that most of SDOB's duties are already advisory. However, two functions required further consideration given their decision-making qualities. First, SDOB appoints, evaluates, and may remove the Inspector General. Staff reviewed alternatives but found no ideal fit. Second, SDOB has the authority to issue subpoenas, administer oaths, and take testimony. Staff recommended retaining this function, as no suitable alternative exists. Ms. Hall also outlined how the SDOB could be aligned with the advisory body template.

Film Commission

When first discussing the Film Commission, the Task Force did not direct staff on four template components: term lengths, term limits, qualifications, and hiring and firing authority. Ms. Hall requested that the Task Force decide whether the Film Commission should have three-year terms with four term limits to align with the advisory body template or retain its current scheme of four-year terms with three term limits. She also requested the Task Force decide whether the Film Commission should retain hiring and firing authority of the SF Film Executive Director.

Family Violence Council (FVC)

When first discussing FVC, the Mayor's Office of Victims' Rights (MOVR) told the Task Force that it was drafting legislation to update the body and could incorporate the Task Force's recommendations. Accordingly, MOVR planned to introduce legislation in November 2025 to reduce membership from 28 to 15 (retaining three public seats), maintain a sunset date, and add three-year terms with a four-term limit. Staff recommended allowing MOVR to proceed with its independent legislation.

Historic Preservation Commission (HPC)

The Task Force asked staff to recommend which HPC functions should remain in the Charter versus move to the Planning Code. Staff recommended retaining sections on general provisions, qualifications, budget, fees, department head, and staff in the Charter; moving most other sections to the Planning Code; and eliminating the Preservation Element. At the Task Force's request, staff also recommended making seat qualifications desirable at the body level.

Public comments were received by three speakers.

- Julie D. Soo, prior SDOB President, noted that SDOB does not neatly fit into any of the Task Force's templates. She shared that SDOB has the authority to hire an Inspector General now and is in contract with an independent recruiting firm to do so. Ms. Soo recommended that the terms be staggered two-years at a time. She also noted SDOB is authorized to investigate all complaints and all in-custody deaths, with no limitations on reviewing misconduct.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:
You need to keep the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board as a governance body, and NOT, repeated NOT, convert it to an advisory body. You should keep it in the City Charter, and not move it to the Admin Code, just as you kept the Police Commission in the City Charter. You should NOT, repeat NOT, remove this Board's authority to hire its Inspector General. The members of this Body should not, repeat not, be converted to at-will removal, which would

further politicize the body. Keep the SDOB's independence, and don't change membership qualifications. Also keep its budget authority, given its Inspector general position.

You should also keep the Film Commission's authority to nominate, and hire and fire, its Director. You've made exceptions to your template to allow other boards to retain hiring their Directors and department heads, and you should grant this same exemption to the Film Commission.

- Ovava Afuhaamango, Vice President of the SDOB, echoed Ms. Soo's comments in support of SDOB. Ms. Afuhaamango also stated SDOB was created to help address historic inequities.

Police Commission

Vice Chair Bruss opened Task Force discussion with the Police Commission's role in **employee discipline** matters originating from the Department of Police Accountability (DPA). Ms. Kittler expressed concern about allowing DPA to impose discipline directly, preferring a model where the Police Chief implements DPA's recommendation, with the Commission hearing any appeals. She supported Option 2, which follows this structure.

Ms. Mihal confirmed with Chief Assistant Attorney Jon Givner that under current law, DPA recommends discipline, the Police Commission decides, and appeals go to an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ).

Ms. Hayward requested Paul Henderson, DPA Director, speak about options 2 and 4. Mr. Henderson noted option 2 most closely reflects current practice and would foster collaboration between DPA and the Police Chief. He explained that most discipline cases originate within the Police Department, not DPA.

