A photograph of the San Francisco City Hall dome, a large, ornate, light-colored stone structure with a prominent central dome and a spire. The building is set against a clear blue sky. A dark green rectangular box is overlaid on the left side of the image, containing white text.

# **Deferred Decisions & Consistency Checks**

## **Part 3**

**Commission Streamlining Task Force**

December 12, 2025

# Today's Discussion

- Over the past few months of public meetings, **the Task Force has deferred certain decisions to a later meeting**
- We have held two such meetings on 11/19 and 12/3
- Today, we will be discussing 10 additional items



# Overview of the Task Force's Decisions

**150** total bodies  
(116 active, 34 inactive)

**150** decisions made

- Keep: 81
- Eliminate: 65<sup>1</sup>
- No recommendation: 2<sup>2</sup>
- Deferred: 2<sup>3</sup>

*“Decision-Making Bodies”*

Body Category	Keep				Eliminate <sup>1</sup>	No Rec. <sup>2</sup>	TBD <sup>3</sup>	Total
	In Charter	Move to Code	In Code	TBD Est. Auth.				
Governance	16	9	3		3			31
Appeals & Regulatory	3	5	4				1	13
Other	3		3	1	1		1	9
Advisory		5	18		51	1		75
Staff Working Group		3	8		10	1		22
<b>Current Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>150</b>

Notes:

1. 34 were inactive bodies no longer meeting; 31 were active
2. No recommendations for Joint Zoo Committee (only exists in an MOU between RPD and the Zoo) and the Sentencing Commission (sunsetting in mid-2026)
3. Commission Streamlining Task Force (for 12/18 meeting); Ethics Commission (for 1/14 meeting)



# Agenda

1

## Body-Specific Decisions



1. Human Rights Commission (HRC)
2. Fine Arts Museum Board of Trustees (FAM)
3. Refuse Rate Board
4. Committee on Information Technology (COIT)
5. Retiree Health Care Trust Fund Board (RHCTFB)

3

## Cleanup and Standardization



6. Member Qualifications for Governance Bodies
7. Revisiting Compensation and Benefits
8. Revisiting Contract Authority
9. Confirming Appointing Authority Exceptions
10. Applying Naming Conventions

# Body-Specific Decisions

(5 deferred decisions)



# 1. Human Rights Commission

## Overview of Body and Outcomes of Previous Decisions

Purpose	Investigates citizen complaints of discrimination, advises City leaders, resolves community disputes based on individual or systemic discrimination complaints, reviews department contracts, and helps ensure City contracts, programs, and services comply with civil rights requirements—using tools like public hearings and subpoenas when needed
Current Type	Task Force voted to make HRC an <b>advisory body</b> at the October 15, 2025 meeting
Outcome	Keep
Template Alignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Moved establishing authority to Administrative Code</li><li>• Reduced term length to three years</li><li>• Added four-term limits</li><li>• Removed budget and contract approval authority</li><li>• Removed department head hiring and firing authority</li></ul>
Exceptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Retain name</li><li>• No sunset date applied</li></ul>
Other	Update and clarify which functions and duties belong to HRC as a commission versus a department. Delete any outdated functions assigned to the Commission. Reassign Commission functions to the Department, as seen fit.

# 1. Human Rights Commission

## Commission versus Department

- The Board of Supervisors established HRC as a commission in 1964 via an ordinance amid rising civil rights concerns. HRC was added to the Charter in 1990 via Proposition J.\*
- The Charter and code language encompassing HRC's duties and responsibilities for the Commission are set forth in [Charter § 4.107](#) and [Administrative Code § 12A.5](#).
- Distinctions between the Commission and the Department's functions are complicated to identify since throughout the Charter and Code one name is used to refer to both.



See Handout on Human Rights Commission



\*Prop J (1990) reduced the number of HRC commissioners from 15 to 11 and was placed on the ballot by 10-1 vote by the Board of Supervisors.

