



## Draft Minutes

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

**Daniel Lurie**  
Mayor

**Wednesday, November 5, 2025**  
**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/3hcwkdcp> and password PropE. Members of the public may use email address [CommissionStreamlining@sfgov.org](mailto:CommissionStreamlining@sfgov.org) to join the WebEx meeting if needed. To join by phone, dial 415-655-0001 and enter access code (webinar ID) 2664 365 2923 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 1:01 pm.

#### 2. Roll Call

Ed Harrington, Chair	seat 4 - Board of Supervisors designee (public sector labor representative)
Andrea Bruss, Vice Chair	seat 3 - City Attorney's designee
Sophie Hayward	seat 1 - City Administrator's designee
Natasha Mihal	seat 2 - Controller's designee
Sophia Kittler	seat 5 - Mayor's designee (expert in open and accountable government)

Hannah Kohanzadeh, the clerk, called roll. With five members present, a quorum was established.

#### 3. Announcements (Informational Item)

The meeting was held in hybrid format, with participation available both in person and via WebEx. Technical instructions for public participation via WebEx were provided.

#### 4. Approve Minutes – October 15, 2025 meeting (Action Item)

No public comment was received.

Sophie Hayward motioned to approve the October 15, 2025 minutes as drafted by staff. The motion was seconded by Sophia Kittler and passed unanimously by voice vote.

## 5. General City Administration (Action Item)

*Materials:* [presentation](#) and [memo](#)

After confirming that remote participants could hear her presentation despite not being able to hear previous Task Force discussion, Project Director Rachel Alonso proceeded presenting recommendations for nine bodies: State Legislation Committee, Committee on Information Technology (COIT), Assessment Appeals Board (AAB), Law Library Board of Trustees, City Hall Preservation Advisory Committee, Commission on Animal Control and Welfare, Refuse Rate Board, Sweat Free Procurement Advisory Group (SPAG), and Commission Streamlining Task Force. See the detailed staff recommendation for each body in the [General Administration and Finance Bodies Memo](#).

Public comment was received by 26 speakers while staff addressed technical issues with remote access:

- Jill Rowe, President of the Law Library Board of Trustees (LLBT), advocated against eliminating the LLBT. Ms. Rowe noted that the staff recommendation could impact the Law Library funding mechanisms.
- Diane Rodriguez, Director of the Law Library, spoke in support of the LLBT. Ms. Rodriguez noted that the San Francisco Law Library was the first established in the state and the other law libraries in California are modeled after it. Ms. Rodriguez stated that thousands of members of the public use the Law Library to research their own defense.
- Andrea Woods, Asst. Director of the Law Library, spoke in support of the LLBT and shared the benefits of the numerous free resources offered at the Law Library.
- Lester spoke in support of SPAG.
- Julie Fisher, member of SPAG, spoke in support of keeping SPAG as is.
- Mike Casey, President of the San Francisco Labor Council and organizer with Unite Here, spoke in support of SPAG.
- Sallie Stevens, former Chair of the Commission on Animal Control and Welfare (CACW), spoke in support of the Commission on Animal Control and Welfare, noting the work the body has done to ensure the voices of animal rights advocates are heard in the City.
- Adam Wood, delegate to the San Francisco Labor Council from the Firefighters Union, spoke in support of SPAG. Mr. Wood noted concerns that it is becoming more difficult to identify where a garment has come from and to ensure it was made in a safe and humane facility and that as tariffs make it more expensive to produce garments, producers may look to cut corners wherever possible.
- Curtis Lamore, organizer for SEIU 2015, spoke in support of SPAG and noted that the Board of Supervisors already decided to keep the body.
- David Emanuel spoke in support of the CACW. Mr. Emanuel noted the volume of public correspondence in support of the body. He also stated the Commission took a leadership role in addressing the recent San Francisco Zoo challenges.
- Michael Angelo Torres, Chair of the Commission on Animal Control and Welfare, spoke in support of the CACW. Mr. Torres noted the Commission performs different functions than the department of Animal Control and Welfare.
- Marie Collins, runs a cat rescue organization in San Francisco, spoke in support of CACW. Ms. Collins noted that the Commission provides a forum for public engagement that the Department of Animal Care and Control does not provide.

- Elpha Branit, former Animal Control and Welfare volunteer, spoke in support of CACW.
- Nadine Nay, a native San Franciscan, spoke in support of the LLBT, SPAG, and CACW.
- Alexandra “Sasha” Porshnikoff, student representative of the USF Animal Legal Defense Fund, spoke in support of CACW. She noted CACW takes initiative to lead discussion on interagency policies regarding animals.
- Patricia Briggs, a 64 year resident of the City, spoke in support of CACW.
- Irina Ozernoy, Vice Chair of the Commission on Animal Control and Welfare, spoke in support of CACW. Ms. Ozernoy noted the Commissioners and volunteers are unpaid and put in many hours of work that the Department of Animal Care and Control could not absorb.
- Art Crisico spoke in support of SPAG. He noted that SPAG reflects the City’s awakening to the importance of fair trade and a commitment to respect people globally.
- Kristin Hardy, SEIU 1021 Regional Vice President, spoke in support SPAG and noted that the Board of Supervisors already approved keeping the body. Ms. Hardy also expressed support for CACW and the LLBT.
- Kim Tavaglione, Executive Director of the San Francisco Labor Council, expressed dismay in the lack of public engagement in the Task Force’s process. She spoke in support of SPAG.
- Evelyn Correal, on the executive board of SEIU 1021, spoke in support of SPAG and noted that uniforms protect employees from germs and the harmful environments their work puts them in.
- Calvin Yen, Legislative Aide to Sup. Chan, read a letter on her behalf to the Task Force in support of SPAG. The letter noted that the Task Force previously deferred action on SPAG to await the Board of Supervisors’ action on the body and that the Board of Supervisors passed legislation to keep SPAG.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:
  - The Staff recommendation memo acknowledges on page 70 that this Commission Streamlining Task Force does not align with three of you “Advisory Committee” template components, including not in alignment with the term length, term limits, and establishing authority requirements you have been forcing all other “*advisory bodies*” to “*align*” with. ***Are we to believe that your medicine for others isn’t good enough medicine for yourselves?***

In the event your own Task Force evades actually being sunsetted, you should set term lengths and term limits now, such that the Streamlining Task Force members will **not** serve longer than your standard 12-year maximum length of service if this body is extended. ***Do this while the iron is hot.***

There’s no valid reason to **not** move this Task Force into the Administrative Code, particularly since you are not a governance commission in need of City Charter protections. Fully align with your own template!

