



# Approved Minutes

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

**Daniel Lurie**  
**Mayor**

**Wednesday, January 14, 2026**  
**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/ynce9syp> 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) 2660 754 5080 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.

## Minutes

### 1. Call to Order

Chair Harrington called the meeting to order at 1:02 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. Sophia Kittler was delayed in joining the meeting. With four members present, a quorum was established.

### 3. Announcements (Informational Item)

Ms. Kohanzadeh announced that the Task Force has completed its initial review of all bodies and is currently reviewing its preliminary decisions in preparation for drafting 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. Ms. Kittler arrived at the meeting during Item 3.

#### 4. Approve Draft Minutes (Action Item)

- a) [December 12, 2025](#)
- b) [December 18, 2025](#)

Sophie Hayward noted that the 2<sup>nd</sup> version of the draft report published for the Task Force's consideration did not reflect all the Task Force's decisions accounted for in the minutes.

Public comment was received by one speaker.

- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:  
In a clear “*cover up*” of this Task Force's actual deliberations, these meeting minutes inaccurately report the actual sequence of events during your 12/12/2025 meeting. At 3:01:00 on that meeting's [audiotape](#), Chair Harrington introduced a motion to revisit the “*Reentry Council*” not listed on the agenda, for discussion **at a future meeting** to assess whether to change your initial recommendation. Harrington's motion for a future meeting was seconded.

At 3:05:10 on audiotape, Task Force member Kittler asked “*Separating ‘best practices vs. Brown Act’ rules ... would it be inappropriate for us to discuss this today?*”

City Attorney Givner, also present, had to know that for “*Special Meetings*” of policy bodies, the City Attorney's “*Good Government Guide*” specifically states: “*For special meetings, **the body may consider ONLY matters stated on the agenda; there are no exceptions.***” You discussed and took action anyway. Why are you covering-up performing this Brown Act violation?

Ms. Hayward motioned to approve the December 12, 2025, and December 18, 2025, meeting minutes. Vice Chair Andrea Bruss seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### 5. Deferred Decisions (Action Item)

Materials: [Presentation](#)

Chelsea Hall, Senior Project Analyst with the City Administrator's Office, presented on deferred decisions for the Ethics Commission, Department of Building Inspection Appeals Boards (Access Appeals Commission, Board of Examiners, and Abatement Appeals Board), Relocation Appeals Board, Public Utilities Citizen's Advisory Committee's seats, Mission Bay Transportation Improvement Fund Advisory Committee, and staggering sunset dates.

##### Ethics Commission

The Task Force previously deferred all decisions regarding the Ethics Commission because they wanted more information regarding the body's ability to place measures directly on the ballot. The Ethics Commission may place measures directly on the ballot by a vote of 4 of 5 members. Since 1993, the Ethics Commission has placed five measures on the ballot. Ms. Hall noted the Task Force may opt to align the Ethics Commission to the governance body template. She also shared six options to address the Ethics Commission's ability to place measures on the ballot. The options aimed to improve the public's engagement with proposed measures, strengthen departmental engagement in legislative development, and minimize implementation challenges.

The Task Force deliberated on aligning the Ethics Commission to the governance body template. Vice Chair Bruss motioned to accept staff recommendations: keep the Ethics Commission in the Charter, remove the ability of members to be recalled, make all seat qualifications desirable at the body level, and retain for-cause removal, the broad appointment structure, current term lengths and limits, and hiring/firing authority. Ms. Kittler seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

The Task Force deliberated whether to alter the Ethics Commission's ability to place measures on the ballot. They considered six options proposed by staff and informed by conversations with Ethics Commission staff. The Task Force sought to maintain the Ethics Commission's independence to propose ballot measures while balancing a desire for increased legislative involvement and engagement with the public and departments. Chair Harrington noted that the public may inherently trust the measures proposed by the Ethics Commission as positive additions to the City without understanding their full impact.

The Task Force considered whether the Board of Supervisors (Board) should participate in the vetting of the Ethics Commission's ballot measures. They discussed the appropriateness and necessity of preventing delays by imposing a shot-clock for the Board to consider such measures. Natasha Mihal, Ms. Kittler, and Vice Chair Bruss expressed a desire for the Board to publicly state their position on proposed measures for increased transparency and accountability. The Task Force discussed concerns that if the Board has the final say, ethics measures could be amended with "poison pills" to halt them from advancing to the ballot.