# 1. Human Rights Commission

- **Action Item:** Update and clarify which functions and duties belong to the commission or department

	Current Functions	Citation	Current Function Execution	Future Function Proposal
1	Investigate complaints of unlawful discrimination against any person*	Charter § 4.107(1) and (5) Admin Code § 12A.5(g)	Department	Continue – Department
2	Ensure the civil rights of all persons	Charter § 4.107(2) Police Code Arts. 1.2, 33, 38, 49	Commission and Department	Continue - Department
3	Create operational rules to protect human rights and draft legislation to continue protecting human rights for the Board of Supervisors as needed	Charter § 4.107(7)	Commission and Department	Continue - Department
4	May hold hearings, issue subpoenas, take testimony, and issue orders	Charter § 4.107 Admin Code § 12A.5(a)	Commission	Continue - Department
5	Ensure that the affirmative action plans of each department of the City are current and are being properly implemented	Charter § 4.107(3)	Department	Continue – Department
6	Develop, support, and coordinate voluntary programs that promote equal opportunities and help fix unfair treatment caused by past discrimination in San Francisco	Admin Code § 12A.5(h)	Department	Continue - Department
7	Oversee and direct the Office of Racial Equity	Admin Code § 12A.19	Department	Continue - Department

\*HRC may submit written recommendations to resolve discrimination or represent the citizen that brought the case forward in these instances



# 1. Human Rights Commission

- **Action Item:** Update and clarify which functions and duties belong to the commission or department

	Current Functions	Citation	Current Function Execution	Future Function Proposal
8	Further the efforts to eliminate prejudice and discrimination by supporting, consulting, and collaborating with local associations, working/professional groups, religious groups, ethic or national origins groups	Admin Code § 23A.5(c-d)	Commission and Department	Continue – Commission and Department
9	Collaborate with local and state entities on the development and implementation of programs and practices uplifting and protecting human rights	Admin Code § 12A.5(e)	Department	Continue – Department
10	Enforces employment, public accommodations, housing, AIDS/HIV, anti-discrimination law	Police Code Arts. 1.2, 33, 38, 49	Department	Continue - Department
11	Collect and keep accurate information on related issues	Admin Code § 12A.12	Department	Continue - Department
12	Review and require changes to forms asking about marital status to include domestic partnership fields	Admin Code § 12A.17	Department	Continue - Department
13	With the Mayor’s approval, require City entities to support HRC’s requests for information to furthering human rights protections	Admin Code § 12A.5(f)	Department	Continue - Department

# 1. Human Rights Commission

- **Action Item:** Update and clarify which functions and duties belong to the commission or department

	Current Functions	Citation	Current Function Execution	Future Function Proposal
14	Issue rules and regulations to execute the ordinance establishing HRC's duties	Admin Code § 12A.10	Commission	Continue - Department
15	Create and share educational materials on what is and how to combat prejudice and discrimination	Admin Code § 12A.5(b)	Department	Continue – Department
16	Help people in the city understand each other better and work together with government agencies, community groups, and others to end discrimination and fix the effects of past discrimination by providing information, advice, and support.	Charter § 4.107(4)	Commission and Department	Continue – Commission and Department
17	Defines unfair real estate selling and buying practices that the HRC may investigate	Admin Code § 12A.8-9	Department	Continue - Department
18	Implement the provisions of ordinances prohibiting discrimination in all contracts and subsequent subcontracts, franchises, leases, concessions or other agreements for or on behalf of the City and County	Charter § 4.107(6)	Department and Other (Contract Monitoring Division)	Modify and Continue - Department
19	Connect and consult with peer departments in the Bay Area	Admin Code § 12A.7	Commission and Department	Continue – Commission and Department

# 1. Human Rights Commission

- **Action Item:** **Delete** any outdated or defunct functions.

