



Draft Minutes

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

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

Wednesday, December 3, 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/3bpbvwem> 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) 2661 804 5859 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 1:05 p.m.

2. Roll Call

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

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

3. Announcements (Informational Item)

The clerk announced that the Task Force would hold two special meetings in December. The first will be held on December 12th at 10 am in City Hall, Room 263. The second will be held on December 18th in the Southeast Community Center's Bayview Multipurpose Room at 4 pm. Both sessions will be conducted in a hybrid format with the meetings occurring in-person and via an online Webex webinar.

4. Approve Minutes – November 19, 2025 meeting (Action Item)

Chair Harrington expressed appreciation for the level of discussion his colleagues had in his absence at the November 19th meeting, as documented in the minutes. Sophie Hayward thanked staff for posting a second version of the minutes which noted her departure after item 6.

No public comment was received.

Ms. Hayward motioned to approve the meeting minutes as drafted by staff. Sophia Kittler seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

5. Deferred Decisions on Arts and Building Inspection Commissions (Action Item)

Materials: Presentation and Attachment A – Arts Commission Responsibilities Matrix

Chair Harrington noted that the Task Force was revisiting select topics to finalize preliminary decisions and emphasized that there was no intention to reopen discussion on every body reviewed in this process. Joanna Bell, Sr. Performance Analyst at the Controller's Office, then presented on the Arts Commission and Building Inspection Commission (BIC).

Arts Commission

Ms. Bell summarized the Task Force's October 1st meeting decisions to retain the Arts Commission and move it from the Charter to the Administrative Code. She noted the Task Force postponed deciding whether the Commission should remain a governance body or become advisory, requesting staff to assess how such a change would affect its functions. She also noted the Task Force eliminated the Street Artists and Craftsmen Advisory Committee and noted the approach to ensure public input on artist licensing would be addressed in a future informational memo.

Ms. Bell noted the Mayor created a new arts agency in this year's budget to combine the Arts Commission, Film Commission, and Grants for the Arts. She outlined the template alignment options for the Arts Commission, depending on whether it remains a governance body or becomes an advisory body. She reviewed its key functions and explained that, if reclassified as advisory, most of its responsibilities would shift from oversight to a review role.

Ms. Bell described the Charter-mandated Civic Design Review (CDR), currently conducted by a subcommittee through a four-stage process that examines the exterior design of structures on City land. She noted that in peer cities, such work is typically handled by planning departments. The Task Force could consider moving CDR to the Planning Department, which has staff with relevant design expertise. Potential benefits include a faster, more efficient process, reduced departmental overlap, and greater for Arts Commission appointments. However, she also highlighted trade-offs, such as fewer opportunities for public input, higher staff costs, less focus on artistic value, and challenges in tracking compliance with the Art Enrichment Ordinance.

Public comment on the Arts Commission was received by 21 speakers.

- Dorka Keehn – former Arts Commissioner for ten years, former Chair of the Visual Arts Committee and former CDR Committee member – spoke in opposition to the proposed recommendations. Ms. Keehn stated the Planning Department staff do not have strong enough skills in evaluating architectural excellence, contextual aesthetics, or the cultural and aesthetic quality of civic spaces.

