



Draft Minutes

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

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

Wednesday, September 3, 2025
1:00 pm

City Hall, Room 408
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/4x36bp3u> 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 665 9092 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.

Agenda

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)
Jean Fraser, Vice Chair	seat 5 - Mayor's designee (expert in open and accountable government)
Andrea Bruss	seat 3 - City Attorney's designee
Sophie Hayward	seat 1 - City Administrator's designee
Natasha Mihal	seat 2 - Controller's designee

Hannah Kohanzadeh, the clerk, called roll. Andrea Bruss had a planned absence. With four members present, a quorum was established.

3. Announcements (Informational Item)

The clerk noted changes to the meeting structure: general public comment would be held at the end of the meeting and public comment would be limited to two minutes per person. Commenting on these changes, Chair Harrington hoped they would strike a balance of hearing from the public while also getting through the agenda, since the hearing room was booked for another meeting at 3:30pm. Chair Harrington also remarked that the Task Force is exploring other room options in City Hall to enable the Task Force to hold longer meetings.

4. Consent Calendar (Action Item)

The Task Force considered approval of the draft minutes for the August 6, 2025 and August 20, 2025 meetings.

Public comment was received by two speakers:

- Molly Bodkin stated the Task Force should not only consider eliminating and consolidating bodies but also expanding bodies. Ms. Bodkin shared a framework in which to review bodies within three areas: the public's involvement and oversight, labor and tenant concerns, and the protection of the vulnerable. She encouraged the Task Force to keep the voters' will and intent of creating bodies at the core of their decision making.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:
During your 8/20/2025 meeting, David Pilpel expressed support for the Citizen's General Obligation Bond Committee (CGOBOC), including City Services Auditor oversight. Pilpel proposed folding in all city bond oversight — including the MTA Bond Oversight Committee and SFPUC's Revenue Bond Oversight Committee (RBOC) — under CGOBOC. Pilpel is ill-informed. The Streamlining Task Force's "Commission List" (formerly titled "Commission Workbook"), lists RBOC as item 152 using a "strikeout," and reports RBOC is inactive. Doesn't Pilpel understand the Board of Supervisors sunsetted RBOC in January 2025?

The MTA Bond Oversight Committee should NOT be folded into CGOBOC's workload. CGOBOC already has enough on its plate overseeing general obligation bonds, which are qualitatively different from MTA revenue bonds, and CGOBOC's duties were already expanded to perform the City Services Auditor oversight, including review and disposition of the Whistleblower Program reports.

The Board of Supervisors decision to "sunset" RBOC was a deliberate removal of independent oversight.

The Task Force unanimously approved the meeting minutes for August 6, 2025, and August 20, 2025.

5. Adult Probation, District Attorney, Emergency Management, and Fire Department Public Safety Public Bodies (Action Item)

Project Director Rachel Alonso presented the evaluation criteria results prepared by staff for the Community Corrections Partnership, Reentry Council, Real Estate Fraud Prosecution Trust Fund Committee, Sentencing Commission, Disaster Council, and Fire Commission. She began her remarks with an overview of the Task Force's process and timeline, noting that Task Force decisions are not binding and that the Task Force can change decisions up until approving its final report by February 1, 2026. She noted that by the Task Force must approve legislation to be introduced to the Board of Supervisors by March 1, 2026. At that point, there will be two paths to actualize the Task Force's recommendations. For bodies in the Charter, the Board of Supervisors has until July 2026 to decide whether to place any Charter amendments on the ballot for the November 2026 election. For bodies in the Administrative or Municipal Codes, the Task Force will submit an ordinance to the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Alonso explained how the bodies under consideration were reviewed. Firstly, the bodies were evaluated against the Task Force's evaluation criteria. Secondly, staff researched each body by reading the relevant Charter and code sections, contacting City departments to gather more details, and reviewing

public feedback received. Lastly, the bodies were compared to the templates the Task Force created for Governance Commissions, Advisory Committees, and Appeals Boards to assess if any components of the body needed modification to align with the Task Force's ideal states for bodies. After investigation and application of the evaluation criteria and body templates, staff found that the Task Force should take the following actions:

- Community Corrections Partnership – keep
- Juvenile Justice Coordinating council – keep
- Real Estate Fraud Prosecution Trust Fund Committee – keep
- Disaster Council – consider keeping
- Fire Commission – consider keeping
- Juvenile Probation Commission – consider keeping
- Police Commission – consider keeping
- Sheriff's Department Oversight Board – consider combining or eliminating
- Reentry Council – consider keeping or eliminating
- Sentencing Commission – consider eliminating

Adult Probation: Community Corrections Partnership (CCP)

Ms. Alonso outlined that the CCP is legally required to receive state funds. She flagged the CCP is currently not in local code but only in state statute; she recommended the CCP be added to the City's Administrative Code for greater transparency and alignment with the Advisory Committee template. Ms. Alonso suggested that the Task Force consider aligning the CCP to the Advisory Committee template by adding four-year term lengths and three term limits. She advised the Task Force not to place a sunset date on the CCP since it is legally required. She also noted the CCP is a hybrid staff working group and advisory committee and uplifted previous Task Force discussions on potentially removing all staff working groups from City code.