- Brenda Barrows, SEIU 1021 member and employee of Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital, advocated to keep all bodies as they are.
- Claudia Vetesi, Trustee of the Law Library Board of Trustees, expressed support for keeping the LLBT in the Charter.
- Bill Hale expressed support for the CACW. He noted the body provides the City with a fair and balanced forum to discuss animal control and welfare policy.

During public comment, Chair Harrington noted that Chief Assistant City Attorney Jon Givner held a different interpretation of the impacts of the staff recommendations on the LLB Board. Mr. Givner and Ms. Rowe agreed to discuss the details together. The Task Force corrected the Webex technical difficulties during the public comment period.

#### State Legislation Committee (SLC)

Despite her belief that staff working groups should not be codified, Vice Chair Bruss was willing to retain SLC in the Administrative Code given its role coordinating across departments to put forth a unified City position on state policy proposals. Ms. Kittler asked Mr. Givner whether or how the City could advance coordinated policy positions if SLC were removed from code. Mr. Givner explained that the Mayor would have the discretion to take positions on policy unless directed otherwise by the Board of Supervisors.

Vice Chair Bruss motioned to keep the SLC and apply the staff recommendations – including applying neither a sunset date nor term lengths or limits, since the body is made up of City staff. Ms. Kittler seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### Committee on Information Technology (COIT)

Vice Chair Bruss motioned to keep COIT. Ms. Hayward seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote. Later in the meeting, Ms. Kittler asked to revisit at a later date whether the two public seats were necessary.

#### Assessment Appeals Board (AAB)

Chair Harrington asked about the number of members on the AAB. Alistair Gibson, AAB Administrator, provided a brief overview of the board structure and noted that each of the three boards is allowed to have up to eight seats, with five alternates and three regular members. Mr. Gibson stated that 18 of the 24 allowed seats are filled and noted that the AAB is working to fill the vacant seats. Ms. Kittler questioned if AAB members can be reappointed. Mr. Gibson affirmed that members can be reappointed, though they may not want to be. Chair Harrington noted that the volume of work is demanding.

Ms. Kittler motioned to keep the AAB as is. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### Law Library Board of Trustees (LLB Board)

Chair Harrington asked Mr. Givner for legal input. Mr. Givner shared that he had spoken with LLBT President Jill Rowe, and they agreed the Board is not legally required to be in the Charter. However, they plan to continue discussions before the Task Force makes final decisions. He clarified that while the Task Force may recommend removing the Board of Trustees from the Charter, it does not have authority to eliminate the Law Library or its funding, and such matters would need to be taken up with the Board of Supervisors.

Chair Harrington asked whether state law requires a law library and a board of trustees. Mr. Givner confirmed that it does. Chair Harrington clarified that the City must retain a LLBT, but the question before the Task Force is whether it should remain in the Charter. Mr. Givner responded that because LLBT is required by state law, it can continue to exist without being codified locally.

Ms. Mihal asked if there were other examples of state-required bodies and how the Task Force addressed their establishing authority. Ms. Alonso noted that all other bodies the Task Force had discussed were local bodies required to be operated by cities or counties, whereas the LLBT is a state body that is not operated by the City.

Ms. Kittler motioned to remove the LLBT from the Charter. Vice Chair Bruss seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### City Hall Preservation Advisory Committee (CHPAC)

Ms. Hayward noted City Hall's beauty and appreciated the work of CHPAC. She stated that currently the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) sufficiently tends to City Hall's preservation and noted the Task Force's decision to maintain HPC in the Charter. Chair Harrington acknowledged the tremendous amount of work CHPAC did for City Hall after the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake and noted that the need for the body has lessened over time. Ms. Hayward motioned to eliminate CHAPC. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### Commission on Animal Control and Welfare (CACW)

Chair Harrington noted that the Task Force received more public comment about CACW than any other body. He stated his preference to keep CACW since the Department of Animal Care and Control (ACC) is not set up to receive public comment or engage on policy. He also noted that the body costs virtually no money and that there is a passionate and engaged constituency. Vice Chair Bruss noted that many departments and bodies intersect with animal care so CACW is not the only forum to raise concerns about the topic. She questioned whether every issue requires a dedicated public body.

Ms. Hayward agreed with Vice Chair Bruss and highlighted the public comment noting that CACW acts as place for policy dialogue, such as the no-kill shelter policy. She acknowledged that animal issues can be addressed through other venues, including the Board of Supervisors, and suggested that if CACW is retained, it should follow the advisory committee template.

Chair Harrington asked for clarification on the seat qualifications revision recommendation. Ms. Alonso stated that the veterinarian seat would be desirable rather than mandatory. Chair Harrington acknowledged that CACW is one of the few bodies that publishes a regular quarterly report – and without any City staff – which he found impressive. Ms. Mihal recommended that the Task Force consider changing CACW's name.