Chair Harrington motioned to send the Ethics Commission's proposed ballot measures to the Board, to require the Board to act (i.e. hold a hearing, amend, and vote), to socialize with impacted departments, and to ultimately allow the Ethics Commission to retain final authority over its ballot measures. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The motion failed 2-3 by voice vote with Vice Chair Bruss, Ms. Kittler, and Ms. Hayward in opposition.

Ms. Kittler motioned to require the Ethics Commission to put their proposed measure forward to the Board and require the Board to act on the measure within a designated period. The Board may approve or amend the drafted proposal. If the Board fails to act on the proposed measure during the specified timeline, by a 4/5 vote the Ethics Commission may place the measure as submitted to the Board on the ballot. If the Board makes amendments, then the Ethics Commission must reconsider the revised measure and take an up and down vote whether to place the revised measure on the ballot or to withdraw it. Vice Chair Bruss seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-1 by voice vote with Chair Harrington opposed.

Chair Harrington requested details about the Ethics Commission's revised ballot process based on the motion be added to the January 21, 2026, meeting agenda.

The Task Force clarified with Chief Assistant City Attorney Jon Givner that the Charter legislation must align with the decisions outlined in their final report, which must be approved by February 1, 2026.

### Department of Building Inspection Appeals Boards

The Task Force confirmed their recommendation for the Access Appeals Commission: move it to the Board of Appeals while maintaining its functions and structure.

The Task Force later re-opened Item 5 to discuss the Department of Building Inspection Appeals Boards after Item 7 at Project Director Rachel Alonso's request. Ms. Alonso clarified that the Department of Building Inspection can convene a passive meeting body to fulfill the Board of Examiners' role if needed. Vice Chair Bruss motioned to eliminate the Board of Examiners. Ms. Kittler seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

### Relocation Appeals Board (RAB)

Vice Chair Bruss motioned to keep the RAB and limit its jurisdiction to OCII's jurisdiction. Ms. Hayward seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

### Public Utilities Citizen's Advisory Committee

The Task Force opted to take no action, leaving the Public Utilities Citizen's Advisory Committee's number of seats as is.

### Mission Bay Transportation Improvement Fund Advisory Committee (MBTIFAC)

Chair Harrington stated that the authorizing legislation is worded in a confusing way. While it is clear that the corresponding fund must exist as long as events are held at the Chase Center, it is not clear whether the MBTIFAC is also required to exist. Ms. Kittler stated while the body seems to be duplicative of other efforts ongoing in the City, it does good work and has excellent members.

Ms. Kittler motioned to keep the MBTIFAC and add a sunset date of three years. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Chair Harrington and Ms. Hayward emphasized that adding a sunset date to a body does not indirectly eliminate a body but rather creates a mechanism to ensure the body is reevaluated later to ensure it is active and useful, a best practice adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

### Staggering Sunset Dates

Ms. Alonso noted that the Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families Service Provider Working Group should have been noted in the presented materials as scheduled for reauthorization in 2030. The Task Force accepted that edit. Staff confirmed the Task Force did not need to take a motion to approve of the scheduled sunset timeline. The Task Force approved of the sunset timeline.

Public comments were received by 14 speakers.

- Madison Tam spoke on behalf of Supervisor Matt Dorsey in favor of retaining the Mission Bay Transportation Improvement Fund Advisory Committee (MBTIFAC). Ms. Tam noted that the establishing legislation requires the MBTIFAC to exist as long as its corresponding fund exists, which must exist as long as there are events at the Chase Center.
- Alice Rogers, President of the South Beach Rincon Mission Bay Neighborhood Association, urged the Task Force to keep the MBTIFAC.
- Bruce Agan, member of the South Beach Rincon Mission Bay Neighborhood Association, urged the Task Force to keep the MBTIFAC.