Ms. Kittler and Mr. Henderson discussed the ten-day rule, in which more serious cases involving potential discipline of ten or more days are sent directly to the Police Commission. Rachel Alonso, Project Director, clarified that the Task Force previously voted to eliminate the ten-day rule and allow the Police Chief to impose discipline in all cases, with the Police Commission serving only as an appellate body; the discussion at that time did not address how this change would apply to DPA-initiated cases.¹

Ms. Kittler asked for clarification on the difference between options 1 and 2. Mr. Givner explained that the two are functionally similar but that option 2 better aligns with City practice, where department heads impose discipline. He added that option 2 ensures the Police Chief formally engages with the decision, rather than allowing DPA's recommendation to proceed directly to the Police Commission. In response to an additional question from Ms. Kittler, he noted that aside from limited cases involving the Department of Human Resources in Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) matters, departments do not impose discipline outside their own staff.

Vice Chair Bruss expressed support for option 4; Mr. Henderson noted that an ALJ would bring legal expertise and improve efficiency, especially for cases where delays complicate resolution. In response to a question from Ms. Hayward about how discipline would be implemented under option 4, Mr. Givner explained that an ALJ would hold a hearing and make a final decision, which the officer could then appeal to the Police Commission. Vice Chair Bruss summarized that the key distinction across the

¹ See the approved minutes and video recording from the [September 3, 2025](#) meeting.

options is who makes the initial discipline decision: the DPA Director alone, in coordination with the Police Chief, or through an ALJ. She noted that all options leave the Police Commission as the appellate body.

The Task Force discussed hearing procedures under options 1 and 2, including Police Commission evidentiary hearings and how Skelly hearings fit into the process. Mr. Givner confirmed that a Skelly hearing would occur under all options, though Mr. Henderson clarified that DPA is not involved in those.

Vice Chair Bruss asked Mr. Henderson to describe DPA's current process, which involves investigating independent allegations, applying the ten-day rule to determine case severity, and routing cases either to the Police Commission or Police Chief, who may assign the hearings to command staff. With the removal of the ten-day rule, all DPA cases would go to the Police Department, which Ms. Alonso confirmed is the intended outcome. Ms. Hayward raised concerns about unequal procedures between DPA and Police Department cases and favored option 2 for consistency. Ms. Mihal added that other jurisdictions should be reviewed to identify best practices and that the process should be streamlined regardless of where a case originates from.

Ms. Kittler moved to adopt option 2, requiring the Police Chief to implement DPA's recommendation for discipline with the Police Commission acting as the appellate body. She noted the Board of Supervisors should discuss this topic further after the Charter amendment is introduced. Ms. Mihal seconded. Vice Chair Bruss expressed reservations, citing a lack of clarity about implementation and the need for DPA's independence, but agreed the Task Force needed to move forward. She wanted to see documentation of how the new process would be implemented. The motion passed 3-1 by voice vote, with Vice Chair Bruss opposed.

Ms. Kittler and Vice Chair Bruss requested the Task Force revisit the topic to have greater clarity on how option 2 would be implemented.

Ms. Kittler moved the discussion to whether the Police Commission should **hire and fire the DPA Director**. She supported keeping that authority with the Commission but recommended removing the Board of Supervisors' confirmation role. The Task Force recalled a similar discussion involving the Civil Services Commission, which is rare in that it appoints both its Executive Officer and the Director of Human Resources. Vice Chair Bruss agreed that it was unnecessary to involve the Mayor or Board since DPA is supposed to be politically independent.

Ms. Kittler motioned for the Police Commission to directly appoint the DPA Director. Ms. Hayward seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0 by voice vote.

Sheriff's Department Oversight Board (SDOB)

Ms. Hayward noted that SDOB does not align neatly with the Task Force's templates; while most of its functions are advisory, selecting the Inspector General is a core governance role. She also asked how frequently the SDOB uses its subpoena power. Ms. Julie Soo, current member and former SDOB president, stated the Board has not issued subpoenas to date, as they rely on the Inspector General or the public to trigger such actions. She noted that the City's jail population has nearly doubled under Mayor Lurie's approach to the drug crisis and suggested that investigator staffing should be tied to jail population rather than the number of sworn officers. In response to a question from Ms. Hayward, Ms.

