



Draft Minutes Revision 2

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

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

Wednesday, October 1, 2025
1:00 pm

City Hall, Room 408
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Meeting will also be broadcast online and remote public comment will be available via WebEx event. To view the online presentation, join the meeting using the link <https://tinyurl.com/2nd7b9n2> and password PropE. Members of the public may use email address CommissionStreamlining@sfgov.org to join the WebEx meeting if needed. To join by phone, dial 415-655-0001 and enter access code (webinar ID) 2660 030 1920 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	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. Sophia Kittler had a planned absence. With four members present, a quorum was established.

3. Announcements (Informational Item)

Chair Harrington requested that members of the public find seats since the Sheriffs planned to conduct room capacity checks throughout the meeting. He noted that if the room became too crowded, the Task Force might request that some members of the public wait outside the meeting room until public comment periods were called so as not to overcrowd the room. Chair Harrington also stated that general public would be held towards the end of the meeting but acknowledged that members of the public may observe a holiday that would require them to make their comments before dusk so the Task Force would be flexible when they heard general public comment. The clerk noted the Task Force anticipated the

meeting to run long and planned to take a brief recess at some point during the meeting.

4. **Elect Vice Chair (Action Item)**

Sophie Hayward nominated Andrea Bruss to serve as vice chair. The Task Force did not nominate anyone else to serve as the vice chair.

Public comment was received by two speakers:

- Peter Warfield, Executive Director of the Library Users Association, shared this was his first time attending a Commission Streamlining Task Force meeting and lamented there was no in-depth discussion about the vice chair nomination.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:
Thanks for electing a new Vice Chair. However, you didn't take public comment on Agenda Item 3, and you're forgetting you have to take public comment on EACH agenda item, despite Deputy City Attorney Jon Givner's incorrect advice he provided. Why do you keep forgetting this basic Sunshine Ordinance requirement?

So let me say this. In a previous meeting's "Announcements" agenda item, Chair Harrington moved public comment for one meeting to the end of the meeting agenda because you only had room reservations until 3:00 p.m., or 3:30 p.m. He implied it was just for that single meeting. Now that this Task Force has room reservations until 5:00 p.m. or later, why hasn't this Task Force returned the General Public Comment period, back to the top of your meeting agendas?

If "General Public Comment" isn't completed, you can continue it to the end of the meeting agenda.

Ms. Hayward motioned to elect Vice Chair Bruss as vice chair, Natasha Mihal seconded the motion. Chair Harrington asked Vice Chair Bruss if she was willing to serve as vice chair to which Vice Chair Bruss said yes. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

5. **Adopt Amended Bylaws (Action Item)**

Ms. Alonso explained the proposed bylaws amendments would allow the Task Force flexibility to choose where to hold meetings depending on room availability in City Hall so meetings would not need to stop at a prescribed time but rather when the Task Force completed its agenda. She noted that notices posted outside of room 408 or room 263 would indicate which room the Task Force would use for its meeting. Chair Harrington also noted that the Task Force intends to hold its regular meetings in City Hall and may hold a special meeting in the community as the Task Force nears drafting final products.

Public comment was received by three speakers:

- Peter Warfield, Executive Director of the Library Users Association, supported the proposed bylaw amendments, especially considering the overflow crowd attending the meeting.
- David Pilpel raised concerns about the proposed bylaw amendments stating that the Task Force should be as specific as possible when stating which room they will use to adhere to Brown Act and Sunshine Ordinance implementation best practices. He did not believe posting the meeting location notice on the agenda would be sufficient notice.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw expressed support for the proposed bylaw amendments.

Chair Harrington asked Chief Assistant City Attorney Jon Givner if he would approve of the proposed bylaw amendments. Mr. Giver approved of the proposed amendments and confirmed Mr. Pilpel's

comment that standard practice among many commissions is to name the room in City Hall where the body regularly meets in their bylaws but flagged it is not legally required.

Vice Chair Bruss motioned to approve the amended bylaws as proposed by staff. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

6. Approve Minutes – September 17, 2025 meeting (Action Item)

Public comment was received by three speakers:

- Peter Warfield, Executive Director of the Library Users Association, expressed dismay that printed copies of the minutes were not supplied at the meeting. Mr. Warfield hoped that the meeting minutes contained detailed content on all discussed matters, including public comment.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:
Thank you. Mr. Warfield is woefully misinformed. The meeting minutes along with the entire agenda is posted on the Task Force’s website which is working perfectly well for people interested in their deliberations. He should just get online and be able to see what he’s complaining about.

Although the September 17 meeting minutes report that the Sheriff’s Department Oversight Board (SDOB) was retained, but converted to an advisory body, the Staff Recommendation had been made to combine or eliminate the SFOB entirely. But the motion made to retain the SDOB did not include a clarification of what, if any, of the SDOB’s **FUNCTIONS** — and any Body’s in the “Infrastructure Bodies” group — may face having their functions transferred permanently to another body.

I recommend that this Streamlining Task Force clearly state both in any motions made on retaining, eliminating, or combining any Body or Commission, that both the motion and your meeting minutes clearly state what specific **FUNCTIONS** of any Body being combined with either another body, or handed off to a City Department to perform those functions, so that there is a clear written record of any such decisions being voted on and passed.

- Julie Soo, board member of the Sheriff Department Oversight Board (SDOB), clarified that the \$1.3 million operating costs assigned to the SDOB include the Inspector General’s and other staff’s salaries. She also noted that the SDOB received approval to look for a new Inspector General and hoped the actions of the Task Force do not collide with the recruitment process.

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

7. Arts and Culture Bodies (Action Item)

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

To ensure the public’s participation throughout the meeting, Project Director Rachel Alonso directed staff to continuously announce what agenda item the Task Force was on outside the room due to fire code overcrowding concerns. Ms. Alonso introduced the item with a brief overview of the Task Force’s process and timeline and explained that this was the third of five meetings focused on reviewing public bodies by policy area.

Ms. Alonso presented the staff recommendations for seven bodies: the Arts Commission, Film Commission, Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Advisory Committee, Library Commission, War Memorial Board of Trustees, Asian art Commission, and Fine Arts Museums Board of Trustees. See the detailed staff recommendation for each body in the [Housing and Economic Development Bodies Memo](#).

Chair Harrington noted that the arts bodies differ from previous bodies discussed since they have numerous responsibilities, so the ramifications of Task Force decisions have less transparent consequences. He explained the Task Force may ask staff to follow lines of inquiry if certain decisions were made to help the Task Force make informed decisions for the arts bodies.