- Jill Manton, former Director of Public Arts at the Arts Commission, spoke in opposition to the proposed recommendations. Ms. Manton stated that civic design and public art are intrinsically related and required for smooth and successful art installation.
- Adam Keen spoke about challenges installing community gardens across the City.
- Kim Striker, former Chair of the CDR Committee, opposed moving CDR to the Planning Department.
- Nabil Musleh, a current Arts Commissioner, spoke in opposition to the proposed recommendations.
- Heather Davies, a Sunset District resident, recommended art installation reviews from multiple departments including Planning, Arts, and SFMTA. She cited an example of an art installation on Judah Street which caused sidewalk access challenges. She advocated for a stakeholder list to be mandated for every commission to notify residents of events, work, or processes that could impact them.
- Patrick Carney, Arts Commissioner and an architect who sits on the CDR Committee, opposed moving CDR to the Planning Department. He emphasized the work CDR Committee performs alongside the Visual Arts Committee is essential.
- Lex Leifheit, a cultural policy advisor and City resident, urged the Task Force to retain the Arts Commission as a governance body in the Charter. She noted creative jobs are growing in the City, in contrast to their decline across the Bay Area.
- Janine Shiota, Vice President of the Arts Commission and native San Franciscan, noted the City is recovering and competing against other cities to attract and retain employees. She supported maintaining the Arts Commission as a governance body and retaining CDR within the Commission. She used SFO airport's collaboration with the Arts Commission as an example of the strong and successful work of the body.
- Charles Collins, President of the Arts Commission, shared his qualifications and noted that the other commissioners are equally qualified. He appreciated staff pointing out the City's CDR process differs from its peers. He urged the Task Force to maintain CDR as part of the Arts Commission. He also noted the arts element of the City's General Plan relies on the Arts Commission for execution.
- Rachele Axel, former Arts Commission employee for 21 years, urged the Task Force to keep the Arts Commission in the Charter as a governance body.
- Sunny Angulo, Prop E drafter, stated that Prop E marginally beat out Prop D, suggesting that the public is not keen on the Task Force removing bodies in large swaths. Ms. Angulo urged the Task Force to keep the Arts Commission in the Charter as a governance body.
- Heraldo Garma, an artist, raised concerns with consolidating art grant reviews, stating it may lead to censorship and a lack of funding for specific projects. He stated he has not found any public research on the benefits of consolidating arts departments.
- Debra Walker – artist, Arts Commissioner, and Chair of the Civic Design Review – noted the City's reputation as a renowned art city. She expressed appreciation for the work of the Task Force and noted the Arts Commission needs governance body authority to perform some of its tasks while others could be sufficiently supported by advisory body powers. She noted that all commissions should have clearer definitions of their jurisdictions. She also supported the mayor hiring and firing all department heads.
- JD Beltran, an artist and native San Franciscan, expressed appreciation for the City's public art and art in SFO. She shared some of the Arts Commission's history and noted that arts in the City

generate approximately \$1.7 billion in annual economic activity and supports roughly 3,700-3,900 jobs.

- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:
You should leave the Arts Commission in the City Charter as a governance body and make no changes. Don't make it an advisory body. Obviously, the Board of Supervisors are not qualified to take on the oversight duties of the Arts Commission, and they don't have time to hold public hearings that the Arts Commission currently holds. The president of the Arts Commission is right: This Streamlining Task Force, must, repeat, MUST, stop trying to fix things that are not broken!

You are going way beyond the mandate of "Proposition E."

- Richard Rothman requested that the Task Force empower the Arts Commission with more authority to maintain and preserve the public murals in the City. He urged the Task Force to keep the civic art collection in the Charter.
- Caelen agreed with previous speakers that the Task Force should not make sweeping changes to the Arts Commission. She urged the Task Force to preserve the Commission's ability to conduct CDR. She also agreed with Mr. Rothman that the Commission should have greater authority to preserve public sculptures.
- Jeremiah Moore, an artist in the City, expressed general support for the Arts Commission and noted it enhances the revival of civic spaces in the City.
- Yesenia Sanchez, Executive Director of Intersection for the Arts, urged the Task Force to keep the Arts Commission a governance body. She stated the Commission helps create and implement a cultural strategy that attracts and retains artists in the City which would not be possible as an advisory body.
- Stella Lockman, an arts administrator, expressed concerns with taking away political accountability by making the Arts Commission an advisory body.

Chair Harrington expressed concern about volunteers on the Arts Commission conducting CDR, a critical City function, instead of City staff or contractors. He acknowledged that public commenters stated the current CDR process works. He emphasized the arts' permanent role in the City, suggesting that the body should remain in the Charter. However, with plans to restructure arts departments into an agency model, he suggested moving details about the Commission's composition and duties to the Administrative Code to provide future flexibility, while retaining its mission in the Charter. Ms. Kittler agreed, saying the proposal seemed reasonable.

Vice Chair Bruss asked if Chair Harrington intended to move all Arts Commission functions to the Administrative Code for easier amendment by the Board of Supervisors. Chair Harrington confirmed, citing the need for thoughtful review. Vice Chair Bruss noted this would mirror the Fire Commission's structure. Ms. Mihal supported the split Charter/Code approach and suggested the Task Force begin identifying functions. She also supported paying for CDR but was hesitant to recommend specific changes to the process at this time.

Ms. Hayward asked whether the Task Force was re-considering whether the Arts Commission should be a governance or advisory body. She recalled a prior decision to move the body to the Administrative Code and was hesitant to revisit placing part of it in the Charter. She noted other bodies could benefit

from similar restructuring and did not want to reopen other decisions. Ms. Hayward questioned why public commenters doubted City staff's ability to conduct CDR, noting that the Planning Department employs qualified professionals.