Soo clarified that DPA conducts serious investigations related to sworn officers and custody issues under an MOU, while SDOB handles complaints involving contractors and non-sworn staff. She emphasized that subpoena power is essential for SDOB to acquire the information needed to carry out its oversight work.

In response to questions from Ms. Mihal, Mr. Givner stated that the Board of Supervisors, Ethics Commission, and many adjudicatory bodies may issue subpoenas. He also noted there is a general catch-all subpoena authority under the Power of Inquiry in the Charter for many bodies and confirmed that the Sheriff Inspector General also has subpoena power. Noting that SDOB is not an appellate body, Ms. Kittler did not see the need for SDOB to have subpoena power.

Vice Chair Bruss agreed with Ms. Hayward that SDOB does not neatly fit into any one template and with Ms. Kittler that SDOB did not need to retain subpoena powers. However, she was uncertain who should appoint the Sheriff Inspector General.

Ms. Hayward motioned to remove the body's subpoena powers with the understanding that the Inspector General would have that power. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0 by voice vote.

Vice Chair Bruss opened discussion on aligning SDOB to the advisory template. Ms. Kittler motioned to align SDOB to the advisory template by changing member removal to at will, reducing term length from 4 years to 3 years, implementing 4-term limits, making qualifications desirable at the body level, moving SDOB's establishing authority to the Administrative Code, not adding a sunset date, and removing budget authority. Ms. Hayward seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0 by voice vote.

Ms. Kittler made a subsequent motion to change the appointing authority to four mayoral and three Board of Supervisor appointments. Vice Chair Bruss seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-1 by voice vote with Ms. Mihal in opposition.

Ms. Hayward motioned to have the appointing authority for Inspector General be the SDOB. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-1 by voice vote with Ms. Kittler in opposition. Vice Chair Bruss directed staff to bring up this topic again when all members of the Task Force were present.

Film Commission

Ms. Kittler stated she saw no reason to change the term limits for the Film Commission. She recommended transferring the hiring and firing authority from the Film Commission to the Mayor. Ms. Kittler clarified that the Film Commission used to be part of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development and is currently being moved to the general arts agency, per the recent budget. Ms. Kittler motioned to maintain the current term limits and remove the hiring and firing authority from the Film Commission. Vice Chair Bruss seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0 by voice vote.

Family Violence Council (FVC)

Ms. Kittler and Vice Chair Bruss recommended the Task Force include the proposed FVC changes in its ordinance, in case MOVR's separate legislation is delayed or not adopted by the Board. Mr. Givner noted MOVR's legislation is unlikely to pass before the Task Force's ordinance takes effect. Ms. Kittler motioned to include language in the Task Force's ordinance to reduce FVC's membership from 28 to 15

(keeping three public members), keep the sunset date, and add three-year term lengths with a 4-term limit. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0 by voice vote.

Historic Preservation Commission (HPC)

Vice Chair Bruss and Ms. Kittler stated support for the staff recommendations. Ms. Hayward opposed moving HPC duties from the Charter to the Planning Code but supported eliminating the Preservation Element of the General Plan, noting the Commission's already strong work in this area without it. She also favored setting qualifications at the body level and appreciated staff's confirmation that the changes would not affect HPC's CLG status or grant eligibility.

Vice Chair Bruss motioned to retain the professional qualifications but to make them desirable at the body level rather than at the seat level. Ms. Kittler seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0 by voice vote.

Ms. Hayward motioned to eliminate the Preservation Element of the General Plan. Ms. Kittler seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-0 by voice vote.

Ms. Kittler motioned to move landmark and historic district designations, certificates of appropriateness, significant or contributory building and conservation district designations in the C-3 districts, alteration of significant or contributory buildings or buildings in conservation districts in the C-3 districts, Mills Act contracts, referral of certain matters, and other duties from the Charter to the Planning Code. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The motion passed 3-1 with Ms. Hayward in opposition.