Public comments were received from 26 speakers:

- Peter Warfield, Executive Director of the Library Users Association, supported the staff recommendation to keep the Library Commission. Mr. Warfield expressed curiosity about the evaluation criteria and templates used to craft the staff recommendation. He stated his general support for commissions as a tool of democracy. He supports keeping all commissions.
- Rachelle Axel, staff of the Arts Commission for 21 years, expressed support for keeping the Arts Commission or at least deferring the decision about the Arts Commission's fate until the Mayor's Office releases details about the new arts agency's formation. Ms. Axel also called out that the Arts Commission serves as the City's Local Arts Agency which makes the City eligible for federal and state funding for the arts.
- Jason Seifer, Chief Financial Officer of the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, noted his entities submitted written public comment. Mr. Seifer emphasized that the commission is thrifty, spending about \$13,000 annually on their commission. He noted the Fine Arts Museums Board of Trustees' preference to maintain their appointing authority to nominate and appoint trustees and removal authority to insulate the body against political interference and continue not imposing term limits to support the trustees' institutional knowledge of the collections and fiduciary needs of the museums.
- Vinay Patel, a member of the arts community for over 20 years, provided comments on behalf of the Arts Commission. Mr. Patel emphasized the Arts Commission's community engagement work and appreciated Chair Harrington noting the diversity of functions the body performs.
- Jack Song, Vice President of the Film Commission, requested the Task Force to keep the Film Commission and not to modify any part of the body. Mr. Song noted the Film Commission acts as Film SF's advertising arm to draw in television, film, photography, etc. opportunities to the City.
- Devanshu Patel, attorney member of the Film Commission, expressed support for retaining the Film Commission. Mr. Patel emphasized that San Francisco is a top tier filming destination in competition with other areas across the country. He also noted that preserving the Film Commission is not just about art, but also about jobs, small business, and keeping San Francisco vibrant and visible.
- Sunny Angulo, a co-drafter of Proposition E, noted that Proposition E defeated Proposition D. Ms. Angulo supports improvements to commissions rather than eliminations of bodies. She also supported the Task Force deferring its decision on the Arts Commission.
- Tad Sky, licensed street artist since 1974, advised the Task Force to keep the Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Advisory Committee. He noted that it is essential that street artists receive licenses to sell their pieces to distinguish them from street vendors, a function currently performed by the Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Advisory Committee. He also expressed support for the Art Commission.
- Lucinda Page, part of the Street Artists and Craftsmen program since 1994, asked those in the meeting room who are part of the same program to raise their hand, about half of the people in the hearing room did so. Ms. Page reminded the Task Force that the work licensed artists create sustain their livelihoods and are not hobbies.
- Joanne Lee, former Deputy Director of Programs at the Arts Commission, expressed support for keeping and maintaining the Arts Commission as is or deferring a decision until more information

is known about the establishment of an arts agency. She uplifted that certain functions of the various commissions considered for consolidation do not mesh well together.

- Khalid Harrison, business representative on behalf of the International Cinematographers Guild IATSE Local 600, supported keeping the Film Commission. Mr. Harrison noted that the Film Commission supported California tax and film incentives which have created more opportunities for workers and attracted more production to the region. He also affirmed the Film Commission's role in attracting and retaining film productions.
- Sheila Taylor Hill, part of the Street Artists and Craftsmen program for over 20 years, expressed support to maintain the Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners program and its location at the Embarcadero. Ms. Taylor Hill noted that the artists participating in the Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners program serve as ambassadors to those visiting the area on behalf of the City.
- A public commenter expressed support for the Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners program, echoing previous comments from those also in support of the program.
- Wanda, a street artist who is a graduate of the Academy of Art in San Francisco and two years of the Beaux-Arts in France, expressed support for the Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Advisory Committee. She requested that the arts bodies be considered holistically and the Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Advisory Committee remain part of the Art Commission, as it is now.
- Claudine Cheng, attorney member of the Film Commission speaking on her own behalf, questioned whether combining bodies makes sense. She wondered if each body would benefit from that kind of consolidation. She recommended the Task Force investigate what impacts their decisions would have further before taking action.
- Curtis Bradford, representative of the Tenderloin People's Congress, emphasized the importance of keeping the Arts Commission. Mr. Bradford noted that when Propositions D and E were under consideration, many people were concerned about the Arts Commission's fate and encouraged the Task Force to keep the Arts Commission and potentially roll other bodies into it. He also expressed support for the Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners program.
- Dale Carlson, former Library Commissioner, encouraged the Task Force to keep the Library Commission in the Charter as a governance commission.
- Neil Lavine, member of the Street Artists and Craftsmen program for over 30 years, provided clarification on what the Street Artists and Craftsmen Advisory Committee does on behalf of the program. Mr. Lavine stated the Committee screens the artists for the program to ensure that the artists make what they sell. He highlighted that screening process is critical to the program to ensure that it is a community of genuine artists and craftsmen. He noted that the program participants are weary of changes to the Advisory Committee because previous changes have not considered the impact to the program.
- Stacy Smith advocated to keep the Library Commission but modify it.
- Carolyn Tyler, Film Commission member and long-time resident of the City, read an email she submitted as public comment. Ms. Tyler objected to the proposed consolidation of the Film Commission with the Arts Commission.
- Richard Rothman expressed support to keep the Art Commission. Mr. Rothman also advocated the Task Force explore how to empower the Art Commission with more authority in managing the care of City buildings where murals and other art is housed when collaborating with other City departments.
- Dee Dee Escobido, Assistant Director to the SAG-AFTRA San Francisco-Northern California Local, uplifted a public comment letter her body submitted in support of the Film Commission. Ms. Escobido noted SAG-AFTRA San Francisco-Northern California Local has 3,200+ members working in film, television, etc. and credits the Film Commission and SF Film department in

ensuring ample opportunities for their members to work. She also noted the industry at-large reviews decisions made in jurisdictions and encouraged the Task Force to appeal to the industry to retain production in the area.

- Yesina Sanchez, Executive Director of Intersection for the Arts, supported keeping the Arts Commission and noted that the body has served as a partner in cultural equity. Ms. Sanchez emphasize that the impacts of eliminating or consolidating arts bodies are unknown and encouraged the Task Force to investigate these uncertainties before taking action.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:
Given Chair Harrington’s opening remarks that preliminary decisions may be made today, but have the Staff come back with additional details, I again recommend this Streamlining Task Force clearly state both in any motions made on retaining, eliminating, or combining any Body or Commission, and in your meeting minutes the specific FUNCTIONS of any Body being combined with either another body, or handed off to a City Department to perform those functions.

As a reminder, the BLA’s cost analysis report shows that neither the Film Commission, nor the Street Artists Advisory Committee, have full-time staff “hard costs.” Eliminating or combining them with another body won’t save one red cent!

As written testimony presented and posted on your web site shows, “streamlining” is not simply moving functions from one oversight body to another body, and creatively misnaming that as “combining.” That isn’t actual streamlining. It’s just shifting costs and expenses.