Vice Chair Bruss stated the Task Force could align the body to the governance or advisory template. She noted that the qualifications would depend on what the Task Force decided to do on CDR. Ms. Kittler noted CDR included two key functions: deciding what something should look like and serving as a public forum to discuss such aesthetic concerns. She opposed moving CDR to the Planning Department because she thought it unnecessary to intertwine questions about a building's existence and its aesthetics. Ms. Kittler supported the Arts Commission weighing in on CDR but did not think it was necessary for the Commission to conduct CDR.

Looking at the Charter language, Vice Chair Bruss opposed the Commission continuing to supervise and control the expenditure of all appropriations made by the Board of Supervisors for the advancement of the visual, performing, or literary arts, which is a governance body function. Ms. Kittler noted she was amenable to the Commission supervising expenditures but not controlling them.

Vice Chair Bruss moved to retain the Arts Commission's mission in the Charter while relocating other elements of its structure to the Administrative Code. Specifically, she proposed moving the Commission's size, appointing authority, and member removal provisions as-is and modifying member qualifications to apply at the body level. She also moved to transfer Charter sections 5.103(2) and 5.103(3) to code. Regarding the Commission's role in CDR (Charter section 5.103(1)), she proposed modifying it to be consultative. Lastly, she moved to revise the Commission's role in overseeing arts-related appropriations (Charter section 5.103(4)) from "supervise and control" to an advisory role. All that would remain in the charter was the mission statement; the other language would move to code. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Hayward requested staff include a recommendation in the report to rename the Arts Commission Department to resolve confusion between the Commission and the Department. The Task Force members agreed.

Building Inspection Commission (BIC)

Ms. Bell summarized the Task Force's decisions on DBI bodies and provided background on BIC, including changes from Proposition B (2022). She reviewed BIC's governance functions and noted that if made advisory, BIC would no longer have decision-making authority but could serve as a forum for DBI accountability, transparency, and public input. She noted in the past two years, BIC rarely used its power to overturn DBI decisions regarding construction work completion or meeting City requirements, suggesting the function could be safely be eliminated. She also reviewed governance functions previously modified by the Task Force, such as budget and contract approval authority, and the transfer of duties to the Board of Appeals. Finally, she showed how BIC could be aligned to the advisory body template.

Chair Harrington acknowledged concerns raised by DBI staff and BIC commissioners about whether BIC, if reclassified as advisory, would retain the ability to review and comment on legislation before the Board of Supervisors. Staff confirmed that as an advisory body, BIC would still be able to provide input on proposed legislation.

Public comment on the Building Inspection Commission was received by 20 speakers.

- Brendan Green, a business representative for IBW Local 6, which represents electrical workers in the City, opposed all changes to BIC and to its subcommittees.
- Osha Ashworth, an assistant business manager with IBW Local 6, opposed all changes to BIC and to its subcommittees. She emphasized the need for these bodies to maintain worker and building safety.
- A speaker opposed all changes to BIC and the Code Advisory Committee (CAC) due to safety concerns.
- Xiaohan Zhong, from SRO Families United Collaborative, spoke using an interpreter. She urged the Task Force to keep BIC as is. She shared her family lives in an SRO and like the others who live in SROs rely on BIC to communicate their concerns with and receive assistance from DBI.
- Mao Yu, from SRO Families United Collaborative, spoke using an interpreter. She urged the Task Force to keep BIC as a governance body to help keep DBI transparent and accountable.
- Joel Coppel, a Planning Commissioner and electrician, noted the City's increasing dependence on electricity with electric vehicles and charging stations which heightens the need for maintaining or increasing safety standards. He urged the Task Force to keep BIC and the CAC as-is.
- Cyntiago Mes, research analysts at Unite Here, echoed other commentor's recommendation that the Task Force leave BIC as is.
- Alex Lanceford, Research Advocacy Director with the San Francisco Electrical Construction Industry, urged the Task Force to keep BIC as-is.
- Henry Karnilowicz, President of the South of Market Business Association, spoke on behalf of his organization and the Building Safety Alliance to strongly oppose altering BIC in any way and eliminating CAC to maintain safety and transparency standards.
- Heather Davies urged the Task Force to keep BIC, add a building code specialist with an international code council accreditation, add an equity and housing specialist, and retain BIC's authority to approve DBI contracts.
- Luce, a tenants advocate with Mission Action, spoke using an interpreter. She urged the Task Force to keep BIC as a governance body.
- Angelina, a member of Mission Action, urged the Task Force to keep BIC as a governance body to ensure tenants have safe homes to live in. She noted BIC champions the culturally competent and multilingual code enforcement outreach program which educates, mediates, and advocates for vulnerable tenants.
- Fred Sherman Zimmer, Housing Rights Committee member, stated BIC is crucial for tenants' protections.
- A member of the Tenderloin Housing Clinic urged the Task Force to keep BIC as-is.
- Rosa Shields, Political Director of the San Francisco Labor Council, noted her organization's concerns with making BIC advisory and eliminating the CAC.
- Jim Reed, a member of the Board of Examiners and Director of the Building Safety Alliance, emphasized the benefits BIC and CAC bring to the City. He noted that CAC has had members who have served for over 20 years.
- Juan Alejandro Garcia, representing the Chinatown Community Development Center, urged the Task Force to keep BIC as-is. He noted BIC is an important tool for tenants' rights to be heard and addressed.