6. Reviewing and Revising Preliminary Decisions (Action Item)

Materials: [Presentation](#), [Attachment A - Task Force Decisions](#), [Attachment B - BOS Appointment Types](#), [Attachment C - Advisory Body Sunset Dates](#)

Senior Project Analyst Chelsea Hall introduced the item and presented an overview of consistency checks and deferred decisions. The presentation covered a wide range of topics that apply to many policy bodies, including establishing authority (Charter vs. Administrative Code), appointment and removal processes, naming conventions, term lengths and limits, and other structural and implementation issues. Ms. Hall noted that the Task Force had made numerous preliminary decisions and exceptions throughout the process, and this item was intended to allow members to revisit those decisions holistically and provide direction to staff and the City Attorney's Office for drafting legislation. For the full list of decision points and the staff analysis and recommendations, refer to the [presentation slides](#) for Items 5-6.

Public comment was received by 8 speakers:

- Julie Lamarre, Executive Director of the Board of Appeals, spoke in support of retaining the Board's authority to hire and remove its Executive Director. She noted the current structure has worked well and provides appropriate accountability.
- Doug Engmann with the Proposition E campaign echoed support for keeping the Board of Appeals as-is, urged the Task Force to retain Board of Supervisors veto power for split appointments, supported staggering member appointments and term limits, and criticized the volume of changes being proposed under a single agenda item.
- Margaret Brodtkin opposed moving the Children and Youth Oversight and Advisory Committee out of the Charter, arguing that the body governs a department larger than several others that

remain in the Charter. She stated that removing it sends the wrong message about the City's values.

- Zach D'Amico, Deputy Director of the Ethics Commission, supported the proposal to have an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) preside over hearings for Ethics Commissioners facing removal, since this would reduce potential conflicts of interest. He also supported changing the Board of Supervisors' threshold for removal to a simple majority but cautioned against changes that would overwhelm the Ethics Commission's limited resources.
- Mark Kelleher, Human Rights Commissioner, expressed concern about the Task Force's surprising recommendation to convert the Human Rights Commission to an advisory body. He requested that the item be agendaized for December 3 rather than December 18 to allow for broader participation before the holidays.
- Rosie Williams, Human Rights Commissioner, urged the Task Force to rescind its recommendation to remove the body from the Charter, citing its historic significance and role in enforcing civil rights protections.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:
This agenda item covers 47 pages of a PowerPoint presentation, covering dozens and dozens of critical issues. It's totally unfair to members of the public who may want to comment on several of these distinct issues. This material should have been broken down into several separate agenda items.

I support converting the Appointing Authority for the Civil Service Commission and Rent Stabilization Board to having split appointments, to help de-politicize both bodies.

You should allow the Board of Appeals to retain its authority to hire and fire its Executive Director.

You need to overturn your decisions to strip at least seven bodies of their ability to submit a short list of three nominees for hiring of their respective department heads, and strip 24 commissions of hiring and firing their department heads.

Also, you should reverse decisions to convert at least 20 bodies from "for-cause" to "at-will" removal of commission members!

- Lila Holzman tried to inform the Task Force of recent Commission on the Environment actions in response to the Task Force converting it to an advisory body. Due to audio issues in the hearing room, Ms. Holzman was invited to submit a written public comment.

Vice Chair Bruss opened the Task Force's discussion by informing those in attendance that the broad discussions that will occur in this and subsequent meetings will be iterative, and that the public can give input on any item up until the Task Force's process concludes in the Spring.

Establishing Authority (Charter or Code)

Task Force members reflected on the logic behind which decision-making bodies were retained in the Charter versus moved to the Administrative Code. Several members expressed difficulty identifying a consistent rationale. Sophia Kittler referenced the recent SPUR report and noted her disagreement with its recommendations to move the Police and Fire Commissions out of the Charter, citing their disciplinary functions. She questioned why bodies such as the Library Commission, War Memorial

Board of Trustees, Juvenile Probation Commission, and Historic Preservation Commission were retained in the Charter. She also noted that when bodies are established in the Charter, it becomes difficult to change their roles in the future when public needs and circumstances shift. Natasha Mihal and Sophie Hayward agreed, with Ms. Mihal pointing out that Charter bodies tied to state law risk falling out of compliance if those laws change. Ms. Kittler mused that the Task Force's templates have been useful as a decision-making framework but may not be helpful as a messaging tool going forward. She emphasized that advisory bodies have an important policy role, but that some view their advisory designation as a demotion.

