



Approved Minutes

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

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

Wednesday, January 21, 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/5fdyzncx> 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) 2660 159 2620 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 p.m.

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. With all five members present, a quorum was established.

3. Announcements (Informational Item)

Ms. Kohanzadeh announced that the Task Force is currently reviewing a preliminary draft of its final report. The Task Force may clarify or modify any of its previous decisions at any time until it approves the final report, scheduled for next week's meeting on January 28, 2026. The report is due to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor by February 1, 2026. The Board must then hold a hearing on the Task Force's final report and recommendations by April 1, 2026.

4. Ethics Commission Ballot Access (Action Item)

Materials: [Presentation](#)

Chief Assistant City Attorney Jon Givner opened the item by summarizing the Task Force’s prior tentative direction on the Ethics Commission’s authority to place measures on the ballot. He outlined three unresolved questions: whether the timeline for Ethics Commission and Board of Supervisors (BOS) actions should be extended, whether the BOS should have authority to reject a measure outright, and what vote thresholds should apply when the Ethics Commission responds to BOS amendments. After answering clarifying questions from the Task Force members, Mr. Givner also summarized the Ethics Commission’s counterproposal for a new process, which built in more time throughout.

Patrick Ford, Executive Director of the Ethics Commission, emphasized that requiring a unanimous vote for the Commission to amend and place a measure on the ballot would set a very high bar, ensuring broad consensus. He also supported early departmental engagement to vet proposals before submission to the BOS.

Public comment was received by two speakers:

- Darius Kemp, Executive Director of California Common Cause, strongly opposed the Task Force’s tentative direction and supported the Ethics Commission’s counterproposal that keeps final authority with the Commission.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:
This five-member Streamlining Task Force acknowledged last November the Ethics Commission needs political interference protections, particularly from elected officials. For the past 24 years of the Ethics Commission’s 30+-year existence, Ethics held authority to place measures on the ballot without **ANY** Board of Supervisors review.

You’re playing your stated “*game of chicken*” over who gets the last word about placing measures on the ballot. Today’s two-page handout about Ethics’ ballot measure authority stated Supervisors could vote to approve or amend, but **not** reject, proposed measures. You are now poised to pass a motion to allow Supervisors to outright reject a proposed measure by an eight-vote supermajority, allowing Supervisors to kill an Ethics-proposed ballot measure — the very definition of political interference — overturning 30+ years of precedent! This harms the Commission’s independence and policy making mandates. Leave the current status quo alone, and stop interfering with the Ethics Commission’s independence. Shame on you!

Following public comment, Task Force members deliberated on the details of the proposals. There was general agreement on adopting a longer timeline and requiring departmental engagement, though members differed on how much operational detail should be codified in the Charter. Director Ford provided additional information on the Commission’s current stakeholder engagement practices when placing measures on the ballot.

Several members expressed concern about creating incentives for “poison pill” amendments and debated whether the BOS should have explicit authority to reject a measure outright. Members also considered whether the Ethics Commission should have the ability to override BOS amendments and whether a unanimous vote should be required for that action. After robust discussion, most agreed that unanimity felt overly restrictive.

Chair Harrington summarized the emerging consensus: the Task Force favored a longer timeline, departmental engagement, and BOS authority to reject by supermajority.

After further discussion, Chair Harrington moved to generally accept the process and timeframe in the Ethics Commission's alternative proposal but add that the BOS can reject a measure by a two-thirds supermajority. If the BOS votes to amend or reject the measure, the Commission could remove it from ballot, accept amendments by a 3/5 vote, or override BOS rejection by a unanimous vote (with the final clause amended from a 4/5 vote by Natasha Mihal). The motion died for lack of a second.

Sophia Kittler made a countermotion to generally accept the Ethics Commission's alternative proposal, with a 4/5 vote threshold for the Commission to make additional changes after BOS amendments, but outright rejection by a BOS supermajority ends the process. Vice Chair Bruss seconded the motion.