- Alysabeth Alexander-Tut, BIC President and former tenant organizer, noted the body has improved over the last six years. In response to Chair Harrington’s question during public comment, she noted that allowing the DBI Director to select participants for the CAC as a passive meeting body could lead to corruption and other concerns DBI has been working to address. She urged the Task Force to keep BIC’s technical members.
- Sean Keegrant, a residential Builders Association member, urged the Task Force to keep BIC as-is.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:
In terms of the safety of all 800,000-plus San Franciscans, this five-member Task Force must vote today to keep the Building Inspection Commission as a governance body and NOT make it a mere **advisory** committee. It must be allowed to nominate candidates for the DBI department head, too!

You are going way beyond the mandate of “Proposition E.”

During public comment, Chair Harrington asked Jim Reed for his thoughts on the staff recommendation to alter the CAC from a public meeting body to a passive meeting body with members appointed by the DBI Director so the body could continue its work without being codified. Mr. Reed stated he could not advise whether CAC should be a public meeting or passive meeting body but thought it should remain as-is and stressed the importance of the CAC’s work continuing. Debra Walker, a former long-serving CAC member, agreed with the staff recommendation. Ms. Walker supported making BIC advisory, keeping the mission in the Charter, and moving the functions to the Administrative Code to provide the City flexibility in the body’s responsibilities.

Vice Chair Bruss began the Task Force’s deliberation by asking Ms. Tut whether the membership qualification changes made by Proposition B (2022) had sufficiently addressed past conflict-of-interest challenges that made it difficult to fill seats. Ms. Tut responded that the new qualifications were sufficient but noted there are currently more vacancies than before. She also expressed appreciation for the technical expertise represented on the body.

In response to the positive sentiments about the CAC, Chair Harrington stated he was open to maintaining the body in the Administrative Code or allowing it to operate as a passive meeting body. He also indicated openness to keeping the Abatement Appeals Board within BIC. Ms. Mihal was unopposed to moving CAC to the Administrative Code and aligning it with the advisory body template, including imposing term limits. The Task Force debated the merits of making the CAC a public or passive meeting body.

Ms. Hayward noted that the Task Force requested staff investigate the implications of making BIC advisory. She affirmed the need for a body to perform the CAC’s work and noted that the only question was whether the body should be a public or passive meeting body, not whether the CAC’s work should cease. She also emphasized the importance of the BIC’s ability to comment on proposed legislation.

The Task Force deliberated on BIC’s appeals functions, including whether the Abatement Appeals Board (AAB) should be transferred to the Board of Appeals. Patrick O’Riordan, DBI Director, answered Task Force member questions regarding BIC’s role in adjusting DBI’s enforcement actions. Mr. O’Riordan stated that the AAB, which shares members with BIC, provides DBI with appropriate feedback for how

to address appeals and provide better customer service to San Franciscans. Mr. O’Riordan also stated his preference to have maximum transparency and accountability to continue building public trust and reforming DBI. Ms. Mihal noted that appeals heard at the AAB bring attention to shortcomings of DBI which can then be corrected so decoupling the AAB from BIC and DBI would not be ideal.

Chair Harrington elaborated on his comments at a previous meeting regarding corruption at DBI and BIC, noting that DBI suffered from systemic corruption. He stated commissioners are not responsible for individual corruption or malfeasance within a department, but commissions are responsible when such malfeasance is systemic.