Adult Probation: Reentry Council

Ms. Alonso began her remarks noting the Reentry Council is set to sunset in 2029. She shared that staff investigated whether the CCP and the Reentry Council could be combined but found that they should not since the Reentry Council includes a focus on juveniles that the CCP does not. She stated that many of the Reentry Council's members are department heads, which suggests that the body could continue to meet and meet with the public without being codified. Consequently, the Task Force may choose to eliminate the Reentry Council. However, she raised, if the Task Force opted to keep the Reentry Council and align it to the Advisory Committee template, the number of seats should be reduced from 24 to 15 and term limits should be added for the public members of the body.

District Attorney: Real Estate Fraud Prosecution Trust Fund Committee

Ms. Alonso noted that this body is legally required.

District Attorney: Sentencing Commission

Ms. Alonso shared that the Sentencing Commission is a hybrid staff working group and advisory committee made up primarily of department heads. She uplifted the Sentencing Commission's imminent sunset date of mid-2026, which is likely the soonest a Task Force recommendation would take effect after being codified via an ordinance. She raised that the Task Force could advise the Board of Supervisors to add term limits and term lengths if they reauthorize the Sentencing Commission.

Emergency Management: Disaster Council

Ms. Alonso shared that Director Mary Ellen Carroll of the Department of Emergency Management was

present at the meeting. Ms. Alonso noted that while the Disaster Council is narrowly focused on disaster preparedness, no other body can perform their work. She noted that the body is a hybrid staff working group and advisory committee with a few members of external agencies. She suggested that the Task Force consider not keeping the Disaster Council in code due to its staff working group-adjacent structure and limitations as operating as public body, such as not being able to coordinate and collaborate over email on specific topics or holding meetings with a subset of members who are experts on matters due to quorum concerns. She also noted the value of keeping the body in code to help ensure coordination occurs and to add legitimacy to the body's purpose. Ms. Alonso recommended that the Task Force make exceptions to the Advisory Committee template on term lengths, term limits, and sunset date, since the body is more about coordination than public input and disaster preparedness is an evergreen topic. She advised that the Task Force recommend updating qualifications for the Disaster Council since they are over 30 years old.

Fire: Fire Commission

Ms. Alonso flagged the Fire Commission is a governance commission and the evaluation criteria did not provide a reason to eliminate the body. She noted the Fire Commission could not be consolidated with another body because there is no body with overlapping functions. She noted if the Task Force keeps the Fire Commission, then the Task Force should consider aligning it to the Governance Commission template by adding three-year term limits and removing the body's authority to hire or fire the department head. She also raised that the Task Force may decide to move the Fire Commission out of the Charter and into the Administrative Code – an unresolved Governance Commission template decision. She also suggested that the Task Force consider placing authority to impose all disciplinary action with the Fire Chief and allow the Fire Commission to serve as an appellate body to satisfy the state's appeal requirement.

Chair Harrington stated he was in general alignment with the outcomes Ms. Alonso presented before the clerk called public comment on the bodies discussed.

Public comment was received from one person:

- Patrick Monette-Shaw submitted the following written summary:
The Mayor appoints all five Fire Commissioners. The San Francisco Bar Association rightly noted: "Independent governance of commissions requires that its members [be] independent. The selection of Commissioners should rest with an informed and transparent nomination process. No single branch of government should name all Commissioners."

You're ignoring that truly effective "Governance Bodies" must be independent and have split appointments.

For the Police Commission, Fire Commission, and other Governance Bodies, this Streamlining Task Force is recommending replacing the short-list of three candidates recommended for City department heads, with an undefined, "consultative responsibility only" role, absent guarantees a given Mayor will engage with any Commission in a consultative, or bicameral-like, manner between the legislative and executive branches, let alone consultatively with any specific Governance Commission to preserve checks-and-balances governance.

This Streamlining Task Force is exceeding your mandate by wading into employee discipline. Retain the Fire Commission as it is currently structured.

Chair Harrington opened the Task Force's discussion with the Adult Probation bodies under consideration: Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) and the Reentry Council. Vice Chair Jean Fraser recommended eliminating the Reentry Council so as not to limit the group to public body rules such as quorum or the Brown Act. Chair Harrington supported Vice Chair Fraser's recommendation. Hearing no discussion on CCP, Chair Harrington surmised support to keep the CCP.

The Task Force discussed the District Attorney bodies under consideration: the Real Estate Fraud Prosecution Trust Fund Committee and the Sentencing Commission. Natasha Mihal suggested leaving the Sentencing Commission as-is and not adjusting the body to have term lengths or limits since the body sunsets before the Task Force's timeline could make any changes. Chair Harrington agreed with Ms. Mihal's rationale. Vice Chair Fraser requested that the Task Force's report include language stating the assumption that the Sentencing Commission would sunset and if it is considered for re-authorization, the Task Force recommends its elimination. Task Force members supported Vice Chair Fraser's suggestion. Hearing no discussion on the Real Estate Fraud Prosecution Trust Fund Committee, Chair Harrington vocalized the Task Force's support of the staff's suggestion to keep the body since it is legally required and add language to the code to clarify that the body only needs to meet if the District Attorney calls a meeting to reevaluate the current funding allocations.