- Anna, a long-time resident of the City and open government advocate, opposed the self-appointment structure of the Fine Arts Museums (FAM) Board of Trustees, calling it uniquely and inherently unaccountable. She criticized the lack of oversight and transparency, alleging that the museums have operated without a formal agreement for over 30 years while COFAM has collected over \$200 million in non-general admission public revenues.
- Bill advocated keeping the Arts Commission and the Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Advisory Committee. He noted their structures are important to preserving artists in and the cultural dynamics of San Francisco. For more than 50 years, the Arts Commission brought street artists from a place of conflict and arrests to economic stability and cultural contributions.

During public comment, Chair Harrington reminded the public that they may find previous documents and all the published memos detailing staff recommendations for bodies on the Task Force’s website. He also inquired about the connection between the Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Advisory Committee and the Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Program.

Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Advisory Committee

After public comment, Chair Harrington opened the Task Force’s discussion with the Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Advisory Committee. Senior Performance Analyst Joanna Bell provided an overview of the distinction between the program and the advisory committee, stating that the advisory committee reviews and approves all applications to join the Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Program. Ms. Bell also noted that due to state legal changes, the Arts Commission department and City Attorney’s Office are planning changes to the licensing structure of the program. She flagged that while changes to the licensing structure are being made, it could be useful to consider altering how applications are reviewed and approved, including assessing whether a distinct body should complete that approval process or if the department could handle the workload.

Ms. Alonso invited members of the Art Commission to speak to changes being made to the program. Ralph Remington, Director of Cultural Affairs, and Anne Trickey, Senior Grants Officer, provided context. Mx. Trickey clarified that since 2018, the program has been out of compliance with state law since the authorizing local code references laws that no longer exist (the “peddler permit” in the Police Code) and limits where street artists and craftsmen can sell their work. They explained the department’s belief that the revised licensing approval path could be similar to the Department of Public Works’ street vending license which moves more quickly and is less expensive than the Advisory Committee approval process. Mx. Trickey noted that if the department took over approving licenses, they would also be able to approve applications on a rolling basis rather than having four approval periods a year.

Chair Harrington asked if restructuring the program’s licensing approval is part of bringing the program into compliance with state law, which Mx. Trickey affirmed. They shared that the timing of these changes relies on when legislation could be introduced at the Board of Supervisors for voter approval. They noted that this path has been challenging, and a public signature-gathering effort is an alternative.

Ms. Hayward clarified for the public that the Task Force was not exploring changes to the Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Program. She verbalized her understanding that moving licensing approval work from Advisory Committee to department staff would require voter approval. Ms. Hayward supported eliminating the Committee and/or moving the program into code to allow for easier amendments.

Chair Harrington recalled that the establishment of the Advisory Committee helped resolve longstanding conflicts over street artist regulation in San Francisco. He acknowledged the benefits of removing the need for voter approval to update the program and suggested that the Task Force help the department in initiating that change. He also emphasized the importance of preserving a role for street artists in the licensing approval process, rather than shifting full-decision making authority to staff.

Vice Chair Bruss noted consensus among Task Force members that such state law compliance changes are not matters that should go back to the voters. She highlighted a theme from public comment that the body provides a curatorial role by reviewing applications to verify that individuals are personally creating the artwork they wish to sell. While recognizing that department staff could perform that work, she asked whether the department has alternative ways to involve artists in the application review process outside of a formal committee structure. Mx. Trickey acknowledged that the Arts Commission has grant review panels with subject matter experts where members of the public can participate without the same expenses as a formal public meeting body with paid committee members. Ms. Mihal emphasized that it is appropriate for Arts Commission staff, rather than the Task Force, to determine the licensing process, as they work directly with program stakeholders.

Task Force members deliberated whether to move both the committee and program to the Administrative Code. Mr. Givner informed them that amending the program itself was outside their purview, although they could authorize the Board of Supervisors to amend the program by ordinance rather than having to go back to voters. Chair Harrington supported allowing the Board to make holistic changes to the program, including how best to involve artists in the licensing process. Vice Chair Bruss preferred eliminating the Advisory Committee while enabling the Board to revise other elements of the program. Ms. Hayward agreed with Vice Chair Bruss’ approach. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote. Chair Harrington affirmed the Task Force’s support of the street artists and noted the motion encourages the Board of Supervisors to facilitate making the program compliant with state law.

Fine Arts Museums (FAM) Board of Trustees, Asian Art Commission, and War Memorial Board of Trustees

Ms. Mihal stated that FAM, Asian Art Commission, and War Memorial Board of Trustees (War Memorial) should be treated the same way since they hold similar characteristics (manage trusts, legally required, City owned property managed by an external entity). Chair Harrington noted that War Memorial is slightly different from FAM and Asian Art Commission. Ms. Alonso noted that the staff recommendation aligns FAM with Asian Art Commission's practices regarding board member nomination and appointment processes, with the War Memorial recommendation differing slightly. Vice Chair Bruss commented that the Asian Art Commission has slightly more mayoral participation in the appointment process. She also noted her willingness to be flexible on cumulative term limits for the museum bodies, a topic she typically champions. Ms. Hayward motioned to accept staff recommendations for the Asian Art Commission and Fine Arts Museums Board of Trustees. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Moving on to the War Memorial, the Task Force discussed the War Memorial's contract authority vis-à-vis the contract approval authority intended in the governance commission template. Chair Harrington suggested that the Task Force defer contracting authority established in Chapter 6 of the Administrative Code. Ms. Hayward motioned to align the War Memorial Board of Trustees with staff recommendations. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Library Commission

Noting that staff issued no recommendation for the body, Chair Harrington stated his preference to keep the Library Commission as a governance body. Ms. Alonso shared that this would require conforming two elements to the governance template: adding term limits and removing hiring and firing authority. Ms. Hayward flagged that the Law Library Board of Trustees, which is scheduled for discussion at a future meeting, could be considered in relation to the Library Commission. She suggested revisiting the Library Commission at that time. Ms. Mihal motioned to keep the Library Commission, maintain it as a governance body, and align it with the governance body template. Ms. Hayward seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Film Commission

Chair Harrington observed that the Film Commission provides significant value but questioned whether its responsibilities warrant governance body status. He acknowledged the importance of the "commission" title, even if the body functions more like an advisory committee. Vice Chair Bruss agreed that the body should be retained with its current name. She stated that the Film Commission is appropriately located in the Administrative Code and supported aligning it with the advisory committee template, observing that it already meets most of the template's criteria. She recommended applying the advisory committee's term limits while opting out of a sunset provision.

Ms. Mihal agreed with retaining the body, aligning it to the advisory committee template, and keeping the name, since it is an important part of the body's brand. She supported imposing a sunset date, not to consider the body for elimination, but as an opportunity to reassess the state of the film industry at that time and evaluate how the Film Commission can best continue to support it. Ms. Hayward also supported keeping the Film Commission. She noted that its placement in the Administrative Code is appropriate and agreed with Chair Harrington that its functions largely align with the advisory committee template. She concurred with Vice Chair Bruss that a sunset date is not necessary given the ongoing nature of the film industry, though she remained open to including one. She added that the Film Commission appears to be structured in a way that would allow it to adapt if an arts agency were to be established.