- Paul Melbostad, former Ethics Commissioner, urged the Task Force to maintain the Ethics Commission’s ability to place measures directly on the ballot. He contested the notion that the Ethics Commission’s measures do not have sufficient public engagement.
- Walter Park, President of the Access Appeals Commission (AAC), advocated to keep the AAC as is.
- Arnie Lerner, Vice President of the AAC, urged the Task Force to keep the AAC as is. He noted that he the AAC has experts that work with individuals to find compliant solutions to appeals that other bodies would not be able to adequately offer.
- Veronica Consalvo asked whether the Ethics Commission must hold public meetings.
- Esther Marks advocated for the Ethics Commission to retain their ability to place measures directly on the ballot.
- JR Eppler, President of a neighborhood association, urged the Task Force to maintain the MBTIFAC.
- Yaman Salahi, Vice-Chair of the Ethics Commission, urged the Task Force to maintain the Ethics Commission’s ability to place measures directly on the ballot. He noted the Ethics Commission’s openness to proposed options 2 and 3 to codify additional opportunities for the participation of city departments and the public in the Ethics Commission's ballot proposition process.
- Patrick Ford, Executive Director of the Ethics Commission, appreciated the Task Force staff’s collaboration on the development of the proposed options to alter the Ethics Commission’s ability to place measures on the ballot. He emphasized the importance of the Ethics Commission retaining the ability to place items on the ballot. He expressed a preference to implement option 3.
- Allison Goh, Co-President of the League of Women Voters of San Francisco, stated her organization supported implementing options 1, 2, or 3 regarding the Ethics Commission’s ability to place measures on the ballot. They opposed options 4, 5, and 6 in order to maintain an independent Ethics Commission.
- Sean McMorris, California Common Cause, opposed implementing proposed options 4, 5, or 6 regarding the Ethics Commission’s ability to place measures on the ballot. His organization supported options 1, 2, and 3 to encourage the Board of Supervisors to weigh in on the proposed measures but maintains the Ethics Commission’s independence.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:  
On 11/5/2025, this Streamlining Task Force deferred taking action whatsoever on the 33-year-old Ethics Commission — because you were completely “*stuck*” on whether the Ethics Commission should retain its voter-approved authority to place measures on the municipal ballot independently.

Now 70 days later, you finally deigned getting around to consider this “*Regulatory Body*.” You acknowledged the Ethics Commission needs to be protected from interference from political interference, particularly from elected officials. Comically, since you are running out of time, Deputy City Attorney Givner just reminded you, proposed Charter amendments are bound by what’s in your “*Final Report*” due end of January. But you just elected to defer decisions again about the Ethics Commission to your 1/21/2026 meeting, playing a “*game of chicken*” over who gets the last word about placing measures on the ballot — Ethics Commissioners or Board of Supervisors. Stop this nonsense! Maintain the status quo of the Ethics Commission!

## 6. Police Commission (Action Item)

*Materials: [Presentation](#) and [Attachment A - Police Employee Discipline Process](#)*

Chair Harrington opened the item by noting that changes to the Police Department's employee discipline process may be beyond the Task Force's scope. Ms. Hall presented information so the Task Force could clarify the Police Commission's role in the employee discipline cases within the purview of the Department of Police Accountability.

Chair Harrington clarified whether all the proposed options recommended that the Police Commission make the final decision in a discipline case; Ms. Hall confirmed. He further confirmed that all employees may sue and take their case to Superior Court after the Police Commission's decision.

Public comment was received by four speakers.

- Paul Chignell, Legal Defense Administrator for the San Francisco Police Officers Association (POA) and former police captain, noted that similar propositions to change the Police Department employee discipline process were rejected by the Board of Supervisors during the Mayor Feinstein Administration. He also noted the Police Commission has changed over the past decade.
- Veronica Consalvo shared her experiences with police officers and the history of policing in the United States.
- A member of the public advocated for greater police accountability measures.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary: Before discussion among Streamlining Task Force members began on this agenda item, Chair Harrington made prefatory remarks stating that he believed that the issue of Police Department employee discipline — ostensibly including discipline matters raised by the Department of Police Accountability — were beyond the purview of this Streamlining Task Force, and that he believed it was a topic area and a policy matter best left to deliberation and decision-making purview of the Police Commission. and that this Streamlining Task Force should NOT be making any decisions about Police disciplinary matters.

Yet other Streamlining Task Force members pressed ahead on the behalf of Mayor Lurie and SPUR, and decided they should weigh in and make recommendations about what the Police Commission, and/or San Francisco's Board of Supervisors, should do to create a process for Police Department employee disciplinary matters.

This is yet more proof you are exceeding your voter-approved "*Proposition E*" mandate.