Vice Chair Bruss proposed flagging these bodies for further discussion at a future meeting. Ms. Hayward agreed, emphasizing the importance of transparency and clarity in agendaing future meetings. She requested that staff compile a summary of changes to establishing authority for all bodies, not just decision-making bodies. The Task Force also directed staff to agenda a future item to revisit the following bodies: Library Commission, War Memorial Board of Trustees, Juvenile Probation Commission, Historic Preservation Commission, Airport Commission, and Health Commission.

Vice Chair Bruss moved to remove the Access Appeals Commission from the Charter and instead codify its functions under the Board of Appeals in the Administrative Code. Ms. Kittler seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Board of Supervisors Veto Authority for Split Appointments

The Task Force discussed inconsistencies in its prior decisions regarding whether the Board of Supervisors should retain veto power over Mayoral appointees for bodies that have split appointments. Ms. Kittler clarified with staff and Vice Chair Bruss that the Task Force has been consistent in removing the Board's ability to expressly *approve* Mayoral appointees, but that in some cases it retained the Board's ability to *reject* Mayoral appointees by a two-thirds vote within 30 days and that this is the item before the Task Force. Vice Chair Bruss argued for a consistent standard allowing a supermajority of the Board to reject Mayoral appointees. Ms. Kittler opposed applying veto power to split appointments, stating that each appointing authority should retain control over its own selections.

Ms. Mihal moved to apply the two-thirds veto standard to the Police Commission and Entertainment Commission to align with the other similarly structured bodies. Ms. Hayward seconded the motion and it passed 3-1, with Ms. Kittler opposed.

Standardizing Board of Supervisors Appointment Methods

The Task Force considered whether to standardize the various methods by which the Board of Supervisors appoints members to public bodies. Members acknowledged the complexity of the current system but ultimately agreed that no changes should be made without input from the Board itself and without a clear idea of the problems, if any, that the current system introduces.

Ms. Hayward moved to retain the current appointment structures. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Appointing Authorities for Appeals Bodies

Task Force members recounted their earlier decisions to not make any changes to the Rent Board and referenced similar public sentiment about the Civil Service Commission. After a brief discussion, the

Task Force confirmed its prior decisions regarding appointing authorities for appeals bodies and agreed not to make any changes.

Ms. Kittler moved to retain the existing structures. Ms. Hayward seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Hiring and Firing Authority

The Task Force reviewed its prior decisions to remove hiring and firing authority from most decision-making bodies and confirmed certain exceptions. However, members flagged two items for further discussion at a future meeting: the Civil Service Commission's authority over the Director of Human Resources (distinct from its authority over the CSC Executive Officer) and the Southeast Community Facility Commission's authority over its facility director.

Vice Chair Bruss moved to retain the Board of Appeals' authority to hire and fire its Executive Director. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

In addition, the Task Force members discussed bodies in the City Administrator's Office (ADM). They clarified with Chief Assistant City Attorney Jon Givner that the City Administrator's involvement in jointly hiring division directors alongside the Mayor is simply a historical practice and is not codified. After some discussion of ADM's structure, Ms. Kittler moved to confirm the Task Force's prior decision to transfer hiring and firing authority for the Treasure Island Development Authority and Entertainment Commission to the Mayor. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Naming Conventions

The Task Force discussed standardizing naming conventions for public bodies. Members agreed that decision-making bodies should generally be called "commissions" or "boards," while advisory bodies should be called "councils," with some exceptions for historical or branding reasons.