The Task Force discussed the Emergency Management body under consideration: the Disaster Council. Vice Chair Fraser noted she has heard the Dept. of Emergency Management (DEM) has been reviewing the Disaster Council and questioned if the Task Force should make any changes ahead of DEM's review. Chair Harrington invited Mary Ellen Carroll, the Director of DEM, to respond. Director Carroll affirmed the staff's suggestion to keep the Disaster Council since DEM is working on editing details of the body since its original drafting in 1972. Ms. Mihal asked Director Carroll whether DEM would do the work of the Disaster Council if the body was not codified. Director Carroll affirmed DEM would continue to carry out the work of the Disaster Council but noted the department would lack a forum to bring together the executive and legislative branches to collaborate on disaster preparedness and the public would miss out on an opportunity to hear about and contribute to the City's disaster preparedness plans. Sophie Hayward confirmed DEM's desire to keep the Disaster Council and its current structure, which is not aligned with the Task Force's templates - noting that there should be exceptions given the importance of this topic, and to allow the Task Force to advise that the body update their membership qualifications. Director Carroll agreed with Ms. Hayward's notes. Ms. Hayward asked Director Carroll and Chief Assistant City Attorney Jon Givner if the membership qualification changes must be codified, to which Mr. Givner replied that the membership qualifications will need to be codified by seat. He recommended that DEM work with his office to draft the updated qualifications which could be introduced to the Task Force at a later date so it could be included in the final Task Force report and drafted legislation sent to the Board of Supervisors. Director Carroll affirmed DEM is working on updates to member qualifications already. Vice Chair Fraser reminded Director Carroll that DEM could engage with the public on disaster preparedness without a commission and raised that commissions are challenging environments to hold dialogues due to the structured processes and rules of public hearings. She encouraged departments and staff to consider alternative methods to connect with the public. Director Carroll noted Vice Chair Fraser's comments and stated the commission also helps keep DEM accountable to share information publicly. Ms. Alonso confirmed Director Carroll was in accordance with the staff's suggestion to keep the Disaster Council, not to impose term lengths and limits or a sunset date, and to update the member qualifications.

The Task Force discussed the Fire Department body under consideration: the Fire Commission. Chair Harrington recapped the proposal to keep the Fire Commission, align it to the Governance

Commission template's three-year term limits, place authority to impose all disciplinary actions with the Fire Chief, and allow the Fire Commission to serve as the appellate body for disciplinary actions. Vice Chair Fraser agreed with the staff suggestion to keep and modify the Fire Commission. She also opened the discussion about whether the Fire Commission should remain in the Charter or be moved to the Administrative Code, stating the body should be added to the Administrative Code so it could be more easily revised by the Board of Supervisors to ensure it is aligned with the City's immediate needs.

Ms. Mihal asked Mr. Givner if the legal requirement for the City to provide fire services impacts where the Fire Commission's authorizing legislation must be housed. Mr. Givner answered that the City does not need a Fire Commission as long as it has appeals body for employee disciplinary actions, so it does not matter where the authorizing legislation is written. Ms. Mihal commented that there may be many positive reasons to move the Fire Commission to the Administrative Code but questioned what the impact of bad actors could be on the Fire Commission in the future if the body were moved out of the Charter, which has maximum protections.

Chair Harrington voiced his belief that certain bodies, like the Fire Commission, are in the Charter because San Franciscans do not want them to change and should a change be sought, the public must authorize it. He affirmed his position that the Fire Commission should remain in the Charter and that the Fire Department should have a commission with public oversight. Vice Chair Fraser refuted the notion, stating that voters vote on issues in a particular year with particular circumstances in mind. She affirmed her belief that elected officials, who are charged with responding to and preventing fires, should be authorized and empowered to respond as quickly and appropriately as possible. She raised concern with prioritizing the voters' voices which may inhibit a functional government that can respond with the level of adaptability required to manage in a changing world. Vice Chair Fraser acknowledged her philosophical difference with Chair Harrington and added that structures created in the past may not be fit for the current world anymore, which is why elected officials need some latitude to make the changes they see fit.

Ms. Mihal commented that if the Task Force placed bodies in the Administrative Code, it would be a referendum on the importance of a body because if the Task Force thought a body should be eliminated, they would eliminate it. She also raised that if the Fire Commission were in the Administrative Code instead of the Charter, the City could have fixed issues stemming from a 2017 legal decision more easily. Chair Harrington affirmed his understanding that core City functions should not be altered by moving out of the Charter.

Ms. Hayward reminded the Task Force that they were all aligned on the Fire Commission regarding moving the disciplinary functions to the department head and allowing the appeals process to occur at the commission and cautioned her colleagues from losing sight of other decisions to be made at the expense of debating whether the Fire Commission should live in the Charter or Administrative Code. She underscored that none of the Task Force members suggested eliminating the Fire Commission. She also stated her core concerns for the Fire Commission were to decide on the disciplinary functions and the appeals process. Ms. Alonso remarked that the Task Force could defer any decisions about establishing authority to November 2025 and deal with a packet of them instead of considering establishing authority body-by-body. Chair Harrington asked the Task Force if anyone would like to make a motion to see if the matter could be resolved.