	Current Functions	Citation	Current Function Execution: Commission or Department	Function Continuation?
1	Report on the implementation of each departments' affirmative action plans to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors	Charter § 4.107(3)	Commission	<b>Delete</b> Drafting reports is unnecessary since City officials and the public may refer to the Commission's minutes to check on the status of reported implementation
2	Establish an Advisory Council on Human Rights	Admin Code § 12A.6(a)	Commission	<b>Delete</b> Task Force recommended eliminating this inactive subcommittee on 7/16/25
3	May establish special committees	Admin Code § 12A.6(b)	Commission	<b>Delete</b> Does not need to be codified; all public meeting bodies may establish committees.
4	Write a report for the Mayor and Board of Supervisors at least once every three months	Admin Code § 12A.11	Department	<b>Delete</b> Task Force has previously recommended removing reporting requirements
5	Hold all meetings publicly	Admin Code § 12A.16	Commission	<b>Delete</b> Does not need to be codified; all public meeting bodies are required to hold public meetings

## 2. Fine Arts Museum Board of Trustees

### Recap of 10/1 Meeting Discussion:

- Task Force Members **voted to partially align** the Fine Arts Museum Board of Trustees to the governance body template and asked staff to propose a maximum number of members.
- Currently there are 7 members; Charter language states that “The Fine Arts Museums Board of Trustees shall consist of **62 members** ... the number of Trustees may be increased or decreased from time to time as needed, provided that the number of Trustees shall not be more than 62”

### Proposed Change:

- Retain some flexibility; amend Charter language to state that “The Fine Arts Museums Board of Trustees shall consist of no more than **20 members** ... the number of Trustees may be increased or decreased from time to time as needed, provided that the number of Trustees shall not be more than 20”



### 3. Refuse Rate Board

#### Recap of 11/5 Meeting Discussion:

- Task Force Members **voted to partially align** the Refuse Rate Board to the governance commission template by adding standard term lengths and limits for the public member (4-years, 3 terms).
- Open question of whether these term lengths and limits are appropriate given unique cyclical nature of refuse rate-setting.

#### Proposed Approach:

- Apply 4-year terms.
- **Limit of 3 terms would be OK, but precedent to not have a term limit** where appointees need to build additional technical expertise through participation in the body. Task Force may choose to not add term limits.
- **Ensure holdover appointments** do not expire, making an exception to prior decision to apply 60-day holdover provision to bodies in the Administrative Code.





## 4. Committee on Information Technology (COIT)

- **Action Item:** Determine whether the two public seats should be retained
- **Staff recommendation:** Remove the two public (non-voting) seats

### Permanent Voting Members

1. Mayor
2. President of the Board of Supervisors
3. City Administrator (Chair)
4. Controller
5. Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
6. Human Rights Commission (HRC) Executive Director
7. Chief Information Officer
8. Chief Information Security Officer

### Rotating Voting Members

The Chair recommends department heads from the listed policy areas for two-year terms, subject to approval by the permanent members

1. Public Protection
2. Human Welfare and Neighborhood Development
3. Community Health
4. Culture and Recreation
5. General Administration and Finance
6. Public Works
7. Transportation
8. Commerce

### Non-Voting Members

Voting members select **two members:**

- Cannot be City employees
- Must have expertise in Information and Communication Technology (ICT) innovation and advances, emerging ICT applications, and related public policy issues



## 5. Retiree Health Care Trust Fund Board (RHCTFB)

### Recap of 11/5 Meeting Discussion

- Questioned whether RHCTFB could be combined with Retirement Board
- Voted to move the RHCTFB from Charter to Administrative Code

### Challenges with Moving RHCTFB to Administrative Code

- Charter provides for split appointments and elected members
- Moving to Admin Code requires deleting the **body** from Charter but adding **new Charter language** that restricts the BOS's ability to modify the board's appointment structure

### Options:

**Option 1:** Confirm 11/5 decision to move RHCTFB to Administrative Code; add Charter language about appointments

**Option 2a:** Keep RHCTFB in Charter. Add language allowing for a merger *by majority vote of RHCTFB and Retirement Board*

**Option 2b:** Keep RHCTFB in Charter. Add language allowing for a merger *by BOS ordinance*



# Cleanup and Standardization


(5 deferred decisions)



## 6. Member Qualifications

### Governance Bodies with Seat-Specific Requirements

- **Action Item:** Consider whether to apply desirable, body-level seat qualifications to an additional 4 governance bodies.
- On 12/3, the Task Force directed staff to create a list of governance bodies that still have seat-specific, mandatory qualifications.
  - Purpose: Change those qualifications to desirable, body-level guidelines.
- Task Force's past decisions on governance bodies with seat-specific qualifications:
  - **4 bodies\*** updated to desirable, body-level qualifications
  - **1 body** had no changes due to state/federal requirements (First Five)
  - **1 body** is TBD (Ethics Commission)
  - **4 bodies'** qualifications were not explicitly discussed (*detailed on next slide*)





## 6. Member Qualifications

### Governance Bodies with Seat-Specific Requirements

- **Action Item:** Consider whether to apply body-level, desirable seat qualifications (or no qualifications) to an additional 4 governance bodies.