Task Force members agreed to split the motion into two parts. First, the motion that a BOS rejection by two-thirds vote should end the process passed 3-2 by voice vote, with Ms. Mihal and Chair Harrington opposed. The motion on the remaining provisions (accept the Ethics Commission's proposal and add a 4/5 threshold for the Commission to override BOS amendments) passed unanimously by voice vote.

Under the adopted framework, to be incorporated into the draft Charter amendment language:

- The Ethics Commission must begin the process at least 275 days before the election and provide notice to stakeholders as outlined on slide 3 of the item presentation.
- The BOS may approve a measure by majority vote, amend it by majority vote (sending it back to the Ethics Commission), reject it by supermajority vote (ending the process), or take no action within 90 days (allowing the measure to proceed to the ballot).
- If the BOS amends a measure, the Ethics Commission may withdraw it by a 3/5 vote, accept the amendments and place the measure on the ballot by a 3/5 vote, or make additional amendments and place the measure on the ballot by a 4/5 vote.
- If the Ethics Commission fails to meet the required vote thresholds, the measure dies.

5. Ongoing Commission Responsibilities (Action Item)

Materials: [Presentation from November 19th, 2025](#)

Public comment was invited, but none was received on this item.

The Task Force turned to a discussion of ongoing responsibilities related to commission coordination, maintenance, and training, and whether to assign these duties to a specific entity. Chair Harrington expressed concern that, absent a clear assignment, these tasks could be lost in the lengthy report. He suggested that the City Administrator's Office might be best positioned to take on this role, given its breadth of authority across departments.

Natasha Mihal voiced hesitation about naming any specific entity without stakeholder engagement. Sophie Hayward noted that the current requirement for maintaining the online database of public bodies already rests with the City Administrator's Office. She acknowledged that the department has the necessary reach to manage a centralized list. However, she expressed reservations about assigning training responsibilities to the City Administrator's Office, suggesting that onboarding and legal compliance training might be better handled by the City Attorney's Office or other departments.

Task Force members generally agreed that the report should identify the City Administrator as the lead entity for maintaining a database of public bodies, with partnership from the City Attorney, Controller, and Ethics Commission for other functions such as training and performance evaluation. Members also noted that the current use of the City Administrator's 311 Division to maintain the vacancy database is outdated and problematic.

6. Report Draft (Action Item)

Materials: [Draft Report v.3](#) and [Summary of Changes](#)

Public comment was received by three speakers:

- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:
In your "**Final Report**," include the Budget Analyst's "**Financial Analysis**" full report as an appendix since it was key feature of "*Proposition E*" and a mandated key deliverable [§4.100.1(c)]. This Task Force has a duty to include it; San Franciscan's deserve to have this taxpayer-funded analysis included as easily accessible in your Final Report.

Also in your "**Final Report**," include the final version of your "**Decision Log**" as another appendix, since it fully documents each decision made supporting your Final Report's recommendations.

Then renumber all other Appendices.

In the "**Supplemental Appendices**" document, at a minimum, on the first page of the document you should add cross-reference page numbers to each Appendix for readers' convenience, since it is a 1,000-plus page document. In addition, add searchable Title Page "fly sheets" just before the start of each Appendix of the report to demark where one Appendix ends and the next Appendix begins.

- Lila Holzman, speaking on her own behalf, expressed concern about sunset clauses, noting confusion among stakeholders and Commission on the Environment members about whether commissions would automatically cease to exist after three years. She requested clearer language in the final report to reassure the public that sunset dates are intended as review points, not triggers for automatic elimination.
- Bruce Wolfe asked the Task Force to clarify the definition of "council," observing that the term currently lacks a consistent meaning.

The Task Force reviewed the third working draft of its final report, which memorializes all recommendations and decisions made throughout the commission streamlining process. Chair Harrington opened the discussion by asking staff to clarify how the report and supporting materials would be distributed and preserved for public access. Senior Performance Analyst Joanna Bell explained the plan: to transmit the report with its appendices to the public library. Supplemental appendices – such as memos, presentations, and meeting minutes – will also be available online, and the report will include links to the Budget and Legislative Analyst (BLA) report rather than embedding it as an appendix. She also noted that while the decision log and BLA report were not originally intended for inclusion due to their redundancy with report content and lack of relevance for decision-making, respectively, they could be added to the supplemental appendices if the Task Force preferred.