Vice Chair Fraser motioned to accept the staff suggestion to keep the Fire Commission, align it to the Governance Commission template's three-year term limits, place authority to impose all disciplinary

actions with the Fire Chief, allowing the Fire Commission to serve as the appellate body, and move the body to the Administrative Code. The motion died for lack of second.

Chair Harrington motioned to accept the staff suggestion to keep the Fire Commission, align it to the Governance Commission template's three-year term limits, place authority to impose all disciplinary actions with the Fire Chief, allowing the Fire Commission to serve as the appellate body, and keeping the body in the Charter. The motion died for lack of second.

Ms. Mihal acknowledged she did not want to defer many items but struggled with making the decision that would need to be consistently applied to many bodies.

Ms. Hayward asked her colleagues if they could agree with moving the disciplinary functions to the department head and allowing the appeals process to occur at the commission. Chair Harrington and Vice Chair Fraser affirmed Ms. Hayward's question. Ms. Hayward requested to defer the establishing authority decision to later in the meeting to ensure the Task Force discusses the rest of the bodies on the agenda.

Ms. Alonso and Mr. Givner requested the Task Force formally vote on their decisions while discussing the bodies.

A motion was made for the following:

- Keep the Community Correction Partnership.
- Eliminate the Reentry Council.
- Keep the Real Estate Fraud Prosecution Trust Fund Committee and add language to the code to clarify that the body only needs to meet if the District Attorney calls a meeting to reevaluate the current funding allocations.
- Provide no recommendation for the Sentencing Commission, leave as-is, and state in the report that the Task Force expects the Sentencing Commission not to be re-authorized.
- Keep the Disaster Council, not to impose term lengths and limits or a sunset date, and to update the member qualifications.
- Keep the Fire Commission, add three-year term limits, remove the Commission's ability to remove the department head, move the disciplinary functions to the department head, and allow the appeals process to occur at the commission.

The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

After deliberating over Item 7 (Police Commission), the Task Force completed its discussion on the Fire Commission. Ms. Mihal motioned to keep the Fire Commission in the Charter. Ms. Hayward seconded the motion, and it passed 3-1 by voice vote with Vice Chair Fraser in opposition.

6. Juvenile Probation Public Bodies (Action Item)

Ms. Alonso presented the evaluation criteria results for the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) and Juvenile Probation Commission (JPC).

She noted the JJCC is legally required and stated her personal preference that the body be memorialized in the Administrative Code in addition to state statutes. She flagged the JJCC as a hybrid staff working group and advisory committee and recommended it be aligned with the Advisory Committee template, which would require reducing the number of seats from 20 to 15, adding four-year term lengths, adding three term limits for public members, and being added into the Administrative Code. Due to its legal

status, an exception to the sunset date requirement was suggested.

Ms. Alonso shared that the evaluation criteria suggested keeping the JPC. She uplifted staff's decision to provide no recommendation for template alignment for the JPC since the Task Force did not create sorting criteria or rules to decide when a body should be a Governance Commission or Advisory Committee. Before the Task Force reviewed JPC's alignment with templates, Ms. Alonso directed the Task Force to decide whether they wanted to keep or eliminate the body.

Before the Task Force's discussion and vote on the Juvenile Probation Department (JPD) bodies, public comment was received from 18 speakers:

- Julie Traun, Director of the Court Appointed Programs of the Bar Association of San Francisco, expressed support for independent governance for law enforcement agencies – Juvenile Probation, Police, Sheriff Departments – citing personal experiences collaborating with various commissions to create programs resulting in setting state standards. She emphasized advisory capabilities were insufficient for law enforcement agencies because they cannot act on the feedback and public engagement the way governance commissions can. Ms. Traun also uplifted the significance of the juvenile commissions in providing transparency and accountability since juvenile court proceedings are closed to the public.
- Najuwanda (Naj) Daniels, a labor representative for the Juvenile Probation Department for SEIU Local 1021, advocated for keeping all 20 seats for the JJCC because the diversity of membership is important to the body's process.
- Johanna Rasmussen, Chair of the San Mateo County Juvenile Justice Commission and member of San Mateo County's JJCC, encouraged the Task Force to reject changing any aspect of the bodies. She noted San Francisco's unique position in California as the only county with a JPD. She supported continued independent oversight of JPD via commissions. Ms. Rasmussen also noted that nearly 40% of youth in San Francisco's Juvenile Hall come from neighboring counties, so other counties rely on the commissions to ensure their residents are being cared for as they see fit.
- Emily Goldman, Managing Attorney of the Youth Defender Unit of the San Francisco Public Defender's Office, emphasized that juvenile court cases occur behind closed doors and in almost complete secrecy. She raised the point that JPD had tremendous power shaping the youth involved in the justice system. She commented that it is most often vulnerable communities that appear in the justice system, including a disproportionate volume of black and brown youth. Ms. Goldman advocated for the JPC to remain a governance commission, stating it was insufficient for the public's voices to be heard, they must also be acted upon.
- Meredith Desautels, Directing Attorney with the Youth Law Center and District 8 resident, noted her agency's sweeping lawsuit against the City's treatment of youth in Juvenile Hall 35 years ago. She also uplifted the City's transformation by becoming a national leader in juvenile justice since the lawsuit. She credited much of the change to the JPC being a governance commission. She commented that it is most often vulnerable communities that appear in the justice system, including a disproportionate volume of black and brown youth. She emphasized the significance of public feedback, transparency, and accountability in these systems. Ms. Desautels advocated the Task Force to keep the JPC as-is and to keep it in the Charter.
- Arnold Morales, a concerned resident, advocated for the JPC by stating his belief that the body keeps the juvenile justice system operating fairly and accountable for its actions. He commented that the JPC provides the public with a voice to ensure transparency and oversight of the treatment of youth. He emphasized weakening the JPC to an advisory committee would silence the public's voice and reduce the JPD's accountability. He encouraged the Task Force to consider

