From: Jordan Wasilewski

Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2025 7:01 PM

To: commissionstreamlining

Subject: Thoughts About Advisory Bodies From A Former Commissioner

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hi all,

My name is Jordan Wasilewski (pronouns she/her or they/them), and I am a former advisory commissioner. I served on the city's Single Room Occupancy Task Force from 2017-2019, when the commission stopped meeting. It sunsetted at the end of 2021.

I think that, when judging the merits of any advisory body, we must also consider not only if they are meeting, but if policy or legislative recommendations are being made to the department or the Board of Supervisors.

I'll use my service as an example. During my time on the Task Force, I was on a seat reserved for SRO Tenants, and I introduced and the commission as a whole passed two major recommendations, the first was to expand the city's all gender restroom ordinance to include common bathrooms (both toilet rooms and shower rooms) in SROs, and the second was to cap rent at 30% for permanent supportive housing tenants. Both of these recommendations were forwarded to the Board of Supervisors, where a supervisor introduced them, they passed the Board of Supervisors unanimously, and are now law.

I write this not to toot my own horn, but to set a standard for what advisory commissions should be doing, which is, advising the department(s) and the Board of Supervisors and pushing for whatever policy and legislative change is necessary, hence the name. Furthermore, if there is pending legislation or policy relating to the subject matter jurisdiction of the board, they should be actively working on recommendations, whether to support, oppose, or modify.

If the advisory commission is not making recommendations, whether in reaction to or proactively policy or legislation, their continued existence should be re-evaluated. Advisory bodies are not country clubs.

I also wanted to state that I would eventually call for the SRO Task Force to be dissolved, for even though there were recommendations being advanced, there were a lot of absences (for example, 3 members who were employees of the SRO Collaboratives were absent for 3 months, even though the collaboratives should have made time for their availability) and conflicts of interest, as well as general inefficacy.

So, I think something that should be asked of advisory bodies is if they are actually advising departments or their appointing authorities and to give concrete examples.

Just my two cents

-Jordan (she/they)