Ms. Kittler raised concerns about voting consistency, noting that the Task Force has eliminated other single-issue bodies. Chair Harrington agreed that most retained advisory bodies provide general input to departments but noted that some, like the Youth Commission, advise the Mayor and Board directly. Ms. Mihal added that advisory bodies are meant to provide expert community input on specific topics, not necessarily tied to a single department. Ms. Kittler questioned whether CACW serves as a forum for constructive feedback or primarily critiques City policy. Ms. Hayward noted that CACW highlights cross-departmental issues that might otherwise be overlooked.

Chair Harrington moved to keep CACW, change its name, align the body with the advisory template, alter the seat qualifications to make it desirable to have a veterinarian, and to modify the quarterly reporting requirement. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The motion unanimously passed by voice vote.

### Refuse Rate Board (RRB)

Vice Chair Bruss recommended keeping the relatively new body as is and supported staff's proposal to add term lengths corresponding to a single rate-setting cycle and adding a three-term limit for the public member.

Chair Harrington stated that rate-setting cycles are irregular and suggested using fixed year terms instead. Jay Liao, Refuse Rate Administrator, confirmed that rate periods typically span two to five years and may be reopened. He emphasized the importance of member continuity due to the technical nature of the work and offered to provide a recommendation on appropriate term length. Chair Harrington and Vice Chair Bruss supported a four-year term length with a three-term limit.

Vice Chair Bruss motioned to keep RRB, move it from the Health to the Administrative Code, keep three members, keep the three-way split appointment structure, add a four-year term length, and add a three-term limit for the public member. Ms. Kittler seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

### Sweatfree Procurement Advisory Group (SPAG)

Chair Harrington thanked Supervisor Connie Chan for submitting a letter and clarified that the Task Force had deferred action on SPAG pending Board of Supervisors legislation. Ms. Alonso explained that while the original draft of President Mandelman's procurement legislation would have eliminated SPAG, the final version did not. Because SPAG has no sunset date, it remains in effect unless repealed by future action.

Ms. Mihal stated that SPAG must be evaluated under Proposition E and that staff applied the advisory template to assess whether its work remains necessary. She noted that SPAG helped implement the policy requiring the City to procure uniforms from sweatfree facilities, and that those standards are currently being met.

Ms. Hayward acknowledged SPAG's role in making San Francisco a leader in ethical procurement and clarified that the Sweatfree Ordinance remains in effect. She confirmed that staff at the Office of Labor Standards Enforcement and the Office of Contract Administration are committed to enforcing sweatfree standards.

Vice Chair Bruss supported retaining SPAG, noting the Board of Supervisors had recently voted to preserve the body and encouraging the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to fill vacancies. Ms. Kittler asked about the reason for SPAG's designation as borderline inactive. Ms. Alonso confirmed that the body was considered borderline inactive due to its vacancy rate and meeting frequency. Ms. Kittler noted that if the Board of Supervisors has not appointed more members to the body, their vote to continue the body's existence seems like an insincere commitment.

Chair Harrington motioned to keep SPAG. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The motion passed with two votes in opposition (Ms. Kittler and Ms. Hayward).

Chair Harrington motioned to adopt staff recommendations to align the body with the advisory template. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.



### Commission Streamlining Task Force (CSTF)

Chair Harrington noted that the Task must consider its own future and acknowledged there were no staff-recommended changes, as the body is set to sunset in January 2027. Ms. Alonso and Ms. Mihal confirmed that the sunset date is in the Charter, and any extension would require voter approval in November 2026.

Ms. Kittler suggested considering a recurring version of CSTF to periodically review public bodies, especially inactive ones. She requested that staff explore how often the body might reconvene and recommended placing any future version in the Administrative Code rather than the Charter. Ms. Hayward asked whether other jurisdictions conduct similar reviews. Chair Harrington noted that SPUR will soon release a report recommending cyclical Charter reviews and suggested the Task Force include a similar recommendation.

Ms. Mihal supported the idea of periodic review but expressed caution about extending CTSF in its current form. She favored including the concept in the final report, with implementation details to be determined later. Vice Chair Bruss was open to further discussion at a future meeting and noted that any Administrative Code change could happen later and need not be decided now.

Ms. Kittler asked what special powers CSTF holds under the Charter. Ms. Alonso explained that CSTF can introduce ordinances that automatically take effect unless vetoed by a supermajority of the Board of Supervisors. If the body were moved to the Administrative Code, it could not retain such power.

Vice Chair Bruss requested deferring the decision to allow staff time to research models from other jurisdictions, determine an appropriate review frequency, and draft possible language. The Task Force agreed to defer action.

## **6. Public Integrity Bodies (Action Item)**

*Materials:* [presentation](#) and [memo](#)

Ms. Alonso presented the staff recommendations for two bodies: the Ethics Commission and Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. See the detailed staff recommendation for each body in the [General Administration and Finance Bodies Memo](#). Chair Harrington requested clarification on how the Ethics Commission's ability to place measures on the ballot might be modified; Ms. Alonso stated that it could be eliminated entirely.

Public comment was received by 10 speakers:

- Matthew Latakey, an advocate for government transparency and public record laws, thanked the Task Force and staff for their work on this process. Mr. Latakey expressed opposition to adding a three-year sunset date to the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF).
- Lila LaHood, Executive Director of the San Francisco Public Press, spoke as a member of SOTF and the Chair of the Compliance and Amendments Committee of SOTF. Ms. LaHood spoke in favor of SOTF. She called out the public correspondence submitted by SOTF Chair Matthew Yankee, raising that SOTF took issue with the notion to make SOTF an advisory body and to add a sunset date.
- Richard Knee, former SOTF member and journalist, spoke in favor of SOTF. Mr. Knee opposed making SOTF an advisory body and changing the membership qualification requirements.