Vice Chair Bruss motioned to keep the Film Commission in the Administrative Code and partially align it to the advisory committee template, with exceptions for sunset date and the name of the body. Ms. Hayward seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Arts Commission

Chair Harrington expressed support for retaining the Arts Commission but questioned which responsibilities should continue to be assigned to the body. Ms. Hayward agreed that the Commission should be preserved and suggested it may be appropriate to remove it from the Charter to allow for greater flexibility in meeting the evolving needs of the City and its departments. Ms. Mihal noted potential confusion arising from the fact that both the department and its governing body share the same name. She emphasized that many important functions are performed by the department itself, rather than the Commission. Ms. Mihal also observed that because the body includes a wide range of stakeholders, aligning it with the advisory committee template may help preserve its diversity.

Chair Harrington asked staff to assess the implications of converting the Arts Commission into an advisory committee, including which functions would be removed and where those responsibilities would be reassigned. He noted that this analysis would help clarify the potential impacts of such a change. Vice Chair Bruss expressed initial support for aligning the Commission with the advisory committee structure and moving it from the Charter to the Administrative Code to allow for future legislative flexibility. She supported requesting staff to explore what full alignment with the advisory committee template would entail. She also suggested the Task Force consider removing seat-specific qualifications and instead apply those qualifications more generally to the overall composition of the body.

Chair Harrington preferred to keep the Arts Commission a governing body in the Charter, but he noted that not all its current duties should be retained. He suggested maintaining the Commission's establishment and composition in the Charter while moving its duties to the Administrative Code to allow for future flexibility. He also recommended removing the Commission's automatic authority to oversee the department. Chair Harrington added that he would prefer to see the Commission eventually oversee a new arts agency, once established, to ensure public discussion of the City's Grants For the Arts program.

Vice Chair Bruss noted that Task Force members agreed the Arts Commission should be retained but held differing views on where its establishing authority should reside and how the body should be structured. She recommended that the Task Force focus on identifying which functions should be retained and where those functions should be formally outlined.

Ms. Bell shared known considerations regarding making the Arts Commission an advisory body, including that the Commission oversees the City's civic art collection and manages trusts for public arts. She also highlighted that the Commission reviews and approves every contract and grant that goes before the department, with 150 items worth around \$15 million last year. She noted the department's desire to have the contract and grant process in the public eye given the subjectivity of art.

Chair Harrington described his ideal structure for the Arts Commission as a hybrid of a governance commission with some advisory functions. He expressed a preference for giving the body flexibility to be either the lead or a component within a larger arts organization. He also suggested structuring the Commission in a way that would allow the Mayor's Office to invoke Charter Section 4.132 to make adjustments through the budget process. Chair Harrington acknowledged that the significance of the decisions under consideration would require more time than was available during the meeting.

Ms. Hayward requested that the Arts Commission discussion be revisited at a future meeting, noting the state of flux related to the creation of the new arts agency. Ms. Mihal agreed it would be useful to better understand the implications of aligning the Commission with the advisory committee template, including

how specific functions would be affected. The Task Force agreed to defer action on the Arts Commission and asked staff to return at a later date with the requested information.

8. Building and Permitting Bodies (Action Item)

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

Ms. Alonso presented the staff recommendations for seven bodies: the Building Inspection Commission, Code Advisory Committee, Structural Advisory Committee, Board of Appeals, Board of Examiners, Abatement Appeals Board, and Access Appeals Commission. See the detailed staff recommendation for each body in the [Housing and Economic Development Bodies Memo](#).

Chair Harrington shared preliminary comments, expressing support for having the Board of Appeals take on any responsibilities it is able to absorb. Regarding the Code Advisory Committee and Structural Advisory Committee, he stated that there was no need for them to be codified.

Public comments were received from three speakers:

- John Trasviña, President of the Board of Appeals, spoke on his individual capacity since the body has not taken a formal position. He supported the recommendation to make member removal for cause. Mr. Trasviña also stated the Board of Appeals would be happy to take on whatever tasks it could.
- Doug Engmann, former Board of Permit Appeals member who served for 11 years, noted that Abatement Appeals Board and Access Appeals Board could be heard by the Board of Appeals. He uplifted that the other building and permitting bodies may require subject matter expertise that the Board of Appeals may not have so consolidated them within the Board of Appeals may be inappropriate. He encouraged the Task Force to consider the Board of Appeals' current workload before assigning them more tasks.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:
You have 17 more bodies left to go on today's meeting agenda to discuss, and it's now 4:00 p.m. On the previous Agenda Item #7, you did not make a clear motion to actually defer the Arts Commission to a future meeting, but it clearly sounded like you deferred taking any action, at all, today on the Arts Commission. As a procedural issue, if you are deferring taking action today on any specific Body, you should make a motion, explicitly vote on the motion, and report that in your meeting minutes!

Board of Appeals, Board of Examiners, Abatement Appeals Board, and Access Appeals Commission

Chair Harrington asked whether the bodies proposed for consolidation into the Board of Appeals handle a low volume of appeals. Julie Lamarre, Executive Director of the Board of Appeals, that they do and noted that the Board of Examiners, for example, has not met in recently due to a lack of cases. She confirmed that the Board of Appeals could absorb the workload as recommended by staff.

Chair Harrington asked the Task Force if there was any opposition to folding the Board of Examiners, Abatement Appeals Board, and Access Appeals Commission into the Board of Appeals, acknowledging that a subcommittee or a separate committee may be needed to meet the legal requirements of the Access Appeals Commission. Vice Chair Bruss agreed with the staff recommendation but questioned adding seat qualifications since the body has had a diverse membership with varied expertise. She summarized her proposal for the Board of Appeals: maintain the split appointing authority structure, change the commissioner confirmation process to align with the governance body template, add a three-term limit, adjust member removal to be for-cause with a precise definition identified later, keep the body in the Charter, and consolidate the functions of the Board of Examiners, Abatement Appeals Board, and Access Appeals Commission into the Board of Appeals with the understanding that the Access Appeals

Commission would be operated as a subcommittee or separate committee to meet state membership requirements.

Chair Harrington made a motion per Vice Chair Bruss' summary. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Code Advisory Committee and Structural Advisory Committee

Chair Harrington remarked that Code Advisory Committee and Structural Advisory Committee could be convened as-needed. Vice Chair Bruss concurred and noted that the Structural Advisory Committee does not appear to meet. She acknowledged that the Building Inspection Commission relies on the Code Advisory Committee for technical assistance but that it also does not need to be codified. Vice Chair Bruss made a motion to eliminate both committees. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Building Inspection Commission

Chair Harrington remarked that the Building Inspection Commission (BIC) lends itself to graft and corruption. He supported eliminating the body, stating it neither adds value to the City nor provides adequate oversight of the Department of Building Inspection (DBI). However, he acknowledged uncertainty about where its current functions should be reassigned.