Mr. Givner confirmed that receiving clear and timely direction from the Task Force would be helpful for drafting legislation. Staff also clarified that the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF) is more an advisory body than a decision-making body, and therefore any broad naming conventions applied to advisory bodies will also apply to the SOTF.

Vice Chair Bruss proposed that the City Attorney's Office rename the Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee to the Children, Youth, and Their Families Commission in its draft legislation. She also proposed making no changes to the names of staff working groups.

Ms. Kittler proposed renaming all advisory bodies to "council," except for the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board, Film Commission, Human Rights Commission, and Commission on the Status of Women, which would retain their names. Accordingly, Task Force members requested that staff produce a list of proposed names for the Task Force to consider at a future meeting.

Confirming Decisions on Term Lengths and Limits

The Task Force confirmed that advisory bodies with sunset dates should have exactly three-year terms. For advisory bodies without sunset dates, members agreed to retain previously adopted term lengths and limits, citing those decisions were made after in-depth conversations. Because the Homelessness

Oversight Commission would be coming back to the Task Force during the December 3rd meeting, they deferred a decision for that body.

The Task Force then considered its prior exceptions to applying standard term lengths and limits to decision-making bodies. Vice Chair Bruss and Ms. Kittler proposed adding a three-term limit for public members of the Children and Families First Commission.

Applying New Term Lengths to Existing Appointees

Ms. Hayward expressed a preference for the second option proposed by staff (applying the new rules on a rolling basis) because it would be the simplest to implement. Ms. Mihal and Ms. Kittler agreed.

As such, Ms. Kittler moved to apply new term lengths only after current appointees complete their existing terms. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Staggering Terms Within Bodies

The Task Force discussed staggering terms within governance bodies that do not already have an effective member staggering process. Ms. Mihal raised the issue of implementing this when there are split appointments between the Board of Supervisors and Mayor, and Ms. Hayward suggested alternating between Board and Mayor appointees consecutively.

After some discussion of the types of bodies to which this action item would apply, the Task Force requested a proposal for staggering terms to avoid quorum issues, particularly for five-member bodies like the Public Utilities Commission.

Implementing Term Limits

Vice Chair Bruss moved that past service will count as no more than one term (regardless of actual length), that future partial terms be counted using the existing “rounding up” rule applied to elected officials, and that term limits are lifetime and by body. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Member Removal For Cause

Ms. Hayward confirmed with other Task Force members that not every for-cause removal of a member of a public body would be due to an ethics violation. Because of this, Ms. Kittler noted that an Ethics Commission hearing as part of the removal process may not be practical.

Following a discussion of the current removal process for non-at-will members, Vice Chair Bruss moved to simplify it. Under the new process, the appointing authority would file charges, the member would be suspended upon service of charges, and removal would require six votes by the Board of Supervisors. There would be no more Ethics Commission hearing prior to the Board of Supervisors vote. Ms. Kittler seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

This change also resolved the issue of how to handle removal of Ethics Commissioners, negating the need for a separate process involving an Administrative Law Judge.

Future Bodies and Templates

The Task Force agreed not to codify templates for creating future bodies in the Charter. Instead, members directed staff to memorialize the Task Force’s recommendations and templates in the final report.

Applying Certain Charter Provisions to Additional Bodies

After some discussion of the implications, Ms. Kittler moved to apply a standard 60-day holdover provision (Charter Section 4.101.5) to all bodies for which the Task Force has defined member terms. Ms. Hayward seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Task Force members agreed that prohibiting advisory body members from seeking elected office would be impractical, given that membership on such bodies can provide valuable training for elected service. Ms. Kittler then moved to extend the existing prohibition on seeking elected office (Charter Section 4.101.1) to all decision-making bodies. Ms. Hayward seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Givner explained that the legal requirement for maintaining meeting minutes (Administrative Code Section 67.16) only applies to bodies established in the Charter, though it is widely practiced. Ms. Kittler moved to require all decision-making bodies, regardless of Charter status, to record meeting minutes. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

The Task Force took a brief recess.

