

Patrick Monette-Shaw

San Francisco, CA 94109

Phone: [REDACTED] • e-mail: [REDACTED]

November 29, 2025

Ed Harrington, Chair
Commission Streamlining Task Force
c/o City Administrator's Office
City Hall, Room 316
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

"The Civil Grand Jury itself had recommended criteria that should be included in board and commission annual reports. Don't eliminate these reports!"

Re: **Don't Eliminate Commission Annual Reports**

Dear Chair Harrington and Commission Streamlining Task Force,

The Task Force voted to *eliminate* requiring all bodies retained, whether in the Charter or in the Administrative Code to submit annual reports, as currently required by City Charter §4.103, apparently deciding to strip the current requirement out of the City Charter. They did so, despite the fact that the Civil Grand Jury itself had recommended several criteria that should be included in board and commission annual reports that are supposed to be prepared as separate and distinct from the annual reports each City Department submits.

The Task Force voted to eliminate the annual reports, with Task Force member Natahsa Mihal (the City Controller's appointee to the Task Force), lamely asserting on November 19 that even annual reports "*may be too frequent*," and asserted that if members of the public want to track down the performance of a given board or commission, they can comb through a board or commission's web site, and pore through the meeting minutes of the body's meetings.

"Eliminating the current Charter provision requiring annual reports runs contrary to the principle that although San Francisco requires annual performance appraisals for each City employee, there's no appraisal of, or self-assessment by, the boards and commissions."

That's bonkers!."

That's impractical, because the Health Commission, for instance, holds two meetings of the full Commission each month, and once-per-month meetings of three or four separate Health Commission subcommittees. That suggests that to gauge the performance of the Health Commission's accomplishments in a given year, members of the public would have to hunt down approximately 80 meeting minutes to read through. More brazenly, Mihal suggested the "*intended audience for [annual reports] is unclear*." It was brazen, precisely because Charter §4.103 clearly states that **each** board or commission "*shall file such report with the Mayor and the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors*." If Mihal doesn't know who the intended audience for annual reports has been all along, she should **not** have been appointed to the Streamlining Task Force, since her motion that was approved will deprive the Mayor and Board of Supervisors with this clear performance-based assessment tool.

And it would be a labor of love not just for members of the public. A future Grand Jury, the incumbent Mayor, and the 11 members of the Board of Supervisors who might be interested in assessing the effectiveness and accomplishments of the 80-plus boards and commissions that may be retained would all have to go through the same nonsense, rather than being able to locate a single annual report. This is the *opposite* of the "*efficiency*" the Streamlining Task Force claimed it was looking for in a more responsive City government, right? The Streamlining Task Force also chose not to include a recommendation in its final report describing how the meeting minutes of each board and commission prepares following each of their meetings be prepared. That failure would clearly make having to hunt through meeting minutes to assess the performance of a specific board and commission more difficult lacking specificity in preparing meeting minutes.

Eliminating the current Charter provision requiring annual reports runs contrary to the principle that although San Francisco requires annual performance appraisals for each City employee, there's no appraisal of, or self-assessment by, the boards and commissions. That's bonkers!

The Charter's annual reports for boards and commissions is separate from the City's Administrative Code §2A.30 that requires each City Department head to submit an annual report about the activities and accomplishments of their department. Why would you assess the department's performance, and individual employee's performance, but not the board or commission's performance?

December 2, 2025

Don't Eliminate Commission Annual Report

Page 2

And although the November 19 [meeting minutes](#) now available clearly states on page 13 that the Task Force had removed the annual report requirements apparently *only* for decision-making bodies, the [sample draft](#) Charter change language City Attorney Jon Giver is presenting to the Streamlining Task Force on December 3 shows the annual report requirement will be removed from **all** boards and commissions, not just decision-making bodies.

You should revisit this decision, and reverse it! Keep the requirement for Annual Reports in the City Charter!

Sincerely,

/s/

Patrick Monette-Shaw

cc: Rachel Alonso, Project Director, City Administrator's Office