what removing or altering the JPD would do and advised them to look at surrounding counties' juvenile justice systems.

- Daniel Macallair, Executive Director of the Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, commented on the uniqueness of San Francisco's JPD in California and oversight mechanisms via the JPC. He recalled when the JPD and JPC were established in 1989 and advocated for the Task Force not to take the City back in time to when the JPC was not around. He urged the Task Force to keep the JPC as is.
- Kisai Henriquez, Director of Youth Justice at Huckleberry Youth Programs, noted their organization oversees San Francisco's community assessment and referral center. They stated the JPC is a bridge between their organization and the relevant City partners to ensure collaborative operations. They commented that the JPC provides a space where community members, community-based organizations (CBOs), and those impacted have a voice and agency over JPD's policy practices. They advocated the Task Force keep the JPC as-is.
- Lucero Herrera, a native San Franciscan who was charged as an adult at the age of 17 and the Bilingual Coordinator at the Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, advocated to keep the JPC as a governance commission in the Charter. Ms. Herrera noted the body provides an important platform for collaboration between the public, CBOs, and City staff.
- Ron Stueckle, Director of Justice Services at Sunset Youth Services and JJCC member, recommended the Task Force make no changes to the JPC, including its placement in the Charter or ability to remove members for cause. Mr. Stueckle affirmed the JPC is one of the most efficient commissions he has witnessed in over 30 years of his career. He cautioned the Task Force from unnecessarily consolidating power under the guise of government efficiency since that always damages vulnerable populations, as seen recently at the federal level.
- Manuel Rodriguez, a JPC commissioner, advocated the Task Force to keep the JPC as-is, especially as a governance commission. He stated the JPC serves as a voice to amplify the community and young people's needs who are in the justice system to work hand in hand, not just with the administrators of the juvenile probation department, but with all stakeholders, to ensure that the policies that come out of the JPD support young people. Mr. Rodriguez invited the Task Force to the next JPC meeting to see the body in action.
- William Palmer shared his experience in the justice system as a youth, when he was tried and incarcerated as an adult at 17 years old. He was not allowed to be considered for parole until he won his court case against then-Attorney General Kamala Harris. SB 260 passed because of his case and others, letting out over 5,000 youth sentenced to life in prison as children. He emphasized the importance of the JPD commissions as opportunities for the community to advocate for children not to be sent to adult facilities and experience other harsh treatments.
- Margaret Brodtkin, President of the JPC, shared her pleasure in hearing people support the JPC before the Task Force. She noted that before the JPC was established, the JPD operated in the dark and JPC brought the issues, policies, and the needs of youth to light. She also voiced opposition to reducing the size of the JJCC to align with the template. She recommended the Task Force not change well-functioning commissions.
- Linda Martley-Jordan, Vice President of the JPC, educator, and advocate for youth, stated her support for keeping the JPC as a governance commission in the Charter. She reminded the Task Force that the Prop L (1989) created the JPC as a governance commission codified in the Charter to ensure oversight of the JPD would not be left to political whims or advisory options alone. Ms. Martley-Jordan dismissed the idea of being an advisory body since their recommendations need not be heeded. She also reminded the Task Force that the JPC is in service of black, brown, immigrant, and LGBTQIA+ youth who too often are caught at the intersections of poverty, systemic racism, and generational trauma.

- Yoel Haile, Director of the Criminal Law and Immigration Project of the ACLU – Northern California, strongly opposed the recommendations put before the Task Force to structurally weaken the JPC. He stated the recommendation reflects an authoritarian approach that would centralize power within the mayor's office and the very offices that require public oversight due to their decades of misconduct, negligence, and harm to the public. He stated the changes under consideration were an attempt to consolidate power within the Mayor's Office masquerading as streamlining or efficiency. Mr. Haile stated the changes considered would decrease accountability and transparency and increase abuse, neglect, and violence.
- Dinky Manek Enty, Deputy Director of the Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, Co-Chair of the Juvenile Justice Providers Association, and member of the San Francisco Justice Services Care Model, spoke to the Task Force on behalf of the Juvenile Justice Providers Association and the San Francisco Justice Services Care Model. She noted her comments reflected about 40 organizations' opposition to changing the JPC in any way. She stressed the JPC serves as a platform for CBOs to express needs, concerns, and challenges to serve youth. She also noted that discussions at JPC meetings have resulted in changes to implementation of the San Francisco Justice Services care model, which is now the model adopted citywide to serve all youth who are arrested in San Francisco.
- Barbara Attard, a native San Franciscan and professional with nearly 50 years' experience working with the Sheriff's Department and county parole and oversight of policing, echoed comments made by Julie Traun of the San Francisco Bar Association and voiced support to maintain the JPC as-is.
- Molly Brown, a juvenile justice reform activist, voiced opposition to changing the JPC. Ms. Brown disliked the logic that since the JPD is a small department, it does not need a governance commission. She stated that the small size of the department and budget should be commended and the JPC helps keep the JPD's department and budget small by reducing how many youth interact with the department.