Body Name	Seat Qualifications (Current)
Elections Commission	<b>Specific requirements for 3 out of 7 seats:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Mayor’s appointee must have experience in election administration;</li><li>• the City Attorney’s appointee in election law;</li><li>• the Treasurer’s appointee in financial management;</li><li>• and the remaining appointees must be broadly representative of the general public.</li></ul>
Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors	<b>Specific requirements for 4 out of 7 seats:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• At least four directors must be regular Muni riders.</li><li>• Body-level requirement: All must have knowledge or experience in government, finance, labor relations, or public transportation.</li></ul>
Police Commission	<b>Specific requirements for 1 out of 7 seats:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• At least one of the Mayoral appointees must be a retired judge or an attorney with trial experience.</li></ul>
Public Utilities Commission	<b>Specific requirements for 4 out of 5 seats:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Seat 1: experience in environmental policy and environmental justice issues</li><li>• Seat 2: experience in ratepayer or consumer advocacy</li><li>• Seat 3: experience in project finance</li><li>• Seat 4: expertise in water systems, power systems, or public utility management</li><li>• (Seat 5: member at-large)</li></ul>








## 6a. Member Qualifications Elections Commission

Current Qualifications	Proposed Qualifications
<p><b>Specific requirements for 3 seats:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Mayor’s appointee must have experience in election administration;</li><li>• the City Attorney’s appointee in election law;</li><li>• the Treasurer’s appointee in financial management;</li><li>• and the remaining appointees must be broadly representative of the general public.</li></ul>	<p>Qualifications for commissioners that are desirable, but not required, include a background or experience in financial management, election law, or election administration. Appointees should be broadly representative of the general public.</p>




## 6b. Member Qualifications

### Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors



Current Qualifications	Proposed Qualifications
<p><b>Specific requirements for 4 out of 7 seats:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• At least four directors must be regular Muni riders.</li><li>• <i>Body-level requirement:</i> All must have knowledge or experience in government, finance, labor relations, or public transportation.</li></ul>	<p>Qualifications for commissioners that are desirable, but not required, include a background or experience in government, finance, labor relations, or public transportation.</p>






## 6c. Member Qualifications

### Police Commission

Current Qualifications	Proposed Qualifications
<p><b>Specific requirements for 1 out of 7 seats:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• At least one of the Mayoral appointees must be a retired judge or an attorney with trial experience.</li><li>• No other qualifications.</li></ul>	<p>[None]</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Qualifications for commissioners that are desirable, but not required, include legal or trial experience.</p>





# 6d. Member Qualifications

## Public Utilities Commission

Current Qualifications	Proposed Qualifications
<p><b>Specific requirements for 4 out of 5 seats:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Seat 1: experience in environmental policy and environmental justice issues</li><li>• Seat 2: experience in ratepayer or consumer advocacy</li><li>• Seat 3: experience in project finance</li><li>• Seat 4: expertise in water systems, power systems, or public utility management</li><li>• (Seat 5: member at-large)</li></ul>	<p>Qualifications for commissioners that are desirable, but not required, include a background or experience in environmental policy and environmental justice issues, ratepayer or consumer advocacy, project finance, water systems, power systems, or public utility management.</p>




## 7. Revisiting Contract Authority

- **Action Item:** Confirm and clarify decisions on decision-making bodies' ability to approve contracts.
- On 8/20, the Task Force decided to continue the **status quo (current abilities)** for governance bodies. This became a component of the governance commission template.
- The Task Force's subsequent votes on relevant decision-making bodies have been consistent with this decision.
  - However, questions arose over whether it meant the legal status quo or current practice.