The Task Force discussed whether to make BIC advisory or keep it as a governance body. Vice Chair Bruss noted if BIC were kept as a governance body it should be aligned to the governance body template, which includes removing the body’s ability to nominate the DBI Director, members serving at will and more. Ms. Kittler noted that tenant advocates could continue successfully using BIC as a forum to lobby the City on budget decisions even if the body were made advisory. She noted BIC’s appeals functions were a convincing reason to keep the body as governance. In response to the information shared by Mr. O’Riordan, Ms. Mihal noted that there were valid reasons to keep BIC as a governance body. She noted though that BIC’s establishing language could be moved to the Administrative Code to allow for flexibility in the body’s responsibilities as DBI continues its journey to rebuild public trust and root out poor processes. She also emphasized the importance of the BIC’s ability to comment on prospective legislation.

Ms. Mihal motioned to reverse the Task Force’s prior decision to transfer the AAB to the Board of Appeals, so instead the AAB would remain its own distinct body made up of BIC commissioners. Vice Chair Bruss seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Vice Chair Bruss motioned to retain BIC with its current size and appointing authorities, while making the following changes: align the confirmation process, hiring and firing authority, and contract approval authority with the governance template; make members removable at will; set four-year term lengths with a three-term limit; make membership qualifications desirable at a body level; and move the Commission from the Charter to the Administrative Code. Ms. Kittler seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

In discussing her motion, Vice Chair Bruss raised that the Charter requires five members of BIC to approve DBI’s budget. She sought to remove that Charter provision and align BIC’s budget authority with the governance template. The Task Force deliberated whether any body has true budget authority, noting that budget decisions ultimately rest with the Board of Supervisors and Mayor.

Vice Chair Bruss motioned to remove the Charter provision requiring five members of BIC to approve the budget and align BIC to the governance body template’s budget authority. The motion was seconded by Chair Harrington. The motion passed 4-1 by voice vote with Ms. Kittler in opposition.

Chair Harrington motioned to move the CAC to the Administrative Code with this current structure, except to add a four-term limit– reversing the Task Force’s previous decision to eliminate the CAC and convert it to a passive meeting body. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hayward. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

The Task Force maintained their previous decision to transfer the Access Appeals Commission to the Board of Appeals as a subcommittee.

6. Deferred Decisions on Aging, Homelessness, and Children's Services Bodies (Action Item)

Materials: [Presentation](#)

Joanna Bell, Senior Performance Analyst with the Controller's Office, opened the item by presenting outstanding Task Force decisions for several public bodies. First, she reviewed the Task Force's prior decision to retain the Homeless Oversight Commission and merge it with the Local Homeless Coordinating Board. She proposed a structure for the new body, specifically a Homelessness Advisory Board (HAB) with seven members. She noted that a Continuum of Care Subcommittee would be part of the HAB and that the City Attorney's Office would help define the subcommittee's decision-making authority.

Ms. Bell then presented the remaining body-specific deferred decisions: a proposal to merge the Disability and Aging Services Advisory Council with the Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee, options for the structure of and continued departmental engagement in lieu of the City's two Service Provider Working Groups, and specific seats to remove from the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council to partially align it with the advisory committee template.

Public comment was received by five speakers:

- Dr. Allen Cooper, President of the Advisory Council to the Disability and Aging Services Commission, spoke in support of retaining a 22-member structure for the merged advisory council and emphasized the importance of having one member from each supervisorial district.
- Marie Jobling, Co-chair of the Dignity Fund Coalition, supported the merger of the two advisory bodies on the condition that the Task Force retain the 22-member structure to manage the increased workload. She also requested that service provider engagement be codified in the Administrative Code if the Dignity Fund Service Provider Working Group is removed from the Charter.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:
Regarding the Disability and Aging Services Commissions Advisory Body and the Dignity Fund Oversight Advisory (DF OAC) Committee, the October 15 meeting minutes only reports on page 11 that the Streamlining Task Force voted to eliminate the LTCCC, but neither the meeting minutes nor the 11/21/2025 update of the "Decision Log" (page 16) report what decision the Streamlining Task Force made with respect to the LTCCC's nominating and appointing authority to appoint three members to the Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee (DF OAC).

Shouldn't the Streamlining Task Force be deciding what to do with the three appointments to the DF OAC during today's meeting? And shouldn't that be explicitly stated in the "Decision Log"?

- Madison Holland, a member of the Children, Youth, and Their Families Service Provider Working Group, spoke on behalf of the group's leadership team in support of retaining the body as a formal advisory group. She opposed a three-year sunset date and advocated for alignment with the Children's Fund baseline in 2041.

- Vincent Crisostomo echoed support for retaining the 22-member structure of the merged advisory council and emphasized the importance of representation for the HIV-affected aging population.