During public comment, Chair Harrington asked Mr. Chignell if the discipline system works effectively. Mr. Chignell stated the discipline system is successful. Ms. Kittler asked Mr. Chignell if it would be best for the Police Commission to weigh in on the discipline process during an initial hearing or an appellate hearing. Mr. Chignell stated the POA believes the discipline process operates effectively as it is, so no changes are necessary. He noted only the most serious discipline cases currently advance to the Police Commission. Vice Chair Bruss inquired whether the Task Force decision to require at least one Police Commissioner to be an attorney with trial experience was sound. Mr. Chignell affirmed the decision; he also noted it is critical for community members to serve on the Police Commission to continue to strengthen community trust in the Police Department.



The Task Force acknowledged altering the Police Department's employee discipline process is a complex task with significant implications. They deliberated whether the Police Commission should continue holding evidentiary hearings or serve solely as an appellate body. Mr. Givner clarified that the Charter currently authorizes the Police Commission to make final discipline decision, however the decision can be contested with an administrative law judge (ALJ). He reminded the Task Force of their previous decision to allow the Police Chief to make all discipline decisions, including decisions beyond ten-day suspensions. He noted these changes must appear in the Task Force's proposed Charter amendment.

The Task Force debated whether to recommend an alternative practice. Ms. Mihal stated that the Task Force could recommend an approach that the Board of Supervisors may disagree with, in which case the Board could choose to exclude that provision from the proposed Charter amendment. The Task Force discussed which approach could ensure the most fair, transparent, and efficient results for the officers, the public and the City. Ms. Mihal stated that the cost of an ALJ should not be part of the calculus of which option to adopt if it leads to a better, fairer process for all parties.

Ms. Kittler motioned to adopt Option B: to keep the ten-day suspension process and switch the ALJ and the Police Commission roles for more serious cases so that the ALJ holds the evidentiary hearings and the Police Commission serves as the appellate body making final decisions. Vice Chair Bruss seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-1 by voice vote with Chair Harrington opposed. Chair Harrington explained his opposition, stating that he was concerned that the right experts were not included in the discussion.

## **7. Report Draft (Action Item)**

*Materials: [Presentation](#), [Draft Report](#), and [Draft Supplemental Appendices](#)*

Before staff began the presentation, the Task Force commended them for their work.

Henry O'Connell, Senior Analyst from the Controller's Office, presented the second working draft of the Task Force's final report. Mr. O'Connell requested the Task Force share their thoughts on the framing of recommendations, the Task Force's process and goals, and the executive summary.

Mr. O'Connell walked through the edits made to the first draft of the report, including clarifying that the Task Force's approach evolved over time, reframing changes to powers and duties, particularly hiring and firing authority, and framing the cost data from the BLA report. Chair Harrington requested that the average cost of a commission be replaced with the range of commission costs to provide a more accurate sense of the cost to administer a body. The Task Force requested that the hiring and firing authority be further clarified to note that even for decision-making bodies, the mayor is not required to consult with a commission but is encouraged to do so. Ms. Hayward noted the section on the number of meetings the Task Force held did not aptly describe how much stakeholder and public engagement the Task Force conducted while making their decisions. Chair Harrington requested that some inactive bodies recommended for elimination have more thorough body-level descriptions explaining the Task Force's decision, but staff clarified that they may not have additional information for all of the active bodies.

Mr. O'Connell also noted other edits staff adopted per the Task Force's feedback, including updating the total counts of seats and members in all bodies, replacing language indicating if a body had "no recommendation," adding an appendix of all votes and noting when decisions were split, and editing

body-level summary language around the type and application of the templates. Chair Harrington noted the request to revise the body-level language meant to add clarity to the report rather than obscure or alter any decisions made.

The Task Force requested to revisit decisions regarding which entity in the City should maintain an accurate list of active bodies. Ms. Hayward advocated that the City Administrator's 311 program not be tasked with maintaining the list because the information they can compile is only as good as the information they receive from departments.

The Task Force discussed whether name changes should be included in the body-level summary. Members decided to continue using the original body names in the report to preserve their flexibility on name updates as they finalize their legislation. The Task Force concurred with renaming the Commission of Animal Control and Welfare to the Animal Advisory Council and maintaining the Workforce Investment San Francisco Board (WISF)'s name as-is. The Task Force decided to revisit the name of the Youth Commission, Human Rights Commission, and Immigrant Rights Commission later.

Mr. O'Connell reviewed the updates to the report's formatting, of which the Task Force approved. Ms. Hayward noted that the public integrity section was out of order in the report.