The Task Force opened discussion on the JPD's bodies. Ms. Hayward initiated conversation, stating her desire to keep the JJCC and align it to the template as staff suggested. She supported reducing JJCC membership from 20 to 15 seats, noting that previous Task Force discussions affirmed 15 seats improved functionality and reduced operational challenges, while still being sizable. Ms. Hayward also agreed with the suggestion not to apply a sunset date to the JJCC since it is legally required, which has consistently been the Task Force's practice. She supported adding the JJCC to the Administrative Code since it is not currently codified. Chair Harrington raised concerns with reducing the seats from 20 to 15 without understanding the membership makeup of the body more thoroughly. He also uplifted public comment that the members of the body are important to the body. Ms. Hayward suggested that the Task Force use their experience convening, participating in, and running groups to rely on their earlier decision to cap membership at 15 seats.

Ms. Mihal requested clarification that the JJCC meets once per year, as noted in the presentation's accompanying memo. Ms. Alonso confirmed that the JJCC is required to meet once annually to produce and submit a state-required plan.

Chair Harrington repeated his preference not to reduce the 20-seat membership of the JJCC. Vice Chair Fraser noted that the state only requires the body to have 12 members, as cited in the accompanying memo. She affirmed the use of templates outlining commission structures to help the public understand how City government operates. Vice Chair Fraser reflected on her own experiences that a smaller commission would function better and agreed with Ms. Hayward's initial points about reducing the body's membership to align with the template.

Ms. Hayward motioned to adopt the staff suggestion on the JJCC: reduce the seats from 20 to 15, add four-year term lengths, add three term limits for public members, add establishing authority language to the Administrative Code, and opt out of applying a sunset date. The motion was seconded but failed after the subsequent discussion:

Ms. Mihal requested Mr. Givner clarify if an advisory body of 15 members were to meet and five other people wanted to participate in the meeting, whether they only be able do so through public comment. Mr. Givner affirmed that was correct.

Chair Harrington repeated his preference not to reduce the 20-seat membership of the JJCC and added he was unsure which five seats the Task Force would recommend eliminating. He voiced dissatisfaction that some Task Force members sought to apply the template to this component. Ms. Hayward noted there may be unrepresented voices in the discussion that would prefer a reduction of seats, like department staff who may not be able to advocate for change in front of their commissioners. She expressed appreciation for the staff suggestions that were drafted taking into consideration not only public comments, but also questionnaires sent to departments and additional investigative research. Ms. Hayward affirmed her stance that the template should apply in this instance and to most bodies, noting that the application of the template is not a judgement on any five people.

Chair Harrington asked the staff if they reviewed each seat to assess which should remain or if the template was applied generally. Ms. Alonso responded that in some instances, staff recommended specific seats to be removed and/or discussed seats with department staff, but not for the JJCC. She noted that should the Task Force decide to reduce the number of seats to 15, the decision about which 5 seats to eliminate could occur during legislation drafting.

Ms. Mihal stated while she is inclined to apply templates, she sided with Chair Harrington in the JJCC's case, which would lead the Task Force to a stalemate on this matter. Ms. Mihal voiced that staff perform the outreach to department staff to uncover which seats they would opt to eliminate.

Vice Chair Fraser motioned to defer the discussion on membership reduction and accept the staff suggestion to add four-year term lengths, add three term limits for public members, add establishing authority language to the Administrative Code, and opt out of applying a sunset date. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by voice vote.

Chair Harrington opened the discussion on the JPC reflecting on the abundant public comment advocating to maintain it as a governance commission in the Charter. Vice Chair Fraser motioned that the JPC be aligned with the governance commission template. Natasha Mihal seconded the motion. Ms. Alonso then walked through how the JPC's current structure compares to the governance commission template. She noted the components that would need to be modified to align with the template: member removal would shift from for cause to at will, three term limits would be added, hiring and firing authority would become consultative only, and the Task Force would need to decide where the body should be established.

Before the Task Force voted on Vice Chair Fraser's motion to align the JPC with the governance commission template, Ms. Hayward stated her support to keep the JPC a governance commission and voiced comments on the significance of advisory committees, which play a vital role in providing transparency, a space for community members to share feedback, and are not a "toothless" type of body.

The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Harrington motioned that the JPC's authorizing legislation stay in the Charter since that is the only way to guarantee a governance commission remains a governance commission in the future. Ms. Hayward asked if all governance commissions are in the Charter. Mr. Givner responded that not all governance commissions are in the Charter, such as the Film Commission. Chair Harrington's motion died for lack of a second.