During public comment, Chair Harrington confirmed with Ms. Jobling that the details on slide 23 aligned with her expectations of what the newly merged aging advisory council would look like.

Homelessness Advisory Board (HAB)

Task Force members expressed appreciation for staff's work in developing the proposals. Sophia Kittler moved to adopt the proposed structure for the Homelessness Advisory Board and its Continuum of Care Subcommittee as outlined on slide 21, keeping membership flexible with up to 13 seats. Ms. Bell clarified that while federal regulations require Continuum of Care members to self-nominate to their governing body, in San Francisco, recipients of Continuum of Care funding are considered members. She recommended that implementation details be ironed out in consultation with stakeholders and the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing. Vice Chair Bruss seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Disability and Aging Services Advisory Council & Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee

Vice Chair Bruss moved to adopt the staff recommendation, including retaining the 22-member structure. Sophie Hayward seconded the motion. Chair Harrington noted that the Task Force's final report should address the transition from the current bodies to the new merged council and the status of existing members. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Service Provider Working Groups

The Task Force then discussed the Service Provider Working Groups. Vice Chair Bruss stated that she did not support reversing the prior decision to eliminate them as formal public bodies, noting that their current structures were incompatible with the Brown Act. She appreciated the efforts by children's advocates to propose a compliant structure but did not see the need to create a new advisory body. Vice Chair Bruss moved to adopt the staff language on slide 26 for the Department of Disability and Aging Services, which codified service provider engagement without creating a new advisory body. Sophia Kittler seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Chair Harrington then moved to adopt the proposal on slide 27 for the Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families, which would establish a formal Service Provider Working Group with seven members. Natasha Mihal seconded the motion and proposed that the sunset date be set at three years rather than aligned with the Children's Fund baseline in 2041. The motion passed by a vote of 3-2, with Vice Chair Bruss and Ms. Kittler opposed.

Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council

Finally, the Task Force revisited its prior direction to reduce the membership of the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council from 20 to 15 seats. Chair Harrington and Natasha Mihal reflected on the Task Force's earlier, more rigid approach to membership counts and expressed support for retaining the current 20-member structure. Ms. Mihal motioned to make no changes to the council's membership. Sophie Hayward seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

7. Deferred Decisions on General Administration and Finance Bodies (Action Item)

Materials: [Presentation](#)

Joanna Bell, Senior Performance Analyst with the Controller's Office, presented the staff recommendations for the Ballot Simplification Committee. Proposed changes covered the member nomination and appointment process, seat qualifications, and term limits.

Public comment was received by one speaker:

- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:
The City Administrator's staff recommendation to the Streamlining Task Force specifically stated for the for the Ballot Simplification Committee:

"The Task Force should not modify the appointment process or qualifications. While it is unusual to explicitly task outside organizations with nominating members, the approach appears to be effective in maintaining the Committee's independence and nonpartisan character. Additionally, the current qualifications promote public confidence that members are selected for their professional expertise."

You voted to potentially change the nominations for the Ballot Simplification Committee members and also modify its member qualifications and nomination provisions — ignoring the Task Force's own staff recommendation against doing so. As of November 19, the Staff had not yet provided recommendations about those changes, which remain unresolved.

You should vote today to retain the existing qualification and make no changes, as your own Support staff had recommended.

Following public comment, Task Force members discussed the proposal. Sophia Kittler asked Ms. Bell to reiterate the rationale for not imposing term limits. Ms. Bell explained that the committee's technical nature and infrequent meetings make continuity especially valuable and that term limits could hinder the development of necessary expertise.

Vice Chair Bruss expressed strong support for the committee, describing its work as difficult, important, and a "learned muscle." She agreed that term limits were not appropriate and noted that frequent turnover could disrupt the committee's effectiveness. She also supported the revised qualifications language for the SF Unified School District (SFUSD) seat, which has historically been difficult to fill. Sophie Hayward also endorsed these changes.

Ms. Kittler acknowledged the value of institutional knowledge but raised concern about the potential downsides of having the same individuals serve for decades, suggesting that rotation could help others build expertise.