Vice Chair Bruss shared the difficulty of appointing members to the BIC due to qualification requirements that are well-intentioned but impractical in practice. Her initial inclination was to eliminate seat-specific qualifications, remove the Commission's governance status, and relocate it from the Charter and to the Administrative Code to allow greater flexibility in determining its functions. She also emphasized that, unlike the Planning Commission or Public Works Department, BIC is responsible for administering mandatory state building code and regulations, which makes its role distinct.

Ms. Hayward agreed that oversight of code changes would require careful consideration to reassign. She stated the first step in the process should be to remove BIC from the Charter. She was interested in eliminating the body but remained hesitant without a clear understanding of where its functions would go. Agreeing with Ms. Hayward, Ms. Mihal saw value in potentially retaining BIC as an advisory committee.

Vice Chair Bruss summarized the Task Force's discussion, noting general support for either eliminating the BIC or significantly narrowing its functions to a non-governance role as much as possible. She requested that staff research the most limited version of the BIC possible to determine whether it plays any substantive roles. Chair Harrington stated that the Task Force would defer action on the Building Inspection Commission and directed staff to perform further research.

9. Economic Development Bodies (Action Item)

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

Project Director Rachel Alonso presented the staff recommendations for five bodies: the Airport Commission, the Board of Directors of the San Francisco Downtown Revitalization and Economic Recovery Financing District, the Small Business Commission, the Entertainment Commission, and the Cannabis Oversight Committee.

She noted that the Task Force may want to make a similar decision for the Airport Commission as it did for the Port Commission during the September 17th, 2025 meeting: remove both for-cause member

removal and the ability for voters to recall an appointee. For the Board of Directors of the San Francisco Downtown Revitalization and Economic Recovery Financing District, she noted that it is a new body that has not met yet and its existence will likely be important for the City's economic recovery goals. Although the evaluation criteria suggest eliminating the Cannabis Oversight Committee, Ms. Alonso cited a recent ordinance that extended its sunset date to 2027, suggesting that the body should be kept until that time. For more information, see the detailed staff recommendation for each body in the [Housing and Economic Development Bodies Memo](#).

Initial comments from Task Force members indicated general agreement with the staff recommendations for the Airport Commission and the Downtown Revitalization District. Members also began discussing the Small Business Commission, with Vice Chair Bruss and Sophie Hayward suggesting it be aligned with the advisory committee template and removed from the Charter.

Public comments were received from three people:

- Asia Nicole Duncan, campaign director for Proposition E, spoke in support of the Entertainment Commission, emphasizing its role in balancing neighborhood and business needs. She warned that weakening or consolidating the commission would reduce community voice and contradict the will of voters who rejected Proposition D.
- Stephen Torres, a former Entertainment Commissioner, also spoke in support of the Entertainment and Small Business Commissions. He expressed concern about efforts to consolidate or reduce the authority of these bodies, emphasizing the importance of maintaining diverse representation.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw submitted the following written comment:
For several Bodies this Task Force considered today for elimination, retention, or consolidation, you specifically directed City Administrator staff to return to you at a later date to more fully explain what specific **FUNCTIONS** some of these bodies perform, including for the Arts Commission, and the Stret Artists Advisory Committee — without knowing what those specific functions are beforehand. You are shamefully, obliviously making initial recommendations anyway, essentially in the dark — placing the cart before the horse!

Page 14 of the BLA's Cost Analysis specifically stated: *"To the extent that the Commission Streamlining Task Force considers specific consolidations, an analysis of both entities' costs and **FUNCTIONS** will be **ESSENTIAL**."*

You're blindly taking actions, without benefit of analyzing these functions beforehand. Ergo, "ass-u-'n-me-ingly"!

The BLA's PowerPoint file you weren't presented on 8/20/2025 noted most respondents to the BLA's Excel template assumed all functions of any bodies being absorbed would remain the same.

Airport Commission

Task Force members agreed that the Airport Commission should remain a governance body and stay in the Charter. Sophie Hayward moved to align the Airport Commission with the governance template, keep it in the Charter, remove the ability for voters to recall commissioners, and allow removal without cause. Natasha Mihal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Downtown Revitalization and Economic Recovery Financing District

Members discussed and agreed that no changes were needed to this newly formed body, which had not yet met. Ms. Hayward made a motion to retain the body as-is. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Small Business Commission

Ms. Alonso directed Task Force members to decide whether the Small Business Commission should align with the governance commission template or advisory committee template. Vice Chair Bruss recommended aligning it with the advisory committee template and excluding it from the Charter. Ms. Hayward added that the body should have a sunset date as a prompt for future evaluation. She also proposed removing the commission's role in reviewing the Legacy Business Program applications, noting that the Small Business Commission's involvement in this process does not seem to add value. She recommended removing this review role for both the Small Business Commission and the Historic Preservation Commission and keeping that responsibility with department staff.

Vice Chair Bruss emphasized the importance of clarifying appointing authorities for advisory committees and proposed retaining the current split appointments between the Mayor and Board of Supervisors (BOS), removing the Small Business Commission from the Charter, and eliminating all qualification requirements, citing her confidence that appointing authorities would select appropriate representatives. She also agreed with Ms. Hayward's prior suggestion to include a sunset date and remove the Legacy Business Program from the commission's duties.

Chair Harrington asked for confirmation that department staff currently prepare the Legacy Business Program materials and the commission approves them. Ms. Hayward confirmed this was the case.

Ms. Alonso summarized the motion: move the commission from the Charter to the Administrative Code; retain split appointments; eliminate qualifications; impose terms and term limits per the advisory committee template; add a sunset date; remove budget approval and hiring/firing authority; and remove the commission's role in the Legacy Business Program. Vice Chair Bruss made the motion and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Entertainment Commission

Ms. Alonso informed the Task Force members that the Executive Director of the Entertainment Commission, Maggie Weiland, was available via Webex for any questions.

Chair Harrington expressed support for retaining the Entertainment Commission largely as-is, citing its effectiveness and value to the city. Ms. Hayward emphasized the importance of nightlife to San Francisco's pandemic recovery and praised the commission's joyful and community-oriented approach. She raised a question about the commission's dual role in issuing and hearing appeals on permits.

Executive Director Maggie Weiland explained that director-issued decisions can be appealed to the full Commission, and the permit holder can then appeal the Commission's decision to the Board of Appeals. She noted that appeals of director orders are extremely rare, with only one filed in her ten-year tenure; it is more common for Commission decisions to be appealed to the Board of Appeals. Chair Harrington asserted his view that the current process was functioning well and did not require changes.