Ms. Mihal repeated a previous suggestion that the conversation about governance commissions' establishing authority be deferred to the end of the meeting. Ms. Hayward noted the Task Force deferred this question during the Fire Commission conversation as well and that it would make sense to discuss those items together to make a consistent decision. Chair Harrington closed Item 6.

After deliberating Item 7 (the Police Commission) and voting on the establishing authority language for the Fire Commission, the Task Force completed their discussion on the JPC. Ms. Mihal motioned to keep JPC in the Charter. Ms. Hayward seconded the motion, and it passed 3-1 by voice vote with Vice Chair Fraser in opposition.

7. Police Department Public Bodies (Action Item)

Ms. Alonso presented the evaluation criteria results for the Police Commission. She shared that the evaluation criteria suggested keeping the Police Commission. She walked through the modifications necessary to align the Police Commission with the governance template: removing split appointments in exchange for only Mayoral appointments with no Board of Supervisors confirmation process, allowing the Mayor to remove appointees without Board of Supervisors approval, adding three term limits, and removing department head hiring and firing authority. Ms. Alonso noted that if split appointments are retained, the Task Force has an opportunity to clarify the Board of Supervisors appointment process to align the Charter with longstanding interpretation and advice from the City Attorney's Office.

Public comment was received from 12 speakers:

- Rebecca Young, member representative of the San Francisco Bar Associations' Criminal Justice Task Force and former Public Defender for over 20 years, opposed the suggestions to align the Police Commission to the governance commission template. Ms. Young strongly opposed the template criteria consolidating power with the mayor since it may diminish constructive deliberation and collaboration between agencies.
- Douglas Engman commented that all the suggested modifications to the Police Commission were in Prop D (2024), which did not pass. He further opined that the Fire and Police Commissions are two of the most important public safety commissions in the City and advocated both be kept in the Charter. He noted the need to maintain public oversight of the Police Department through the Police Commission given the current state of public safety.
- Kisai Henriquez, Director of Youth Justice at Huckleberry Youth Programs, noted their organization's close working relationship with the Police Commission, particularly on the Department General Orders which guide police officers on handling young people allegedly involved in crime. They advocated for the Task Force to keep the Police Commission as-is.
- Ovava Afuhaamango, commissioner on the Sheriff's Oversight Board, advocated to keep the Police Commission as-is. She raised concerns with the suggestions that the mayor consolidate power to appoint all the commissioners.

- Meredith Desautels, Directing Attorney with the Youth Law Center and District 8 resident, urged the Task Force to keep the Police Commission as-is. She stated the suggested modifications disrupt the checks and balances over the Police Department, the operations of which are of vital importance to San Franciscans.
- William Palmer shared a brief history of policing to support his position that it would be a mistake to change the Police Commission from its current state. He noted that while this mayor may be trustworthy and respectable, there may be a more nefarious mayor in the future that could appoint poor commissioners. He urged the Task Force not to tamper with the current checks and balances and to centralize too much power with the mayor.
- Ajai Nicole Duncan, Director of the Prop E (2024) campaign and Chair of the Harvey Milk Democratic LGBTQ+ Club political action committee, strongly opposed suggestions to weaken the Police Commission. She noted the suggested modifications before the Task Force aligned with the changes Prop D (2024) sought to make but failed. She affirmed that the Police Commission needed to remain independent and empowered to hold law enforcement accountable.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:
Currently, the Mayor appoints four of the seven seats on the Police Commission; the Board of Supervisors appoints three seats. The San Francisco Bar Association rightly noted:
“Independent governance of commissions requires that its members [be] independent. The selection of Commissioners should rest with an informed and transparent nomination process. No single branch of government should name all Commissioners.”

To be an effective “*Governance Body*,” the Police Commission must retain split appointments.

The short-list of three candidates for Police Chief must be retained, too, not replaced with a “*consultative responsibility only*” role, to preserve checks-and-balances governance.

The staff’s “Public Safety Bodies Recommendations” memo stated in Item 4-B on page 37, that the Police Commission can NOT take on the work of other bodies in its policy area. Therefore, this Task Force should stop attempting to transfer the Sheriff’s Department Oversight Board to the DPA under the Police Commission.

- Yoel Haile, Director of the Criminal Law and Immigration Project of the ACLU – Northern California, shared the organization’s early history of continuously holding the institution of policing and police departments across the state, including SFPD, accountable to the communities they serve and the rights of the people enumerated in the constitution. He cited statistics from SFPD demonstrating evidence of systemic racism in their policing practices to advocate for continued oversight and reform of SFPD.
- Zac Dillon, staff at the San Francisco Public Defender’s Office, strongly opposed suggested modifications to the Police Commission because they would significantly reduce the independence of the body, exacerbate existing problems, and incite new problems. He raised concerns with the proposal to place authority to impose all disciplinary action with the Police Chief, stating that the current process takes too long and the bottleneck is already with the Chief. He cited a 2022 Department of Police Accountability report showing that more than half of the cases it referred to the Chief for review waited more than a year. He also raised concerns about consolidating mayoral power.
- Jayson Wechter, a former Department of Police Accountability employee for nearly 20 years and an expert in law enforcement oversight, urged Task Force members not to adopt the suggested modifications to the Police Commission. He noted that consolidating appointment and member

removal powers with the mayor would weaken the independence of the City's Police Commission far beyond similar commissions in Berkeley, Oakland, and for Bay Area Rapid Transit. He urged the Task Force to affirm the independence of oversight and to make it more inclusive, to reflect the diversity of their communities.