Vice Chair Bruss moved to accept the staff recommendations: allow the SFUSD Superintendent to directly appoint the designated seat, adopt the changes to that seat's qualifications, and maintain no term limits. Ms. Hayward seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

8. Reviewing and Revising Preliminary Decisions (Action Item)

Materials: [Presentation](#); [Attachment A – Seat Qualifications](#); [Attachment B – Advisory Body Sunset Dates](#); [Attachment C – Memo from the City Attorney’s Office](#); [Attachment D – Section-by-section description for Charter amendment sample language](#); [Attachment E – Charter amendment sample language](#)

Chelsea Hall, Senior Project Analyst with the City Administrator’s Office, presented two deferred decisions. First, she reviewed the Task Force’s decisions regarding member qualifications. Ms. Hall noted that the Task Force has increasingly moved toward converting mandatory qualifications into desirable, body-level guidelines. However, only a few bodies had been explicitly updated to reflect this approach. She concluded her presentation by detailing several options for staggering sunset dates for advisory bodies to prevent all expirations from occurring at the same time.

Public comment was received by one speaker:

- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:
The “sneak peek” samples includes modifying several items in City Charter §4.102, including removing the annual statements of purpose, and removing the requirement to hire a commission secretary.

Both recommendations are nonsense.

First, the idea Commissions shouldn’t have a dedicated Commission Secretary is a terrible idea, because “institutional knowledge” about a given Board’s current affairs would vanish. Removing the requirement to appoint a Commission’s secretary will impair managing the affairs and operations of the body.

Second, eliminating the current Charter provision requiring annual reports runs contrary to the principle of annual performance appraisals for City employees. That’s bonkers!

Your November 19 **meeting minutes** clearly stated the Task Force removed annual report requirements only for decision-making bodies; the sample draft Charter change language Jon Giver presented shows the annual report requirement will be removed from **all** boards and commissions, not just decision-making bodies. **Revisit and reverse this decision! Keep annual reports!**

Seat Qualifications

During the discussion, Vice Chair Bruss requested a consistency check for any remaining seat-specific qualifications for governance bodies, clarifying that she was interested in revisiting qualifications for those bodies only. The Task Force agreed to return to the topic at a future meeting and to leave previously adopted decisions for advisory body qualifications as-is.

As to the bodies with split appointments, Vice Chair Bruss moved to make qualifications for the Small Business Commission and the MTA Citizens’ Advisory Council desirable at the body level, applicable to all appointing authorities. Sophia Kittler seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Regarding the Immigrant Rights Commission, Ms. Kittler moved to retain the requirement that eight of the fifteen members be immigrants, with the requirement split with two seats for the Mayor and six seats

for the Board of Supervisors appointments. Natasha Mihal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Regarding the inconsistency between the Human Services Commission and the Disability and Aging Services Commission, Task Force members agreed to allow their prior decisions to stand.

Staggering Sunset Dates

The Task Force then discussed staggering sunset dates for advisory bodies. Members debated when to begin the clock for three-year sunsets and considered grouping bodies by subject matter or establishing authority (Charter vs. Code).

After discussion, the Task Force proposed keeping the existing sunset dates for the Cannabis Oversight Committee and Free City College Oversight Committee. All other advisory bodies would be assigned staggered sunset dates in thirds, beginning on June 1st of 2026, 2027, and 2028. This would result in expirations from 2029 through 2031, with bodies established in the Administrative Code generally sunsetting sooner. The Task Force asked staff and the City Attorney's Office to draft a proposed schedule with groupings.

Draft Charter Amendment

Chief Assistant City Attorney Jon Givner then previewed the draft Charter amendment, which will be considered more fully during an upcoming Task Force meeting in January. He explained that the amendment would create a binary classification for public bodies: decision-making bodies (commissions) and advisory bodies. These definitions would be layered throughout the Charter to clarify which rules apply to each type. Article IV of the Charter would be updated to reflect these distinctions, with general rules applying to all bodies and specific rules for commissions.

Mr. Givner noted that the amendment would remove outdated language and clarify ambiguous provisions, such as voting thresholds and gendered pronouns. He also discussed how the governance template would be applied to existing Charter bodies, with default rules for term lengths and limits. Exceptions would be made where the Task Force had already approved departures from the template.

Mr. Givner also addressed bodies created by voter initiative ordinances, which cannot be amended by ordinance at the Board of Supervisors (BOS) unless explicitly authorized. The Charter amendment would include language allowing the BOS to make targeted changes to specific provisions, such as imposing term limits on the ratepayer representative of the Refuse Rate Board. The Task Force debated whether such changes should be discretionary ("may") or mandatory ("must"), ultimately agreeing that narrowly prescribed changes made by the Task Force should be considered mandatory. The Task Force also discussed how to memorialize decisions to eliminate certain bodies, such as the Street Artists Advisory Committee, in a way that respects affected communities. Mr. Givner agreed to revise the Charter amendment language to reflect the specificity of the Task Force's decisions and distinguish between ministerial actions and discretionary authority.