- Jennifer Esteen, a nurse employed by the City for over 15 years, spoke in favor of keeping SOTF as it is.
- Patrick Ford, Executive Director of the Ethics Commission, thanked the Task Force and staff for their work on this process. Mr. Ford requested the Task Force not make the Ethics Commissioners serve at will for fear of disrupting their independence if they hear cases regarding their appointing authority. He also spoke in favor of retaining the body's ability to place measures directly on the ballot.
- Patrick Monette- Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary: This Task Force shouldn't eliminate the Ethics Commission's ability to place measures on the ballot for voters to consider. It's an important tool for voters to enact reform laws without interference by City Hall and the Board of Supervisors!

Voters deserve to retain their right to recall elected officials, **AND** appointees those elected officials appoint to Boards and Commissions!

You should grant an exception for removal of Ethics Commission members by retaining "*for-cause only*" removal as you have for other bodies, expand their term limits, and retain the Commission's current ability to place measures directly onto the ballot.

Don't apply "*Advisory Committee*" template component criteria to SOTF, a Regulatory body! As you have for other bodies the Streamlining Task Force has granted, you should allow the SOTF to keep their seat-level membership qualifications.

- Brenda Barrows spoke in favor of retaining the Ethics Commission and SOTF. Ms. Barrows noted that all government operations should be accessible to the public.
- Laura Stein, current SOTF member, spoke in favor of the SOTF noting that the body is the correct body to handle the Sunshine Ordinance implementation. Ms. Stein also expressed an openness to expanding the membership requirements.
- Sheryl Lorkin, SEIU 1021 member, opposed the staff recommendations to the Ethics Commissions. She stated the City should be strengthening ethics oversight rather than tarnishing it.
- Matthew Yankee, Chair of SOTF, reiterated his comments submitted to the Task Force as public correspondence. Mr. Yankee opposed adding a sunset date to the body and make the body an advisory body. He also encouraged the Task Force to have better consistency when placing term lengths and term limits on bodies in general.

Chair Harrington asked Ms. LaHood for her opinion on changing SOTF's seat-specific qualifications to general qualifications applicable to the full body. Ms. LaHood responded that she was neutral on the change but emphasized that the qualifications are important. Chair Harrington then asked Mr. Yankee for his perspective. Mr. Yankee stated that the current seat-specific qualifications have not posed a challenge in recruiting members and noted that the only current vacancy is for the seat with the least restrictive requirements.

### Ethics Commission

Ms. Kittler stated her general agreement with many of the public commenters that the Ethics Commission should be as insulated from political influence as possible so at will removal of commissioners would be problematic. However, she disagreed that the Ethics Commission should be



able to place measures directly on the ballot and wondered how other jurisdictions handled the matter. Ms. Alonso responded that staff could research and share findings at a future meeting.

Ms. Mihal asked whether only the Mayor and Board of Supervisors can submit ballot measures or whether departments may do so directly. Mr. Givner clarified that only the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors can formally submit measures, though departments commonly work with them to do so. Ms. Mihal noted that the Ethics Commission can place measures directly on the ballot without Board of Supervisors review, which limits opportunities for public scrutiny.

She also confirmed with staff that the Ethics Commission consists of five members, each appointed by a different elected official, and that commissioners may only be removed only for official misconduct or through a voter recall. Chair Ed Harrington asked about the removal process. Mr. Givner explained that an appointing authority initiates the process by filing written charges, which suspends the commissioner. The Ethics Commission then holds an evidentiary hearing, after which the Board of Supervisors may remove a commissioner with a 9-vote supermajority.

Ms. Mihal raised concerns about the circularity of the process: Ethics commissioners are appointed by an elected official, difficult to remove, empowered to place measures on the ballot, and responsible for appointing their department head. She questioned whether any elements of this structure should be adjusted and voiced opposition to the Commission's ability to place measures directly on the ballot without broader public review.

Vice Chair Bruss acknowledged the importance of preserving the Commission's independence but echoed concerns about the high thresholds for removal, noting that the official misconduct standard can make it difficult to remove commissioners even when it is clear that they are unfit to serve. She expressed discomfort with the Ethics Commission being responsible for overseeing its own removal hearings and requested assistance from Mr. Ford in exploring alternative removal mechanisms. She also supported requiring Ethics Commission ballot measures to go through the Board of Supervisors for broader engagement.

Chair Harrington agreed that commissioners should not serve at will and noted that their independence of shields appointing authorities from political pressure. However, he expressed concern that the public tends to trust Ethics Commission ballot measures without fully understanding them, and supported efforts to increase public engagement in the process.

Ms. Hayward thanked staff for their recommendation and acknowledged the difficulty of applying a template-based approach to a unique body like the Ethics Commission. She supported maintaining its independence and, while skeptical that allowing at-will removal would lead to abuse due to the diversity of appointing authorities, still favored a high bar for removal. She shared concern about the Commission overseeing its own misconduct process and noted that a recent ballot measure introduced by the Commission lacked early input from City staff input, creating implementation challenges after voter approval.

Vice Chair Bruss recommended deferring decisions on the Ethics Commission until staff could conduct further research. Ms. Alonso confirmed that findings would be presented at a meeting in December.

### Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF)

Ms. Alonso clarified that staff did not recommend making SOTF an advisory body, despite using the advisory template to suggest structural changes. She confirmed that no recommendations would alter SOTF's existing powers or functions.

Vice Chair Bruss emphasized SOTF's important role and opposed combining it with the Ethics Commission, as considered but not recommended by staff. She expressed concern that current seat-specific qualifications and external nominations requirements limit the pool of candidates. She recommended removing nominations, making qualifications desirable at the body level, and adopting cumulative term limits. Ms. Mihal asked whether removing nominations would increase workload for the Board of Supervisors, and Vice Chair Bruss responded that vacancies would be filled through the usual Rules Committee process. Ms. Kittler supported term limits but did not believe a sunset date was necessary. Chair Harrington agreed.