- Barabara Attard, a native San Franciscan, professional with 15 years at the Department of Police Accountability, and nearly 50 years' experience working with the Sheriff's Department, noted that the San Francisco Police Commission is one of the oldest in the U.S. She noted the Police Commission has undergone charter revisions over the years to strengthen it and diversify the appointment process – all of which were done through voter mandates. She affirmed the Police Commission's role as a governance body and in establishing policy recommendations. She strongly urged the Task Force to maintain the body in its current form, without changes to appointment procedures or any reduction of its authority.

The Task Force opened discussion on the Police Commission with Vice Chair Fraser recommending that if the Task Force keeps split appointments between the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor, then the Board of Supervisors should not have veto authority over the Mayor's appointments, because it would essentially give them full control over the commission's appointments. Ms. Hayward raised a distinct point to mirror the decision for the Fire Commission's disciplinary function so that the Police Chief would make disciplinary decisions and the Police Commission would act as the appeal body. Chair Harrington noted that disciplinary items that surface from the Department of Police Accountability will also need to be updated to align with whatever changes the Task Force recommends. He further stated that those changes will be more involved and could wait until the final recommendations.

Chair Harrington proposing keeping the Police Commission's split appointments (three appointments by the Board of Supervisors and four appointments by the Mayor). Vice Chair Fraser and Ms. Hayward requested clarifying the Board of Supervisors' veto power on mayoral appointments while deciding on split appointments. A motion was made to allow split appointments with no Board of Supervisors vote power. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The vote passed 3-1 by voice vote with Chair Harrington in opposition.

Vice Chair Fraser recommended accepting the following: (1) Mayoral appointees could be removed by the Mayor without Board of Supervisors consent, (2) add three term limits, (3) have the Police Chief make disciplinary decisions and the Police Commission act as the appeal body, and (4) clarify the Board of Supervisors' appointment process to align the Charter with longstanding interpretation and advice from the City Attorney's Office. Chair Harrington opposed Vice Chair Fraser's recommendation because he felt that removal of mayoral appointees should be subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors. Chair Harrington took a voice vote of Vice Chair Fraser's proposal which passed 3-1 with Chair Harrington voting in opposition.

The Task Force decided to defer deciding whether the Police Commission will serve as an appellate body for recommendations from the Department of Police Accountability until a later meeting.

Ms. Hayward stated she would recommend keeping the Police Commission, Fire Commission, and JPC in the Charter. Mr. Givner advised the Task Force to take separate votes on each body's establishing authority language. Ms. Hayward motioned to keep the Police Commission's establishing authority language in the Charter. Chair Harrington seconded the motion. Vice Chair Fraser requested Ms. Hayward explain her rationale for keeping the Police Commission in the Charter. Ms. Hayward stated that for Police and Fire Commissions, the disciplinary appeals process is fundamental, so they should live in the Charter. She elaborated by stating the information provided by Mr. Givner that most governance

commissions live in the Charter persuaded her to keep governance commissions in the Charter. Ms. Hayward also noted she felt pressure to make decisions to keep the Task Force moving forward. Ms. Mihal added that public safety bodies could be considered differently from other functions since these departments and bodies impact the safety of individuals, which is worth memorializing in the Charter to protect these issues from being at the whim of political actors. Vice Chair Fraser responded that memorializing bodies into the Charter prevents elected officials from being able to modernize and update the bodies as needed. She also reminded the Task Force that the City's Charter is unlike others across the country in its length and level of detail. The motion passed 3-1 by voice vote with Vice Chair Fraser in opposition.

8. Sheriff's Department Office of Inspector General Bodies (Action Item)

This item was not called.

9. Future Agenda Topics (Discussion Item)

This item was not called.

10. General Public Comment

Patrick Monette-Shaw provided submitted the following written summary:

The BLA's full cost analysis of the 112 Boards and Commission was only posted online on the Streamlining Task Force's web site on September 2, a day overdue, reporting total costs of all 112 Policy Bodies at \$33.9 million — a mere two-tenths of one percent (0.213836%) of the \$15.9 **billion** FY 2024–2025 City Budget. \$33.9 million for robust public oversight of City government, is chump change.

Notably, the BLA's August 20 PowerPoint presentation admitted it was not asked, or tasked, to do a full cost-benefit analysis, let alone assess the value these Boards and Commissions bring to public transparency and oversight. It's strictly a financial analysis performed **only** on Charter-mandated policy bodies, among other data limitations.

This Task Force, and the craven "*Prop D*" and "*BlueprintSF*" Astroturf backers, focus narrowly only on costs of Boards and Commissions, while ignoring the \$301.5 million bloat in City manager hiring since 2010.

11. Adjournment

Chair Harrington adjourned the meeting at 3:33 pm.

--

Minutes prepared by Hannah Kohanzadeh, Principal Administrative Analyst.