

From: [Alonso, Rachel \(ADM\)](#)
To: [Hartwick, Alek \(ADP\)](#)
Cc: [Westbrook, Victoria \(ADP\)](#); [commissionstreamlining](#)
Subject: RE: Reentry Council - December 12th Commission Streamlining Task Force Meeting
Date: Tuesday, December 2, 2025 7:49:13 PM

Thanks, Alek – I have shared this with the Chair and Vice Chair. We will post the public comment letter on our website as well. I will try to let you know tomorrow or Thu what the outcome of the meeting was; feel free to reach out as well if you don't hear from me.

Rachel Alonso (pronouns: she, her, hers)
Project Director – Assets and Infrastructure
Office of the City Administrator
City Hall, Room 352
1 Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
rachel.alonso@sfgov.org
628.652.1262

Note: I work remotely on Fridays

From: Hartwick, Alek (ADP) <alek.hartwick@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, December 2, 2025 6:36 PM
To: Alonso, Rachel (ADM) <rachel.alonso@sfgov.org>
Cc: Westbrook, Victoria (ADP) <victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org>; [commissionstreamlining](#)
<commissionstreamlining@sfgov.org>
Subject: Reentry Council - December 12th Commission Streamlining Task Force Meeting

Good Afternoon Rachel,

Per our discussion earlier, I'm reaching out to request the Commission Streamlining Task Force's recommendations for the Reentry Council be added (or re-agendized) to the agenda for the December 12th meeting and if possible to meet with the Task Force Chair, Ed Harrington prior to the December 12th Task Force meeting.

The Reentry Council met formally to discuss the recommendations and hold a formal vote as a policy body if they wanted to move forward as a passive body or appeal the recommendations and remain in the administrative code as a formal body. Though the flexibility of a passive body was certainly an important consideration, the Reentry Council decided to appeal the recommendations with strong support voiced in public comment from community stakeholders.

In the coming days and weeks the Commission Streamlining Task Force will receive letters of support as well as public comment from public and private stake holders of the Reentry Council. I've attached a letter from a Board of Supervisor Appointee to the Reentry Council with lived experience as a returning citizen. Many of the letters of support will touch on the

strengths of the Reentry Council however I'd like to highlight the discussion points from the Lorenzo's letter and the public comment we received which underscores why relegating the Reentry Council to a passive body was met with such strong opposition.

The Council actively involves formerly incarcerated individuals in leadership and advisory roles (e.g., as appointed members who must have served time in a correctional facility). This ensures that programs and policies are informed by the lived realities and direct feedback of the people they serve. Eliminating the Council would effectively silence the voices of the people most impacted by reentry policy, reversing more than a decade of equity-focused policymaking. A formal body in the administrative code provides transparency, public participation, community oversight and trust from the individuals and families most impacted by the criminal legal system.

The Reentry Council's appointment structure—requiring representation from both the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors—reflects San Francisco's core values and institutional commitment to shared governance. By embedding these appointments in the Administrative Code, the City signals that reentry policy is not a peripheral concern but a priority that warrants formal oversight, public accountability, and meaningful participation from those most impacted. San Francisco has earned national recognition for its leadership in reentry reform precisely because it created a body that grants real authority to directly impacted individuals and ensures collaboration across multiple systems. Few jurisdictions codify their reentry councils in law; the structure is both distinctive and foundational to the City's equity-centered approach. Maintaining the Reentry Council in the Administrative Code also guarantees consistent departmental participation. When agencies are required by statute to attend, report, and collaborate, reentry policymaking remains coordinated and comprehensive. If the Council were downgraded to a passive body, participation would become voluntary and risk being shaped by individual departmental priorities, undermining the collective, citywide strategy that effective reentry demands.

Transforming the Reentry Council to a passive meeting body would significantly reduce legislative advocacy and funding oversight.

The Reentry Council currently functions as the Local Advisory Committee (LAC) for significant justice-related grants, including multimillion-dollar funding streams from State and Federal funding. The Reentry Council advises how to identify and prioritize the most pressing needs to be addressed (to include target population, target area, etc.); the strategies, programs and/or services to be undertaken to address those needs; development of the grant project; and ongoing implementation of the grant project which is reported out regularly to the council.

Transferring LAC responsibilities to a passive body would:

- Reduce transparency in how reentry funds are allocated
- Limit input into program design
- Weaken oversight of City implementation
- Increase risk of misaligned or duplicative services (precisely what the Task Force is

trying to reduce)

Furthermore, with the Sentencing Commission slated for elimination and the Community Corrections Partnership having no required meeting cadence, the Reentry Council is the only remaining body capable of providing reliable, cross-sector oversight of reentry funding and policy.

The Council's Legislation, Policy & Practices Subcommittee actively analyzes, drafts, and supports legislation at both the State and local levels. When the full Council votes to support a bill, it elevates that position to the City's State Legislation Committee—a critical pathway for ensuring San Francisco formally supports justice-related legislation.

A passive body **cannot** serve this function.

Without the Reentry Council:

- Legislative advocacy for reentry-related bills would become inconsistent
- Responsibility would fall to individual departments, which may not have the mandate, capacity, or political alignment to advance legislation
- Cross-department consensus on City positions would be harder to achieve
- The community's voice in shaping legislation would be significantly diminished

This would materially weaken the City's ability to influence State policy at a time when reentry legislation is accelerating rapidly.

For these reasons, and in alignment with the Reentry Council's formal vote and the strong opposition expressed by community members and appointed representatives, we respectfully request the opportunity to discuss this further.

Thank you so much for your consideration, time, and guidance so far!

Alek Hartwick
Legislative Affairs Manager
San Francisco Adult Probation Department
Phone: (628) 652-2341
alek.hartwick@sfgov.org