Vice Chair Bruss moved to keep SOTF, remove external nominations, apply qualifications at the body level, set a six-term limit, and not add a sunset date. Ms. Kittler seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

## **7. City Employment and Benefits Bodies (Action Item)**

*Materials:* [presentation](#) and [memo](#)

Ms. Alonso presented the staff recommendations for five bodies: Civil Service Commission, Special Strike Committee, Health Services Board, Retirement Board, and Retiree Health Care Trust Fund Board. See the detailed staff recommendation for each body in the [General Administration and Finance Bodies Memo](#).

Public comment was received by 19 speakers:

- Kate Favetti, President of the Civil Services Commission (CSC), spoke on behalf of the body. She advocated for the CSC to remain in the Charter and for the oath to be kept. She opposed changing commission appointments to be at will because it would run counter to the Charter's goal to have checks and balances and commissioner independence. She also opposed removing CSC's ability to nominate candidates for the Director of Human Resources, citing that it would open the position up to political interference. Ms. Favetti supported staff recommendations regarding Charter Sec. 4.101(c), implementing six-year terms and the ability to fire the Human Resources Director with a supermajority.
- Adam Wood, the most recent appointment to CSC, echoed Ms. Favetti's comments. He noted the importance of listening to and being receptive to public comment altering his voting decision which could be negatively impacted if serving at will. He raised concerns that the cumulative effect of the staff recommendations would adversely impact the body's ability to serve as a meaningful check and balance in City government.
- Sandra Eng, Executive Officer of CSC with over 20 years of service to the body, advocated for the CSC to retain its oath of independence. Ms. Eng stated CSC was created by the voters.
- Adrienne Mao, City employee and member of IFPTE Local 21, spoke on her own behalf. She advocated for the CSC. She opposed staff recommendations to make commissioners serve at will and to increase the mayor's authority. She noted the importance of CSC to be able to support the City's employees. She supported CSC's ability to provide input on hiring the Director of Human Resources and to retain the commissioners' oath.

- Felix Carballo, City employee and IFTPE Local 21 Chapter President, voiced opposition to the staff recommended changes citing that they open opportunities for political interference.
- Kristin Hardy, Regional Vice President for SEIU 1021, native San Franciscan, and Dept. of Public Health employee, spoke in favor of retaining the CSC's commissioner oath. She opposed the recommendation to remove the seats designated for women.
- Jennifer Esteen, a nurse employed by the City, opposed the staff recommendation to remove the designated seats for women on CSC. Ms. Esteen supported retaining the CSC commissioner oath. She also supported the CSC's role in nominating the Director of Human Resources.
- David Kenam, representative of SEIU 1021, supported Ms. Favetti's comments. He noted the timing of the Task Force's deliberation was poor given that the federal administration is dismantling many merit-based processes. He strongly opposed the removing the designated seats for women.
- Merric Fittrow, a Human Resources Agency employee, was struck that the City may be undergoing similar changes to those he saw in the southern legislative bodies he used to work at. He expressed alarm at changing commissioner service to be at will for the CSC.
- Jessie Stinton, SEIU 1021 member and a Human Resources Agency employee, spoke in favor of the CSC and echoed Ms. Favetti's comments.
- A speaker spoke in favor of retaining the CSC commissioner oath.
- Kim Tavaglione, Executive Director of the San Francisco Labor Council, stated that the CSC staff recommendation was low quality. Ms. Tavaglione stressed the importance of the CSC in maintaining the City's merit-based workforce.
- Joe Duncan, nurse at the Dept. of Public Health, cited concerns about increasing political interference by adopting the staff recommendations for the CSC. He opposed removing the designated seats for women on CSC.
- Jegy Sering, staff of SEIU 1021, opposed removing authority for the CSC to recommend candidates for the Director of Human Services. He also opposed making the commissioners serve at will and removing the designated seats for women.
- A speaker urged the Task Force not to make CSC commissioners serve at will.
- Brenda Barrows, a City employee for over 40 years, expressed support for CSC as is. Rather than curtailing some of CSC's powers, she advocated for the CSC's powers to be expanded. She noted the CSC supports Black and other minority City employees. She expressed concerns that some of the actions the City is taking have the same end results of those taken by the federal administration.
- Patrick Monette- Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:  
In your rush to "*streamline*" the City Charter, why is this Streamlining Task Force debating whether to keep 1,656 unlawful words about the so-called "*Strike Committee*" in the City Charter? California's Public Employment Relations Board (PERB) determined City Charter §A8.346 is unlawful, and ordered the City and County of San Francisco to cease and desist from maintaining and enforcing it.

Completely remove the Strike Committee from the Charter!

It's unacceptable making Health Service Board member qualifications "*desirable*" rather than mandatory.

For San Francisco Employees' Retirement Board, you shouldn't decide how to remove the three Board members elected by City employees/retirees if they engage in "*serious misconduct*" unless you decide how the Mayor's three appointees and Board of Supervisors one appointee, (a sitting Supervisor), will be removed for similar "*serious misconduct*."

City retirees and employees demand you make **no** changes to either the Health Services Board or to the Retirement Board!

- Sheryl Thornton, a Dept. of Public Health employee, expressed support for CSC and advocated for the City to strengthen rather than weaken the body.
- Naj Daniels supported Ms. Favetti's and Mr. Wood's comments regarding CSC and thanked them for their service for the body.

During public comment, Chair Harrington asked Ms. Favetti why, unlike other positions the Mayor nominates and Board of Supervisors approves (the Controller and City Administrator), the Mayor must select the Director of Human Resources from a list of candidates rather than appoint freely. Ms. Favetti explained that a rule dating back to 1900 requires the Director of Human Resources to be qualified to uphold the merit system and prevent political interference. She clarified that the CSC does not appoint the Director but provides a list of qualified candidates for the Mayor to nominate. Although the selection process occurs in closed session, she noted it includes opportunities for public comment, promoting transparency and engagement.