Ms. Hayward turned the discussion to whether the Commission should remain in the Charter. Chair Harrington supported keeping it there to preserve its structure. Vice Chair Bruss, Ms. Hayward, and Ms. Mihal expressed a preference for moving it to the Administrative Code to allow future flexibility while acknowledging the Commission's current effectiveness. However, Task Force members agreed that the Commission functions as a governance body due to its permitting authority.

After reviewing the Entertainment Commission's alignment with the governance commission template, Ms. Hayward moved to maintain split appointments; remove the BOS's ability to veto appointees; move it to the Administrative Code; eliminate qualifications; remove hiring and firing authority; and otherwise align it to the governance commission template. Ms. Mihal seconded this motion and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Cannabis Oversight Committee

Ms. Hayward noted that the Cannabis Oversight Committee had recently received a sunset extension from the Board of Supervisors and praised it as a successful example of a time-limited advisory body. She recommended retaining the body but reducing one seat the next time a member reaches their term limit to align with the advisory body template.

Task Force members discussed which seat to remove. Ms. Hayward suggested eliminating the San Francisco Unified School District's non-voting seat, as it is the only department not involved in the permitting process. She moved to remove that seat, and Ms. Mihal seconded the motion; it passed unanimously by voice vote.

10. Housing and Community Development Bodies (Action Item)

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

Project Director Rachel Alonso presented the staff recommendations for four bodies: the Citizens Committee on Community Development (CCCD), the Inclusionary Housing Technical Advisory Committee (IH TAC), the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board (Rent Board), and the SOMA Community Stabilization Fund Community Advisory Committee (SOMA CAC).

She noted that CCCD was previously recommended for retention due to a federal requirement, but the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) had since confirmed that the City could meet its obligations through alternative outreach processes. She also flagged that the Task Force's decision on the Rent Board should include whether to transfer its appellate functions. Lastly, she explained that the SOMA CAC was recommended for elimination because of limited future revenues, high vacancy rates, and potential conflicts of interest. For more information, see the detailed staff recommendation for each body in the [Housing and Economic Development Bodies Memo](#).

Public comments were received from 12 speakers:

- Ajai Nicole Duncan, Proposition E campaign director and community advocate for TODCO, urged the Task Force to preserve the SOMA CAC because it is a unique, community-based source of guidance for anti-displacement strategies. She stated the Task Force memo was factually incorrect regarding vacancies and funding, noting that certain vacancies will soon be filled and concluding that eliminating the body would erase protections for a historically marginalized neighborhood.
- Ramon Bonifacio, SOMCAN representative and longtime SOMA resident, gave the Task Force hard copies of a letter from SOMA Pilipinas and SOMCAN. They echoed concerns about inaccuracies in the memo—specifying that there is only one vacancy on the SOMA CAC—and emphasized the importance of preserving both SOMA-related bodies and their unique functions.
- Jericho Sinaban read a written comment from Teresa Dulalas, a longtime SOMA resident, who urged the Task Force not to eliminate or merge the SOMA bodies, citing their role in preserving community voice and resisting displacement.

- Christina Varner, Executive Director of the Rent Board, opposed transferring its appellate functions to the Board of Appeals or imposing term limits. She emphasized the Rent Board’s technical expertise, legal complexity, and cost-efficiency.
- Eric Wu with the Chinatown Community Development Center opposed transferring Rent Board appeals, citing the need for tenant representation and subject matter expertise.
- Stephen Torres, a renter of subsidized housing and former Entertainment Commissioner, spoke in support of both the Rent Board and SOMA CAC, warning against reframing community oversight as an impediment.
- Kim Tavaglione, a representative from the San Francisco Labor Council, strongly opposed changes to the Rent Board and SOMA CAC, warning of the political consequences of taking away working people’s voices.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:
Moving Rent Board appeals to the Board of Appeals would require an average of 114 tenants and landlords annually (62 tenants, 52 landlords) to begin paying fees to file appeals for adjudication, an unnecessary new burden they’ve never had to pay.

In June 1979 — 46 years and four months ago — San Francisco’s Board of Supervisors passed the Rent Ordinance creating the “*Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board*” to assist tenants and landlords resolve disputes. It was intentionally titled “*Arbitration*” to provide a forum for tenants and landlords to file rental unit appeals for **arbitration** in the event of landlord/tenant disputes.

The Board of Appeals was created for the purpose of providing a review process for **administrative appeals** related to **City permits and licenses**, not leases. Don’t transfer Rent Board appeals to the Appeals Board!

Keep, don’t eliminate, the Citizens’ Committee on Community Development oversight of MOHCD, either!

- Angelica Cabande with SOMCAN described the SOMA Stabilization Fund as a product of years of negotiation and a model of direct democracy. She urged the Task Force to preserve both SOMA bodies.
- Raymond Castillo with SOMCAN supported both SOMA bodies and emphasized the CAC’s role in community-led decision-making and highlighted specific projects funded through the body.
- David Woo with SOMA Pilipinas supported retaining both SOMA bodies and stressed the importance of maintaining their independence and funding. He also noted factual errors in the memo regarding the CAC’s vacancies and noted that the body will receive future funding via special tax revenues.
- Richard Kurylo, manager of the Legacy Business Program, objected to the Task Force’s recommendation to remove the Small Business Commission’s role in reviewing legacy business applications, stating he had not been consulted.

During public comment, Chair Harrington asked Christina Varner about the nature of the Rent Board’s decisions and how they relate to those made by department staff. Ms. Varner clarified that the department processes petitions from landlords and tenants and the Rent Board’s attorneys render decisions on those petitions. Those decisions can then be appealed to the Rent Board itself, after which the Superior Court handles any further appeals. She explained that department staff’s role is to prepare the petitions for hearings and issue memoranda on legal issues as needed. Task Force members confirmed with Ms. Varner that reassigning the Rent Board’s appellate function does not make sense because the Board does not hear appeals twice and there are legal processes and remedies that guide the process. She also noted

that it takes many years to develop the complex legal expertise required of Board members and emphasized that the Task Force should not impose term limits.

Rent Board

Chair Harrington opened the Task Force discussion by stating that he does not see a need for any changes to the Rent Board. Vice Chair Bruss and Sophie Hayward also expressed strong support for maintaining the body without changes. They cited its effectiveness, balance, and the overwhelming public support for its current structure. Vice Chair Bruss moved to retain the Rent Board with no changes. Natasha Mihal seconded the motion and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Citizens Committee on Community Development (CCCD)

Chair Harrington informed the Task Force that historically, the CCCD had been instrumental in the allocation of Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) but that role appears to have lessened over time. Task Force members raised the new information that the City could meet the outreach requirements of this federal funding source without the CCCD. Ms. Alonso stated that eliminating it would not require changes to the Consolidated Plan, but that staff would confirm this.