Ms. Hayward left the meeting. With three members present, a quorum was maintained.

7. Operational Improvements for Commissions (Action Item)

Materials: [presentation](#)

Hannah Kohanzadeh, clerk and Principal Project Analyst for the Task Force, presented best practices to strengthen and support the administration of commissions. Ms. Kohanzadeh began by explaining that staff held a meeting on October 20, 2025, with over 65 clerks, secretaries, and commission staff to gather input on mission and commission scope management, onboarding and training, strengths and best practices.

Ms. Kohanzadeh shared current approaches used by commission staff use to ensure commissioners understand their roles and stay focused. Ms. Mihal asked whether staff are equipped to manage commissioners effectively, noting it can be a significant challenge. Ms. Kohanzadeh responded that most respondents were confident in their commissioners’ ability to stay on task. Ms. Kittler shared that her office uses a comprehensive guide combining role descriptions, best practices, and task instructions which, though tedious to initially compile, only requires periodic updates. Ms. Mihal also inquired about managing vacancies. Ms. Kohanzadeh noted varying views on who should lead that process, from the appointing authority to the clerks and staff. In response to a question about City Attorney support, Ms. Kohanzadeh said governance bodies generally feel supported when attorneys attend meetings and noted requests for more education and guidance on commission powers.

Ms. Kohanzadeh reviewed current onboarding and training approaches and shared requests from commission staff for improved resources, including tools like a duty checklist similar to the one suggested by Ms. Kittler. She noted that while many trainings exist, there is little guidance for City staff who serve as clerks or secretaries. She suggested that a checklist or asynchronous resource could help fill

this gap. Ms. Mihal and Ms. Kittler supported creating a standardized tool outlining essential commission tasks. Vice Chair Bruss questioned whether existing trainings for staff and commissioners are effective and asked if any recommendations for commissioner training emerged from staff outreach. Ms. Kohanzadeh said they had not. Vice Chair Bruss recommended the Task Force include in its report the development of a standard checklist and support materials for all commissions, along with commissioner training that goes beyond compliance to support effective participation.

Ms. Kohanzadeh shared the factors commission staff felt led to effective and successful commission meetings. She then shared the fewest, most, and average number of times each type of body held meetings in 2024. She asked the Task Force if they wanted to prescribe the minimum number of times advisory and governance bodies need to meet. Ms. Kittler suggested that each body should state how frequently they should meet and be measured against their own goal. Ms. Mihal and Vice Chair Bruss agreed with Ms. Kittler.

Ms. Kohanzadeh noted that both conversations with City staff and literature reviewed highlighted the need for better commission performance tracking and data maintenance. She outlined three oversight options: creating a new oversight body, assigning the work to the Controller's Office, or having appointing authorities manage it. Ms. Mihal opposed creating a new oversight body, while Ms. Kittler emphasized that appointing authorities should be responsible for their commission and that public concerns should go to the Board of Supervisors. Vice Chair Bruss expressed concern that the accurate and comprehensive list of bodies created through the Task Force process could become defunct without a designated entity to maintain it.

As recommended by the Civil Grand Jury "Commission Impossible" report, Ms. Kohanzadeh asked the Task Force if they wanted to standardize reporting requirements. Ms. Mihal inquired whether advisory bodies should have set publication timelines. Ms. Kohanzadeh stated that the Task Force had previously leaned toward annual reporting instead of quarterly, if any reporting requirements were maintained. Ms. Mihal suggested that even annual reports may be too frequent, as much of the desired information is already available on commission websites, and the intended audience for reports is unclear. Vice Chair Bruss added that while a limited-in-time body might produce a report to summarize its work, she did not support requiring ongoing reporting from standing bodies.

Mr. Givner asked whether the City Attorney should remove the Charter language requiring boards and commissions to submit annual statements of purpose and reports to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. The Task Force agreed to remove these requirements for decision-making bodies. He also asked whether to strike the Charter §4.102 requirement that commissions hire a secretary. The Task Force supported removing it to allow staffing flexibility.