### Contract Approval Authority for Decision-Making Bodies

Overview of Current State



- No Contract Approval
- Chapter 6
- Allowed by Charter
- In Practice Only
- Allowed by State/Federal Law



# 7. Revisiting Contract Authority




## Legal status quo:

- Bodies subject to **Chapter 6** of the Administrative Code can approve contracts.
  - Chapter 6 departments: Public Works, MTA, Airport, Port, Public Utilities, and Recreation and Park
  - Authority to approve construction contracts above \$1.17M and professional services contracts that support construction above \$230k.
- **BOS can adopt ordinances** requiring commissions to approve certain contracts and restricting the department head's authority to execute.
  - *Example:* BOS requires commission president approval for some emergency contracting and sole source grants under Chapter 21G.
- **Some other commissions must approve** a small number of contracts per the Charter.
  - *Example:* Health Service Board must approve the health plan agreements.



## Current practice status quo:

- In addition to the above, for **Chapter 21** departments, many governance commissions have decided to exercise their policymaking authority to require departments to submit contracts to them for review.
  - However, commission approval does not legally bind department decisions regarding the contract.



# 7. Revisiting Contract Authority: Options

Least  
restrictive

1

Continue the **status quo**.

2

Allow commissions to **approve only certain types** of Ch. 21/21G contracts.  
(Choose threshold based on amount or duration.)

- Note: Existing thresholds vary greatly depending on the type of contract/service.
  - Ch. 6 threshold: Above \$1.17M for construction, above \$230k for services that support construction
  - HSC threshold: Above \$29k

3

Allow commissions to **advise** on Ch. 21/21G contracts but not approve them.

4

Continue the **legal status quo** and state that commissions **cannot review or approve** contracts **except where allowed by the BOS (e.g., Ch. 6) or state/federal law**.

5

**Prohibit commissions from reviewing/approving contracts** and **restrict the BOS** from making additional exceptions.

Most  
restrictive


If the Task Force restricts contract approval by selecting any option between **#2-5**, it might also consider requiring departments to regularly report on contracts to the commission.



## 8. Revisiting Compensation and Benefits

### Current State


- **Compensation** for members of public bodies:
  - Members of certain bodies receive stipends
  - Board of Supervisors (BOS) approves compensation by ordinance or in the annual budget
- **Health benefits** for members of public bodies:
  - Members of certain bodies can opt into receiving City health benefits (but at full price)
  - Charter Section 12.102 authorizes the BOS to decide which bodies are eligible for benefits
    - BOS makes these decisions by ordinance in Administrative Code Section 16.107
    - Somewhat arbitrary; some decision-making bodies are ineligible
    - Generally excludes advisory bodies – those members are not City “officers” (Charter language)



## 8a. Revisiting Compensation and Benefits

### Advisory Bodies: Compensation

- **Action Item:** Clarify who should decide whether advisory body members receive stipends.
- During its 7/16 meeting, the Task Force made a tentative decision on compensation and benefits for the members of advisory bodies.
  - *Tentative decision:* Make an explicit statement that advisory body members are ineligible for health benefits and that compensation decisions remain at the discretion of **appointing authorities**.
    - Could result in inequities
    - Conflicts with current compensation rule: Members can receive compensation only if the *Board of Supervisors* has adopted an ordinance authorizing it.
- **Staff Recommendation:** Make an explicit statement that advisory body members are ineligible for health benefits and that compensation decisions remain at the discretion of the **Board of Supervisors**.





## 8b. Revisiting Compensation and Benefits

### Advisory Bodies: Benefits

- **Action Item:** Confirm prior decision on advisory body health benefits.
- On 7/16, the Task Force tentatively decided that advisory body members should be ineligible for City health benefits.
  - This would remove the ability to enroll in health benefits from the following advisory bodies,\* though the Task Force stated that benefits should not be taken away from anyone currently using them:
    1. Youth Commission (0 members enrolled) (*already advisory*)
    2. Commission on the Environment (**1 member enrolled**)
    3. Commission on the Status of Women (**2 members enrolled**)
    4. Film Commission (0 members enrolled)
    5. Human Rights Commission (0 members enrolled)
    6. Small Business Commission (0 members enrolled)

Note: Citywide, **only 15 people** accessed health benefits through their membership on a public body in 2023.