#### Civil Service Commission (CSC)

Chair Harrington expressed strong support for the CSC and the merit-based civil service system. He agreed with public commenters that CSC commissioners should not serve at will and saw no reason to remove the oath requirement. He supported adding term limits and asked Ms. Favetti whether a two-term limit was appropriate. Ms. Favetti agreed and suggested including language to allow limited term extensions, such as six months, in cases where multiple terms expire simultaneously and it could be difficult to meet quorum.

Chair Harrington also asked about CSC's ability to hold meetings outside normal business hours. Ms. Favetti confirmed that the Commission has discretion to do so in response to public requests. She further noted that while the requirement to include two women on the commission has been valuable, it is superseded by broader diversity requirements in Charter Section 4.101(c).

Ms. Mihal observed that for other bodies where members serve at will, shorter term lengths have typically been applied. If CSC members are not at-will, she was uncertain whether a "for cause" or official misconduct removal standard would be more appropriate. She confirmed that only the Controller, City Administrator, Director of Human Resources, and the Director of the Department of Police Accountability require Board of Supervisors confirmation.

Vice Chair Bruss agreed with Chair Harrington and thanked Ms. Favetti for her active participation. She supported applying a 12-year cumulative term limit and acknowledged the need to address term expiration timing. She moved to adopt a two-term limit and to remove the seat-specific requirement for two women, relying instead on existing Charter provisions promoting diversity. Chair Harrington seconded the motion. The vote passed unanimously by voice vote.

The Task Force took a brief recess.

#### Special Strike Committee (SSC)

Chair Harrington asked Mr. Givner if the SSC was illegal. Mr. Givner confirmed that it was rendered illegal after the California Public Employment Relations Board (PERB) struck down the strike provision from the Charter. The City appealed the decision in court, the court upheld PERB's decision, and there are no further appeals possible. He noted the language remains in the Charter because the City cannot remove the language without voter approval. Mr. Givner stated that the City Attorney's Office is considering recommending language to the Board of Supervisors to allow the City Attorney to remove language when there has been a court decision invalidating parts of the Charter. Mr. Givner noted the Task Force could also propose that in their report as well.

Chair Harrington motioned to eliminate SSC and to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that they enable the City Attorney to remove Charter language rendered illegal by court decisions. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0.

#### Health Services Board (HSB)

Ms. Kittler asked whether the Controller's appointee to HSB requires HSB approval. Chair Harrington confirmed this is correct. Ms. Kittler also inquired about the recommendation regarding the removal of elected members for official misconduct. Mr. Givner explained that while the Mayor can initiate official misconduct proceedings for City elected officials, there is currently no removal process for elected HSB members. Ms. Mihal agreed that the Task Force should consider adding such a provision.

Ms. Kittler asked why HSB should retain authority to hire and fire its Executive Director. Rey Guillen, Executive Director of the Health Service System, responded that the Board's structure is designed to ensure political insulation and collective decision-making on benefits. He emphasized that the Executive Director's independence helps staff implement HSB's policies effectively. Mr. Guillen added that the rates set by the HSB must be approved by the Board of Supervisors, which is another check.

Ms. Kittler questioned the need for insulating the HSB Executive Director, suggesting that rationale could apply to any commission. Chair Harrington responded that HSB is distinct due to its broad membership, with appointments made by the Mayor, Controller, Board of Supervisors, and three elected members from the health system membership at-large. This structure, he argued, makes it essential that the Executive Director report directly to the Board.

Ms. Kittler made a motion to keep HSB and adopt all staff recommendations, except for allowing the Board to retain sole authority over hiring and firing its Executive Director. Ms. Hayward seconded. The motion carried 4-0.

Chair Harrington then moved to allow HSB to retain that hiring and firing authority. Ms. Mihal seconded. The motion carried 4-0.

#### Retirement Board

Ms. Kittler moved to adopt staff recommendations. Ms. Mihal seconded. The motion carried 4-0.

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

Ms. Kittler asked why RHCTFB and the Retirement Board are separate bodies. Chair Harrington and Ms. Mihal explained that RHCTFB was formed when the City began requiring employee contributions to fund retiree health benefits, following new accounting standards requiring governments to plan for these long-term obligations.

Ms. Kittler questioned why the two boards needed to have different investment strategies. Ms. Alonso responded that the boards have different missions, which drive different strategies, and combining them would create administrative challenges, including the need for RHCTFB to function as a subcommittee. She added that staff workload would remain the same regardless of structure.

Ms. Kittler moved to adopt the staff recommendation with one change: to move RHCTFB from the Charter into the Administrative Code. Chair Harrington supported the motion, provided there was no legal reason the body needed to remain in the Charter. Mr. Givner explained that while Charter placement allows for split appointments and elected appointments, the same structure could be preserved through Charter language even if the body were moved to the Administrative Code.

Ms. Alonso reminded the Task Force that staff suggested language could be added to allow the Retirement Board and RHCTFB to combine in the future, if they decide to do so.

Ms. Hayward seconded Ms. Kittler's motion. The motion passed 4-0.

## **8. Elections Bodies (Action Item)**

*Materials: [presentation](#) and [memo](#)*

Project Director Rachel Alonso presented the staff recommendations for three elections-related bodies: the Elections Commission, the Ballot Simplification Committee, and the Elections Task Force (commonly referred to as the Redistricting Task Force).

For the Elections Commission, Ms. Alonso explained that the only proposed alignment to the governance template was to change the commissioner removal process to allow for at-will removal. She acknowledged the importance of political insulation for this body but noted that the broad appointment structure already provides some protection.