Vice Chair Bruss moved to eliminate the CCCD, with the understanding that MOHCD would continue to fulfill its obligations through an alternative public process. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Inclusionary Housing Technical Advisory Committee (IHTAC)

Vice Chair Bruss described IH TAC as a well-balanced, functional body that does not fit neatly into any template. She recommended retaining it with one change: clarifying that members' terms expire upon issuance of the Committee's final report. Ms. Hayward seconded the motion and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

SOMA Community Stabilization Fund Community Advisory Committee (SOMA CAC)

Chair Harrington expressed support for retaining the CAC if it does indeed have ongoing revenue sources. Ms. Alonso underscored the misunderstanding about funding, citing information from MOHCD staff that funding would soon be exhausted.

Ms. Hayward raised questions about a potential merger with the Planning Department's SOMA body, including whether there would be a lead agency over both bodies. Vice Chair Bruss expressed openness to a merger but raised concerns about conflicts of interest when members advise on funds for which they may also apply. Chief Assistant City Attorney Jon Givner clarified that conflict-of-interest laws generally do not apply to advisory bodies, but members must recuse themselves when they know that specific funding decisions involve their organizations.

Chair Harrington moved to retain the SOMA CAC and apply a three-year sunset date, consistent with the advisory body template, with the understanding that there is an ongoing funding source for the body. The motion was seconded by Ms. Mihal and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

11. Planning and Land Use Bodies (Action Item)

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

Project Director Rachel Alonso presented the staff recommendations for six bodies: the Planning Commission, the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC), the Bayview Hunters Point Citizens Advisory Committee (Bayview CAC), the South of Market Community Planning Advisory Committee

(SOMA CPAC), the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee, and the Interagency Planning and Implementation Committee (IPIC).

She highlighted that the Planning Commission is a hybrid governance-regulatory body with broad authority and a unique relationship to the Planning Department, and the Task Force may want to make more detailed recommendations than with other bodies. She flagged the HPC as potentially controversial, with options to retain or consolidate its functions. She identified the Bayview CAC and SOMA CPAC as borderline inactive bodies. Lastly, she mentioned that the Board of Supervisors (BOS) already imposed a sunset date for the Market and Octavia CAC, while IPIC was a staff working group not operating according to public meeting laws and therefore should be removed from code. For more information, see the detailed staff recommendation for each body in the [Housing and Economic Development Bodies Memo](#).

Public comments were received from 15 speakers:

- Doug Engmann, former Planning Commissioner, supported retaining the Planning Commission's current appointment structure. He described the body as appellate in nature and emphasized its unique authority under the Charter.
- Stan Hayes with the Telegraph Hill Dwellers provided the Task Force with written comments and urged it to retain the HPC as a separate body, citing its voter-approved creation and role in securing federal funding as a certified local government.
- Asia Nicole Duncan, campaign director for Proposition E, emphasized the HPC's role in protecting cultural districts and correcting imbalances in development. She urged the Task Force to preserve it as a standalone body.
- Ramon Bonifacio with SOMCAN again asked the Task Force to retain both SOMA bodies and their unique functions.
- Jericho Sinaban read a written comment from Teresa Dulalas, a longtime SOMA resident, who again urged the Task Force to preserve both SOMA bodies and not erase residents' voices.
- Stephen Torres, a former Entertainment Commissioner, warned that consolidating power ignores the intent of Proposition E. He also emphasized the importance of community representation in planning.
- Eric Wu with the Chinatown Community Development Center opposed centralizing Planning Commission appointments under the Mayor and dismantling community commissions.
- Georgia Schudish supported keeping the HPC and Planning Commission as-is, opposing term limits to strengthen institutional memory and supporting removal only for cause.
- Woody LaBounty with San Francisco Heritage warned that removing HPC from the Charter could politicize preservation and cast the body as anti-housing. He also praised the legacy business hearings as a celebratory and valuable process and that department staff ownership could diminish its value.
- Raymond Castillo with SOMCAN opposed changes to the Planning Commission and HPC and supported retention of both SOMA advisory bodies. He also opposed centralizing Planning Commission appointments under the Mayor and dismantling community-based forums for input.
- Bridget Maley, former Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board member, supported the HPC and emphasized that it was created to streamline preservation approvals and should remain a decision-making body along with the Planning Commission.
- Richard Kurylo, speaking on his own behalf, agreed with Mr. LaBounty and supported retaining the HPC without changes. He also highlighted the emotional significance of legacy business hearings.
- Richard Rothman strongly supported keeping HPC and emphasized that preservation and housing can coexist with smart planning.

- Devanshu Patel, chair of the Bayview CAC, refuted the staff's recommendation to eliminate the body, citing appointment delays and the CAC's unique equity-focused role that centers neighborhood voices. He contextualized the Task Force's decisions with actions at the federal level.
- Angelica Cabande with SOMCAN and the REPSF coalition opposed changes to the Planning Commission and HPC, warning against politicization and loss of community voice.

During public comment, Chair Harrington clarified with Devansha Patel that the Bayview CAC advises the Planning Department.

Planning Commission

Chair Harrington opened the Task Force discussion by asking Ms. Alonso about the Planning Commission's scope of authority. She noted that its functions are uniquely distinct and that the Task Force and support staff may consult the Planning Department and City Attorney's Office for clarity around which functions should be in the code versus the Charter.

Task Force members deliberated about how to handle governance commissions with split appointments and associated confirmation processes. Ms. Alonso stated that the plan was for the Task Force to revisit and potentially standardize Board of Supervisors appointment processes at a later meeting. The group agreed that for governance commissions with both split and entirely mayoral appointments, the BOS has the authority to reject the mayoral appointments with a two-thirds majority. However, Ms. Hayward suggested that the Task Force review its prior decisions on such governance commissions and ensure it is being consistent.

Vice Chair Bruss moved to retain the Planning Commission, partially align it to the governance template with the exception of maintaining split appointments, and keep it in the Charter. Natasha Mihal seconded the motion and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Historic Preservation Commission (HPC)

Ms. Hayward relayed her history with the Historic Preservation Commission to Task Force members, explaining that she worked on Proposition J (its establishing legislation) while at the Planning Department. Drawing on her own experience, she emphasized the HPC's governance role and suggested removing rigid seat qualifications and the legacy business application review process, per the HPC's own suggestions in its written comment letter.

Chair Harrington and Vice Chair Bruss expressed support for retaining the HPC. Task Force members discussed the efficacy of the body's seat qualifications and whether it should live in the Charter or the Administrative Code.