Mr. O'Connell walked through new content added to the second draft of the report, including an executive summary, recommendations for managing and improving public bodies, summary statistics, and several appendices. Chair Harrington noted that the executive summary incorrectly described that "most" Charter bodies were moved to code; he flagged that 23 of the 42 Charter bodies remained in the Charter so the word "most" is incorrect. Flagging that the staff meeting with commission clerks and secretaries was not the only engagement conducted to gather insights on how to improve management of public bodies, he requested the section's introduction be reworked.

Ms. Alonso noted that some bodies will not be moved to the Administrative Code, as the City Attorney's Office believes there are more appropriate sections of the Municipal Codes for some, such as the Health or Planning Code. Mr. Givner expanded on her note, stating that the Administrative Code will include a reference section of the other bodies and their code citations. Mr. O'Connell shared next steps to draft the third iteration of the draft report. He noted the final report will be presented to the Task Force on January 28<sup>th</sup> for approval.

Public comment was received by 10 speakers.

- Shakema Straker, Community Organizer at the Coalition of Homelessness, shared a statement on behalf of Isaac Langford who sits on seat seven of the Shelter Monitoring Committee. Ms. Straker urged the Task Force to keep the Shelter Monitoring Committee to provide transparency and accountability.
- Jennifer Friedenbach, Executive Director of the Coalition of Homelessness, advocated for the retention of all homelessness bodies. She also opposed allowing the mayor sole appointing authority and having members serve at will.
- Colleen, a social worker, shared her experience working with the unhoused community. She stated the shelter bodies are important since they provide a space for the unhoused community to advocate for themselves. She urged the Task Force to retain the Shelter Monitoring Committee.



- Veronica Consalvo shared her experience staying in a shelter when she first moved to San Francisco. She urged the Task Force to keep all shelter bodies.
- Richard Knee, former Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF) member, urged the Task Force not to rename the SOTF as a council. He also opposed the Task Force’s decision to make SOTF qualifications desirable, not mandatory, to remove the external organizations’ member nomination process, and application of term limits.
- David advocated to maintain the shelter bodies.
- Angela Calvillo, San Francisco Clerk of the Board, urged the Task Force to maintain the Youth Commission in the Charter.
- A commissioner from the City of Berkeley stated that the Task Force’s decisions weaken homelessness oversight and direct democracy.
- Charles Pitts advocated to retain the Shelter Monitoring Committee and Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary: First, this Streamlining Task Force lies. Then you move to a cover up. All in the second draft of your “*Final Report*.” How is this different from Trump’s Administration dismantling democratic norms in the United States?

**The Lie:** The “*Score Card*” in your “*Decision Log*” listed up until December 10 this Task Force was evaluating just 150 bodies, which suddenly grew to 152 bodies by December 15, without any discussion of where two bodies had come from.

**The Cover-Up:** You are deleting references that your decisions were based on “*aligning to templates*.”

Your meeting minutes document that 58 motions about 114 bodies (51%) were to **align** to your templates disproves whether you relied on “*templates*” that you’re now backtracking about. Other documents presented today clearly state proposed decisions are to “*align with templates*.” You’re now trying to “*reframe*” that templates were mere “*standards*”? Why are you engaging in this cover-up?

Chair Harrington requested staff to add revisiting the name of the SOTF to a future agenda.

## 8. Future Agenda Topics (Discussion Item)

Ms. Alonso stated that the Task Force will meet on January 21, 2026. She acknowledged the Task Force’s desire to revisit the decision regarding which entity in the City should maintain an accurate list of active bodies and details about the Ethics Commission’s authority to place measures on the ballot.

Ms. Alonso also noted that the Task Force is scheduled to approve the final report at its January 28, 2026, meeting. It should approve the report as-written or have very minor modifications so the report may be transmitted to the Clerk of the Board by Friday, January 30, 2026, prior to the February 1<sup>st</sup> deadline. She shared that the City Attorney’s Office will discuss draft Charter legislation at the January 28<sup>th</sup> meeting as well.

Ms. Alonso said that meetings were also scheduled for February 11<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> for the City Attorney’s Office to share further iterations of the draft legislation, with the Task Force needing to approve the

legislation at its February 25<sup>th</sup> meeting, prior to the March 1<sup>st</sup> deadline. The group could also meet on February 4, 2026 if needed. There would likely be no meetings in March 2026.

Public comment was received by two speakers.