For the Elections Task Force, Ms. Alonso acknowledged past controversy surrounding the body and noted that while some administrative improvements could be made, broader structural reforms should be addressed through a separate redistricting reform process. She emphasized the need for a formal administrative plan to ensure adequate funding, staffing, and interdepartmental support for future redistricting cycles.

Public comment was received from one speaker:

- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:  
Most changes to the *Elections Task Force* (a.k.a. *Redistricting Task Force*) should be part of a more comprehensive redistricting reform process, **which exceeds the scope of this Commission Streamlining Task Force.**



The *Redistricting Task Force* shouldn't be forced to “**align**” to the Streamlining Task Force's “*Advisory Committee*” template. Because the Elections Task Force plays a critical role in local elections, it should retain its current term lengths, remain in the Charter, and have no sunset date.

However, you should change the *Redistricting Task Force*'s member removal component to “*for-cause removal*” only, precisely to help protect against undue influence by their appointing authorities and undue political influences.

The Staff Discussion memo noted that the Elections Task Force reported in 2022 it “*witnessed unprecedented assaults on its independence by political actors*,” and its members were pressured to cast specific votes to appease their appointing authorities.

This isn't rocket science. Do this today!

### Elections Commission

Chair Harrington opened the Task Force discussion by providing historical context for the Elections Commission, describing past issues with the Elections Department when it was under the City Administrator and the reforms that led to the creation of the Commission. He emphasized the importance of maintaining the Commission's current structure to preserve the integrity of elections.

Sophia Kittler moved to adopt the staff recommendations for the Elections Commission and keep it in the Charter. Chair Harrington seconded the motion. Sophie Hayward expressed support for keeping the structure as designed. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

### Ballot Simplification Committee

Task Force members expressed strong support for the Ballot Simplification Committee. Ms. Hayward praised the committee's work and noted its value as a civic education tool. Natasha Mihal and Chair Harrington echoed her sentiments, with the latter noting that the long-serving chair has played a key role in maintaining the committee's effectiveness.

Ms. Kittler proposed eliminating the nominating requirements for specific seats, suggesting that the qualifications could be met by a broader pool of candidates. Ms. Alonso reviewed the current nomination structure, and Task Force members discussed the challenges of filling seats under the current process. Ms. Hayward suggested deferring the decision to allow staff to consult with the committee and return with proposed changes to the nomination and qualification requirements.

Ms. Kittler moved to direct staff to return with revised language aimed at simplifying the seat qualifications and nomination process. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

### Elections (Redistricting) Task Force

Angela Calvillo, the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors (BOS), addressed the Commission Streamlining Task Force regarding the Elections Task Force. She emphasized the importance of establishing clear duties, timelines, and administrative support well in advance of each redistricting cycle. She noted that the BOS Clerk's Office had provided clerking and funding support for the most recent cycle but

expressed concern about the appropriateness of the Clerk's Office continuing in that role. She recommended that the City consider alternative staffing arrangements and begin planning earlier in the process. In addition, though the body was established in the Charter, she noted that it would be appropriate for the specifics of the body to remain in the Administrative Code.

Task Force members discussed the need for a more structured and better-resourced redistricting process. Chief Assistant City Attorney Jon Givner surmised that many such changes could likely be achieved through a Board of Supervisors ordinance rather than a Charter amendment.

Chair Harrington moved to adopt the staff recommendation to retain the Redistricting Task Force in the Charter with no changes to its structure. Ms. Kittler seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

## 9. Capital Projects and Infrastructure Bodies (Action Item)

*Materials: [presentation](#) and [memo](#)*

Project Director Rachel Alonso introduced the item and presented staff recommendations for four bodies related to capital projects and infrastructure: the Capital Planning Committee, the Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District Public Financing Authority No. 1 (EIFD PFA), the Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee (GOBOC), and the Municipal Transportation Agency Bond Oversight Committee (SFMTA BOC).

She noted that these bodies are structurally unique, so staff selected the most appropriate governance or advisory templates for comparison. For the Capital Planning Committee, staff recommended retaining the body due to its formal role in capital planning and budgeting.

For GOBOC, staff recommended keeping the body but suggested several changes to improve functionality and reduce vacancies. Staff also noted that GOBOC plays an important role in building public trust regarding general obligation bonds.

Finally, for the SFMTA BOC, Ms. Alonso clarified that the Task Force does not have authority to make changes directly, as the body was created by the MTA Board. However, the Task Force could recommend that the MTA Board eliminate the body or merge its functions with GOBOC. Staff noted that the body has overlapping responsibilities with GOBOC and has limited activity due to the infrequent issuance of revenue bonds by SFMTA.

Public comment was received from two speakers:

- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:

The Board of Supervisors approved appointment of Benjamin Tingle, to C-GOBOC's, Seat 3, on October 21, 2025. C-GOBOC appears to now have only two vacancies, at a rate of 22%, and isn't "borderline inactive."

The Staff recommends the Streamlining Task Force should also consider converting C-GOBOC's seat-level requirements into merely "*desirable*" qualifications, to broaden the applicant pool and give appointing authorities greater flexibility in filling vacancies. Citizen oversight isn't about providing appointing authorities with greater flexibility, which may well

lead to just more corruption in City government. The qualifications for appointment to the C-GOBOC should **not** be changed, just to offer the appointing authorities *carte blanche* “flexibility.”

Indeed, the Streamlining Task Force has broken its own rules and granted exceptions to **not** sunset other advisory bodies housed in the Administrative Code. This Task Force should issue an additional sunset date **EXEMPTION** for C-GOBOC!

Leave C-GOBOC exactly as it currently is!

- Will Fox, a current GOBOC member and former civil grand juror, expressed appreciation for the Task Force’s work. He opposed combining GOBOC with the SFMTA BOC, stating that such a merger would be misaligned with GOBOC’s scope. He supported reducing the number of seats to address the body’s vacancy issues.