After some deliberation, Vice Chair Bruss moved to maintain the HPC in the Charter, move some of its technical duties to the Administrative Code, codify desirable rather than required seat qualifications and direct staff to return with a specific proposal, eliminate the provision allowing the Board President to appoint if the Mayor fails to act, and otherwise align the body with the governance template. Ms. Hayward seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Bayview Hunters Point Citizens Advisory Committee

Vice Chair Bruss acknowledged this body's historical importance and her own work for the District Supervisor who established it. She then asserted that although the body's struggles were not the fault of the body itself, she would be comfortable eliminating it. Members agreed that the body's advisory role

was no longer necessary, as its functions are already carried out by the Planning Commission and other bodies and its involvement is merely an additional step. Vice Chair Bruss also explained other aspects of the Bayview CAC, including the City Administrator's role in staffing the body, as a holdover from prior policy contexts.

Chair Harrington moved to eliminate the Bayview CAC. Vice Chair Bruss seconded the motion and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

South of Market Community Planning Advisory Committee (SOMA CPAC)

Chair Harrington highlighted the SOMA CPAC's recent creation in 2019 and its role in fulfilling promises made to the community. Members agreed that the body should be retained. Ms. Hayward moved to retain the CPAC and apply the advisory body template, including a three-year sunset and four-term limit. Vice Chair Bruss seconded the motion and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee

Staff noted that the Board of Supervisors had already voted to sunset the body in six months. No action was taken.

Interagency Planning and Implementation Committee (IPIC)

Vice Chair Bruss made a motion to eliminate IPIC, noting that it functions as a staff working group and should not be codified. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

12. Workforce Development Bodies (Action Item)

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

Project Director Rachel Alonso introduced the final item of the meeting with an overview of staff recommendations for the two workforce-related bodies: the Committee on City Workforce Alignment (CCWA) and the Workforce Investment San Francisco Board (WISF).

She explained that CCWA, created in 2022, is a hybrid advisory body and staff working group composed of public members and city department representatives. Ms. Alonso also relayed that the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) had expressed concern that removing the body from code would reduce its effectiveness in coordinating with community labor leaders and City departments. Staff recommended retaining the body, with the option to reduce its size and apply a sunset date.

WISF, Ms. Alonso explained, is legally required to receive federal funding and currently exceeds the Task Force's recommended advisory body size. Staff suggested working with OEWD to explore membership adjustments (including the potential for a broad cross-section of labor and business representatives) and aligning the body's member removal process with the advisory body template. For more information, see the detailed staff recommendation for each body in the [Housing and Economic Development Bodies Memo](#).

No members of the public wished to comment on this item.

Committee on City Workforce Alignment (CCWA)

Task Force members concurrently discussed CCWA and WISF. Chair Harrington and Vice Chair Bruss began by noting that CCWA was relatively new and had recently begun a five-year planning process. Vice Chair Bruss stated that she was open to retaining the body in code, despite her general preference to avoid codifying staff working groups. She recommended reducing the number of seats from 17 to 15,

incorporating term limits, and applying a sunset date aligned with the conclusion of the OEWD's five-year plan in 2030.

Chad Houston, Director of Workforce Strategy with OEWD, clarified that City department seats are based on who has more interest and professional investment in workforce development. Chair Harrington and Natasha Mihal agreed that if reductions were made, they should come from City department seats rather than public seats. However, members ultimately agreed to leave the membership unchanged for now and revisit the issue later if needed.

Vice Chair Bruss moved to retain the CCWA and its current size until such time as department staff identify specific seats to remove, incorporate term limits for public seats, and apply a sunset date of 2030 to align with the body's five-year plan. Natasha Mihal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Workforce Investment San Francisco Board (WISF)

Vice Chair Bruss supported retaining WISF without reducing its size, pointing out that the current membership helps manage quorum. She recommended removing the requirement for the Board of Supervisors to confirm mayoral appointments.

Mr. Houston clarified that if there are two BOS members who sit on the WISF, then mayoral appointees do not need to go to the larger BOS for a vote. He noted that this has always been the case in his seven years with OEWD. Vice Chair Bruss affirmed that since WISF is an advisory body, it should still align with the template and any BOS confirmations should be removed from code. Mr. Houston also pointed out that some seats are federally mandated but not tied to specific individuals, which members agreed would not conflict with the proposed term limits.

Vice Chair Bruss made a motion to retain WISF, maintain the current number of seats, remove BOS confirmation of mayoral appointees, impose a 12-year cumulative term limit, and apply no sunset date. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

13. Future Agenda Topics (Discussion Item)

Chair Harrington invited Task Force members to suggest topics for future meetings. Project Director Rachel Alonso noted that the Task Force had completed the third of five major review phases, with the next meeting expected to be similarly long and potentially contentious. She explained that after the next round of body-specific decisions, the Task Force would shift to operational improvement topics in mid-November and December, including training, information management, and deferred or second-level decisions. She encouraged the Task Force members to suggest individuals or groups for staff to interview as part of that phase. She also previewed that staff would present the Commission Streamlining Task Force's draft report during the December 3rd meeting.

Task Force members discussed logistical considerations for upcoming meetings, including location and overflow capacity for public commenters. Ms. Alonso reminded everyone that the next meeting will be in City Hall Room 263 and that the Task Force should plan to confirm the location of the subsequent meeting at the end of each meeting. Chair Harrington also raised the possibility of holding supplemental meetings in alternate locations in the community to increase accessibility.

After some discussion of what technical capabilities would be needed for these additional meetings, Ms. Alonso agreed to explore options for overflow space and off-site meeting locations and to return with recommendations.

Public comment was received from 1 speaker:

- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided public comment and submitted the following written summary:
Chair Harrington noted many people who wanted to speak left early. It's important to move General Public Comments back to the top of meeting agenda's and if time runs out at start of the meeting, continue the remainder of general public comment to a continuation agenda item at the end of the meeting.

14. General Public Comment

Chair Harrington opened the floor for general public comment on matters within the Task Force's purview but not on the day's agenda.

Public comments were received from 2 speakers:

- Richard Rothman advocated for split appointments for the Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors, citing concerns about mayoral dominance and lack of responsiveness to public input. He emphasized the importance of democratic representation and accountability in transit governance.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:
Across your 8/16/2025 through 9/17/2025 meetings, this Streamlining Task Force was asked to make initial decisions about 66 Boards and Commissions. You voted to eliminate 44 of those 66 bodies. The BLA's Appendix 4 showed there would be zero dollars full-time "*hard cost*" savings from the 44 bodies eliminated.

The BLA's report did show that the 44 bodies you've eliminated **might** save \$1,248,796 in "*soft-cost*" part-time staff costs, but the BLA noted "*soft costs*" savings would likely not actually result in any full-time staff "*hard costs*," net savings to the City budget, precisely because those "*soft-cost*" employees would retain their jobs, netting zero actual savings.

The Budget and Legislative Analyst's Appendix 6 in the BLA report showed that this Task Force **MIGHT** have saved \$73,536 from your elimination of the Streets and Sanitation Commission, but again, that apparently also involved only "*soft-cost*" employees, also netting zero actual "*hard cost*" savings.

15. Adjournment

Chair Harrington adjourned the meeting at 7:33 p.m.

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