- Charles Pitts advocated for the creation of an SRO oversight body.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:  
I urge the Streamlining Task Force to schedule an agenda item for your January 21 meeting to reconsider your initial decisions to eliminate several of the homelessness oversight bodies. Even Mayor Lurie’s “*State of the City*” address on January 15 closes with Lurie stating, “*We are just getting started, and we aren’t going to leave anyone behind.*” But you **ARE** leaving the homeless behind, as everyone can see. It’s clear that this Streamlining Task Force doesn’t give a crap about preserving participatory democracy in San Francisco, particularly not caring about the homeless.

Lurie is again invoking “*streamlining*” [by eliminating oversight bodies] to revise our City Charter that already grants him significant power. And your so-called streamlining gives Lurie even more authority that will come at the expense of the very people he was elected to govern — including San Francisco’s homelessness population. Reverse your initial recommendations on homelessness advisory bodies!

The Task Force told Mr. Pitts that the Building Inspection Commission receives the public’s feedback on SRO oversight.

## 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.

The Task Force took Item 9 after Item 3 to allow members of the public to speak without waiting until the end of the meeting.

Public comment was received by 16 speakers.

- Jim Haas, member of the City Hall Preservation Advisory Committee, supported the Task Force’s decision to eliminate the City Hall Preservation Advisory Committee.
- Sarah Souza, Chair of the Immigrant Rights Commission (IRC), advocated to maintain the IRC’s name as is instead of altering it to the Immigrant Rights Council. She stated the name of the consistency of the body’s name is important given the federal landscape.
- Flo Kelly advocated for all housing bodies to be retained.
- Solange Cuba advocated for the retention of the Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee and Our City, Our Home Committee.
- Lupe advocated for the retention of all housing bodies. She noted that removing the Housing Oversight Committee from the Charter would provide the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) with unchecked power. She also noted the Shelter Monitoring Committee is important to make sure shelter standards are enforced.
- Larry Ackerman advocated for all housing bodies to be retained.

- Veronica Consalvo asked if the Task Force would take into consideration the comments made during public comment. She also inquired about the Brown Act rules. She also expressed concern for unhoused individuals.
- Jeff Jacquinto stated concern with the Task Force’s process, highlighting worries of dismantling citizen oversight and government accountability measures.
- Jennifer Friedenbach, Executive Director of the Coalition on Homelessness, expressed her organization’s opposition to the elimination of the Shelter Monitoring Committee; Shelter Grievance Committee; Our City, Our Home Committee; and the collapsing the Local Homeless Coordinating Board into the Homeless Oversight Commission (HOC); and removing HOC from the Charter. She stated she understood the government’s perspective on consolidating these bodies but noted the community’s perspective is different which is why they are all significant.
- Lucas Illa, an on the ground organizer at the Coalition on Homelessness, opposed the removal of the Shelter Monitoring Committee and the Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee and making the HOC an advisory body. Mr. Illa stated that the shelter bodies are the only places where unhoused individuals may communicate their concerns with HSH.
- Zach Bullinger advocated retaining the Shelter Grievance Committee to support unhoused individuals’ rights and dignity.
- Lea McGeever advocated maintaining the Shelter Monitoring Committee and Shelter Grievance Committee to continue to provide unhoused individuals direct forums to engage with local government.
- Joshua Rudy Ochoa, Community Partnership Specialist of the Youth Commission, advocated for the Task Force to retain the body’s name rather than renaming it the “Youth Council.”
- Armando Bravo Martinez opposed the Task Force’s decisions on housing bodies.
- Evelyn Posamentier urged the Task Force to maintain the Shelter Monitoring Committee and Shelter Grievance Committee.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:  
It’s ironic Chair Harrington just clarified the Brown Act forbids policy bodies from discussing and taking action on something not listed on a published meeting agenda. But, you did exactly that, discussing and taking action on the “*Reentry Council*” policy body that had **not** been listed on your December 12 meeting agenda, which led to my filing a Sunshine complaint that will be heard by the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force on January 20.

The solution to many public commenters who spoke passionately today begging this Task Force to reconsider your initial decisions to eliminate several homelessness oversight bodies, is to introduce and pass a motion to place reconsideration of the homelessness services bodies on the 1/21/2026 meeting agenda.

This Task Force needs to stop handing unchecked executive rule to the Mayor, and weakening commissions in the name of so-called “*efficiency*”; this just a pretext to move toward an authoritarian government.

## 10. Adjournment

Chair Harrington adjourned the meeting at 6:09 pm.

---

Minutes prepared by Hannah Kohanzadeh, Principal Project Analyst.