#### Capital Planning Committee

Natasha Mihal noted a disconnect between the City’s capital planning and oversight functions and suggested referencing this issue in the final report as a future consideration. Ms. Kittler moved to retain the body as-is. Sophie Hayward seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District Public Financing Authority No. 1 (EIFD PFA)

For the EIFD PFA, Ms. Hayward moved to retain the body and align it with all staff recommendations. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

#### Citizens’ General Obligation Bond Oversight (GOBOC)

Chair Harrington described GOBOC’s origins and its role in ensuring accountability for general obligation bond spending. He noted that GOBOC has the authority to delay future bond issuances if departments fail to comply with oversight expectations. He acknowledged the body’s past success in compelling departments to improve reporting practices but also noted ongoing challenges in filling seats.

Ms. Kittler questioned whether the Office of Public Finance (OPF) already tracks the relevant financial information. Ms. Mihal clarified that while OPF does track and report on overall bond spending, GOBOC focuses on broader issues of scope, schedule, and budget for capital projects, which are more difficult to monitor. Ms. Kittler expressed concern that the body may not be meeting its stated purposes and suggested she would be inclined to eliminate it if not for the potential risk it could pose to future bond passage. She ultimately supported retaining the body with modifications.

Ms. Mihal emphasized the importance of oversight when the City is spending billions of dollars and supported maintaining GOBOC’s role. The Task Force discussed the challenges of seat-specific requirements and the potential benefits of converting them to body-level qualifications. Ms. Mihal noted that some qualifications, such as construction management, are important but difficult to fill. Chair Harrington added that the distribution of appointment responsibilities can make it awkward for certain appointing authorities to fill specialized roles when qualifications are body-level.

Ms. Kittler moved to retain GOBOC without a sunset date, impose four-term limits, and otherwise align it with the staff recommendations. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

### SFMTA Bond Oversight Committee

Finally, the Task Force discussed the SFMTA Bond Oversight Committee. Ms. Hayward asked whether there was any risk in removing the committee. Ms. Kittler responded that it oversees revenue bonds, which differ from general obligation bonds, and noted that SFMTA has issued few revenue bonds in recent years. Task Force members agreed that the body no longer adds value and that if its elimination would jeopardize anything for the MTA, the MTA Board could choose not to act on the Task Force's elimination recommendation.

Ms. Kittler moved to recommend that the MTA Board of Directors eliminate the body. Chair Harrington seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

As a closing note, Ms. Kittler raised a potential future issue regarding the Committee on Information Technology (COIT), which is currently classified as a staff working group but includes two public members. She suggested the Task Force revisit whether those public seats are necessary at a future meeting.

## **10. Future Agenda Topics (Discussion Item)**

Project Director Rachel Alonso provided an overview of the updated decision calendar and outlined the anticipated structure of upcoming meetings. She noted that the November 19 meeting would focus on operational improvements and deferred decisions. While few decisions had been formally deferred, staff had identified clarifying questions and missed items that would be addressed.

Ms. Alonso explained that both the November 19 and December 3 meetings would include "consistency checks" during which the Task Force would review decisions by body type to identify patterns and validate or revise exceptions. Due to the volume of work, the draft report would no longer be presented on December 3 as originally planned. Instead, the draft report would be presented at a second meeting in December, with a second draft expected in January.

She noted that the Task Force would need to finalize the date and location for the second December meeting and consider holding it in the community. Options discussed included December 12, 17, or 18, with a potential 4:00 p.m. start time to accommodate public participation. Staff would also revisit the timing of the first January meeting and consider moving it out by one week to allow more preparation time.

Chief Assistant City Attorney Jon Givner added that he would begin previewing Charter sections on December 3 and would provide draft legislative language on a rolling basis, with a fuller draft available in January.

Ms. Alonso confirmed that staff would research offsite location availability for a potential community meeting and return to the Task Force with options. She also confirmed that the upcoming consistency checks would allow for revisiting any public body, and that staff would work to clearly communicate this to the public through updated graphics and messaging. Chair Harrington emphasized the importance of public communication, particularly around why specific bodies were being revisited and what portions of earlier decisions were being reopened.

Public comment was received from one speaker:

- Patrick Monette-Shaw strongly opposed presenting the draft report at a remote or off-site location, citing ongoing connectivity issues and accessibility concerns. He urged the Task Force to present the draft report at City Hall to ensure access for people with disabilities and avoid excluding members of the public.

The item concluded with a summary of next steps: staff would identify viable dates and locations for the second December meeting, confirm whether one or two community meetings would be held, and ensure that the public is informed about the potential for any public body to be discussed during consistency checks.

## 11. General Public Comment

One member of the public provided comment during the general public comment period:

- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:  
In response to public records requests, the public learned Task Force Member Andrea Bruss landed her golden parachute as a 0932 Manager IV in the City Attorney's Office (CAO) on 1/4/2025 so she meets the "*seat qualification*" to qualify for Streamlining Task Force membership. Andrea isn't in an attorney job classification and is paid \$237,000 as the CAO's Director of Government Legal Reform.

Which suddenly-needed "*reforms*" is Bruss paid for working on?

This raises a troubling question of whether it is a conflict of interest for Bruss to have that job title, and at the same time be a member of the Streamlining Task Force.

There have been no previous City Attorney employees with a working job titled of "*Director of Government Legal Reform*." That raises the question of whether the job was created just for Bruss.

Bruss should resign from this Streamlining Task Force over potential conflicts of interest!

## 12. Adjournment

Chair Harrington adjourned the meeting at 7:08 p.m.

---

Minutes prepared by Hannah Kohanzadeh, Principal Project Analyst and Chelsea Hall, Senior Project Analyst.