Public comment was received by one speaker:

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

9. **Future Agenda Topics (Discussion Item)**

Rachel Alonso, Project Director, explained that the next meeting would be held earlier than usual – on Friday, December 12 at 10:00 a.m. – and would focus on some additional deferred decisions. She emphasized the importance of confirming which items the Task Force wished to revisit, given that public input had already been received and outreach would be necessary if items were to be reconsidered.

Ms. Alonso asked members to indicate whether they wished to reopen and reconsider decisions related to two categories: (1) establishing authority for six bodies proposed to be moved from the Charter to the Administrative Code (Library Commission, War Memorial Board of Trustees, Juvenile Probation Commission, Historic Preservation Commission, Airport Commission, and Health Commission), and (2) hiring and firing authority for the Civil Service Commission (regarding the Director of Human Resources), the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board (regarding the Inspector General), and the Southeast Community Facility Commission (regarding its facility director).

Sophia Kittler clarified that the original discussion about moving bodies out of the Charter was intended as a framework consideration rather than a definitive recommendation. She proposed rescinding the Historic Preservation Commission from the list, citing robust prior discussion and a lack of interest from the Mayor's Office in revisiting the issue.

Sophie Hayward expressed opposition to bringing any of the six bodies back for discussion, noting that even when the Task Force intends to revisit just one aspect, the conversation often expands to reconsider every aspect of the body. Chair Harrington agreed, stating that unless three members expressed strong interest in revisiting a topic, it should not be brought back. Members did not express the requisite interest in reopening any of the six bodies.

After some deliberation about hiring and firing authority, the Task Force members similarly agreed that there was no need to revisit those decisions. They acknowledged that while some decisions may be inconsistent, they were not necessarily problematic.

Ms. Alonso then raised two additional items for potential reconsideration based on correspondence received from external stakeholders. The first was the Reentry Council, which had requested that the Task Force revisit its recommendation to remove the body's formal status and convert it to a passive meeting body. Some Task Force members expressed concern about setting a precedent where any group could request reconsideration and potentially derail the Task Force's process and agreed not to re-agendize the Reentry Council item. Vice Chair Bruss and Ms. Kittler also requested that future reconsideration requests be initiated by Task Force members during the "Future Agenda Topics" item at the end of each meeting.

The second item was the SOMA Community Planning Advisory Committee. Ms. Alonso explained that the Planning Department had been working on independent legislation to reduce the number of seats, simplify qualifications, and eliminate certain functions in response to changes in state law. For efficiency reasons, the department had asked whether the Task Force would consider incorporating these changes into its own legislation. Task Force members agreed that the Planning Department had sufficient agency and flexibility and that no further action was needed.

Ms. Alonso then reviewed the agenda for the December 12 meeting. She also confirmed that the regular meeting scheduled for Wednesday, December 17 would be cancelled and replaced by a special meeting on Thursday, December 18 at 4:00 p.m. at the Southeast Community Center.

Public comment was received by two speakers:

- Mark Morowitz, Health Commission Secretary, expressed appreciation for the Task Force’s thorough work and stated that the Health Department should be considered equal to the Fire and Police Departments in terms of public safety and institutional importance. Due to audio issues, his full remarks were not captured, and he was invited to submit written comment.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw criticized the scheduling of the December 12 meeting at 10:00 a.m., stating that the early start time was difficult for him. He requested that the agenda be posted online as soon as possible and expressed interest in seeing more detail about the items to be discussed.

10. 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:
The majority of changes the Streamlining Task Force has made to date were all extremely unpopular with San Francisco voters, or voters would not have enacted to many Charter changes at the ballot box throughout the years. It’s why voters rejected “*Prop. D*” in November 2024! The Task Force has taken a wrecking ball to voter’s past decisions regarding open and accountable government.

“*We the People*” who are tired of being *SPUR’ned* must reject this nonsense, by rejecting the Mayor’s Charter change ballot measure for commission reform in November 2026. Just as we voted against “*Proposition D*” in November 2024, we need to be prepared to reject whatever this “*Proposition E*” Streamlining Task Force is apparently going to foolishly place on our ballot a year from now in collaboration with the Supervisor Mandelman–Mayor Lurie Task Force! Lurie must be handed his first ballot measure defeat next November.

11. Adjournment

Chair Harrington adjourned the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

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