Chair Harrington raised questions about the long-term availability of these materials. Staff, in consultation with Sophia Kittler on the City's online retention schedule, confirmed that the Task Force's webpage will remain active on the City's website and, after approximately five years, will be archived but still accessible. Staff added that copies of materials transmitted to the Board of Supervisors would also be hosted on the City website. Chair Harrington indicated that this approach was acceptable and emphasized the importance of ensuring that links and library copies provide long-term access.

Chair Harrington confirmed with staff that the sunset date staggering plan that the Task Force approved in its prior meeting would be reflected in the draft legislation. Project Director Rachel Alonso also identified two additional bodies requiring sunset dates: the Veterans Affairs Commission, recommended for June 1, 2029, and the Mission Bay Transportation Improvement Fund (TIF) Advisory Committee, recommended for June 1, 2031. Task Force members expressed no objection. The Task Force also broadly discussed the importance of being explicit in the final report that sunset dates are intended to refresh and confirm the continued relevance of bodies, not eliminate them.

Vice Chair Bruss stated that the Task Force retained the Rent Board's unique process for department head selection, flagging that any changes for consistency should be made during this meeting. Task Force members agreed to uphold their prior decisions for the Rent Board, and Chief Assistant City Attorney Jon Givner clarified that the City Attorney's Office is proposing non-substantive cleanup to the ordinance language.

The discussion then moved to naming conventions. Chair Harrington requested from staff a list of the proposed new names for public bodies. Ms. Mihal pointed out that this list was already prepared for the December 12, 2025 meeting, with two changes subsequently made during the January 14, 2026 meeting to the Commission of Animal Control and Welfare (renamed to "Animal Advisory Council") and the Workforce Investment Board or WISF (kept the existing name).

Finally, Chair Harrington and Ms. Alonso confirmed the Task Force's prior decision regarding the Police Commission's authority to hire and fire the Director of the Department of Police Accountability (DPA).

Before closing the item, Chair Harrington commended staff for producing a clear, well-organized report that enables readers to navigate the Task Force's complex decisions.

7. Future Agenda Topics (Discussion Item)

Project Director Rachel Alonso outlined the timeline for upcoming meetings. She confirmed that the Task Force will vote to approve the final report at its next meeting on January 28, after which the report will be submitted to the Mayor and the Clerk of the Board by the February 1 deadline. Ms. Alonso also noted that the City Attorney's Office is preparing the draft Charter amendment and ordinance, which will be posted online for review by this Friday, January 23.

Looking ahead, Ms. Alonso confirmed that meetings are scheduled for February 11 and February 25, with the latter intended for approval of the draft ordinance and Charter amendment. A tentative meeting is also scheduled for February 4.

Chair Harrington suggested keeping the February 4 meeting on the calendar for now, given the volume of legislation to review, and recommended revisiting the question after Task Force members have seen the draft legislation.

Public comment was received by one speaker:

- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:
Because Task Force Chair Harrington just commented he's assuming files of the Streamlining Task Force will be retained at the Public Library, but is unsure how long audiotapes of the Streamlining Task Force's meetings stored on either WebEx or SFGOV-TV will be retained, I'm reminding this Task Force when the "Mayors' *"Long-Term Care Coordinating Council"* disbanded and the Human Services Agency transferred LTCCC's records to the Public Library, many of the LTCCC's records aren't available in the Government Records Center at the Main Library.

Harrington indicated he's unsure of when the Streamlining Task Force's web site (and archive of its records on its web site), will "*go away*" (i.e., no longer be accessible or maintained), or how long the hyperlinks will be maintained as active links, or broken because the web site may be moved. That's why the "*Decision Log*" and "*BLA Cost Analysis*" **MUST** be included in your "*Final Report*."

8. General Public Comment

No members of the public spoke during the general public comment period.

9. Adjournment

Chair Harrington adjourned the meeting at 2:45 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Chelsea Hall, Senior Project Analyst.