Ms. Kohanzadeh asked if the Task Force wanted to standardize the level of detail required in meeting minutes. The Task Force declined, stating that best practices should not be codified in the Charter and that future technology may assist in producing minutes.

Ms. Kohanzadeh reviewed exist lists of commissions maintained by the City Attorney, Clerk of the Board, and the City Administrator's 311 program. She noted that other jurisdictions, like the Counties of Los Angeles, San Diego, and Santa Clara, assign this responsibility to their Clerk of the Board, but staff made no recommendation. Ms. Kittler suggested not assigning responsibility in the Charter or code,

noting the City Attorney and Clerk of the Board will already have updated information post-Task Force. Ms. Mihal acknowledged the workload required to maintain such a list. When Vice Chair Bruss asked if a decision was needed, Ms. Alonso confirmed the status quo would remain without Task Force direction. Vice Chair Bruss suggested that the responsible offices coordinate maintenance going forward.

Ms. Kohanzadeh concluded her presentation by sharing requested City support from commission and public body staff.

Public comment was received by one speaker:

- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:
Do NOT create another body in the future charged with evaluating performance of bodies being kept. The appointing authority of each board should conduct periodic assessments of their body's performance.

The idea Commissions shouldn't have a dedicated Commission Secretary, and rely instead on a centralized pool of secretaries is a terrible idea, because "*institutional knowledge*" about a given Board's current affairs would vanish.

Your "Evaluation Criteria" suggests keeping the current City Charter requirement each board and commission author and issue annual reports summarizing their activities and accomplishments, distinct from City Department's annual reports.

The annual reports are the best vehicle to inform members of the public, and the respective City Departments, of how well their boards and commissions are functioning.

This Task Force is trying to micro-manage City employees who are serving as a Board's Executive Secretary by trying to dictate how detailed, or brief, the meeting minutes are prepared.

8. **Future Agenda Topics (Discussion Item)**

Ms. Alonso shared that the next meeting is scheduled for December 3, 2025. She noted that the items deferred in today's meeting would likely be scheduled later in December. She also noted that it is likely the Task Force will be able to meet in the Southeast Community Center for the December 18th meeting, which should operate as per usual in terms of technology. Ms. Alonso noted the first meeting of 2026 is January 14th.

Ms. Mihal asked when the Task Force's report drafts would be scheduled. Ms. Alonso stated the first draft would be reviewed on December 18th, with a second version on January 14th. Ms. Mihal questioned whether holding the December 18th meeting at the Southeast Community Center would improve accessibility and suggested postponing the location decision until Chair Harrington returned.

Public comment was received by one speaker:

- Patrick Monette-Shaw expressed his preference for the Task Force to hold its December 18th meeting at City Hall.

9. General Public Comment

Members of the public may comment generally for up to three minutes on matters within the Task Force's purview but not on today's agenda. The Brown Act prohibits the Task Force from taking action or discussing any item not appearing on the agenda, including those items raised at public comment.

Public comment was received by one speaker:

- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:
You must revise your incomplete decision on the "*Long-Term Coordinating Council*" (LTCCC) that assigned just one of the LTCCC's **functions** to another body on 10/15/2025.

The LTCCC focused only on community-based services, because of its utter antipathy to institutional-based skilled nursing facility (SNF) settings. Because of its antipathy, the LTCCC completely ignored the mandate then Mayor Gavin Newsom assigned to it to develop an **integrated** continuum of long-term care system of home, community-based, and most importantly, long-term care services including in institutional-based facilities in San Francisco. The LTCCC completely failed to do anything regarding developing institutional based facilities.

That neglect has led to a severe shortage of SNF's in San Francisco. That has led to discharging somewhere between 3,614 and 12,022 San Franciscans to out-of-county SNF facilities in the last four calendar years.

This Task Force must require the Health Commission assume the LTCCC's function to increase SNF-bed capacity in-county.

10. Adjournment

Vice Chair Bruss adjourned the meeting at 7:16 pm.

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