Accompanying Handout:  
**Attachment A**



## 8c. Revisiting Compensation and Benefits


### Decision-Making Bodies

- **Action Item:** Decide whether to standardize rules on compensation/benefits for decision-making bodies.
- During its 8/6 meeting, the Task Force deferred its decision on compensation and benefits for the members of decision-making bodies.
- **COMPENSATION:** **17** out of 39\* retained decision-making bodies had members receiving stipends in 2023.
- **BENEFITS:** **31** out of 39 retained decision-making bodies are eligible to purchase health insurance through the City. However, only **8** of those bodies have any uptake:
  1. Board of Appeals (**1 member**)
  2. Historic Preservation Commission (**1 member**)
  3. Juvenile Probation Commission (**1 member**)
  4. Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors (**1 member**)
  5. Planning Commission (**2 members**)
  6. Police Commission (**4 members**)
  7. Public Utilities Commission (**1 member**)
  8. Recreation and Park Commission (**1 member**)




Accompanying Handout:  
**Attachment A**

\*Count includes Law Library Board of Trustees, a state body that the Task Force recommended removing from the Charter.



## 8c. Revisiting Compensation and Benefits Decision-Making Bodies

- *(Informational)* Retained decision-making bodies that are **ineligible** for health benefits:
  1. Assessment Appeals Board
  2. Board of Directors of the SF Downtown Revitalization & Economic Recovery Financing District
  3. Children, Youth and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee
  4. Elections Task Force
  5. Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District Public Financing Authority No. 1
  6. In-Home Supportive Services Public Authority Governing Body
  7. Refuse Rate Board
  8. Treasure Island Development Authority Board of Directors



## 8c. Revisiting Compensation and Benefits

### Decision-Making Bodies

- **Action Item:** Decide whether to standardize rules on compensation/benefits for decision-making bodies.

Options:

1


#### **Compensation:**

- A. Remove stipends
- B. Keep stipends at BOS discretion

2

#### **Benefits:**

- A. Remove benefits
- B. Keep benefits at BOS discretion
- C. Expand eligibility to all (or most) decision-making bodies




## 8d. Revisiting Compensation and Benefits

### Additional Decisions

The Task Force should also:

1. **Decide whether/where to memorialize these decisions (if different from status quo).**
  - Staff Recommendation: Article IV of the Charter
2. **Confirm and vote on the inclusion of a grandfather clause:** benefits/compensation will not be taken away from anyone who currently has them.






## 9. Confirm Appointing Authorities

- **Action Item:** Review decisions for appointing authorities and confirm exceptions.
- Only the governance commission template specifies an appointing authority (Mayor)
- Out of the 20 governance commissions that the Task Force has kept:
  - 14 already aligned with this standard (only the Mayor can appoint members)
  - **6 were given exceptions:**

Body Name	Governance Template Exception
Asian Art Commission	Continue allowing the commission to nominate members for the Mayor to appoint
Children and Families First Commission	State law requires BOS to appoint all members
Children, Youth and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee	Maintain split MYR/BOS appointments
Fine Arts Museums Board of Trustees	Board of Trustees nominates members for the Mayor to appoint
Planning Commission	Maintain split MYR/BOS appointments
Police Commission	Maintain split MYR/BOS appointments





## 10. Applying Naming Conventions

- **Action Item:** Review and confirm proposed names for all bodies.
- On 11/19, the Task Force suggested the following naming conventions:
  - a) Advisory bodies should be “**Councils**”
    - *Exceptions:* Commission on the Status of Women, Film Commission, Human Rights Commission
  - b) Decision-making bodies should be “**Commissions**” or “**Boards**”
  - c) No specific convention for Staff Working Groups
- Proposed new names for each body are in **Attachment B**.
  - *Exceptions/proposals for consideration include:* Sheriff’s Department Oversight Board; Southeast Community Facility Commission; Advisory Council to the Disability and Aging Services Commission



Accompanying Handout:  
**Attachment B**

