



Commission Streamlining Task Force

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

KEY INFORMATION ON PROPOSITION E PROCESS AND TIMELINE

In November 2024, voters approved Proposition E, which created the Commission Streamlining Task Force (“Task Force”). This group is responsible for making recommendations to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors about ways to modify, eliminate, or combine the City’s appointive boards and commissions (“public bodies”) to make the government run better.

Task Force Recommendation Process

The Task Force will discuss and vote on initial recommendations in public meetings from **August through November 2025**. Approximately 1.5 weeks before each meeting, staff will post informational memos online that include criteria-based proposals for which bodies to keep, eliminate, or modify. The Task Force can clarify or modify any of its decisions at any time until **February 1, 2026**.

Task Force recommendations on bodies in the Charter or approved by voters can only be implemented by putting a Charter amendment on the ballot. The City Attorney will draft a Charter amendment based on the Task Force’s recommendations. The Board of Supervisors then must decide if they want to modify the Task Force’s proposed amendment and if they want to put the amendment on the ballot. Any changes to bodies in the Charter will only be final if the Board of Supervisors votes to place a measure on the ballot and the voters approve the measure on November 3, 2026.

Task Force recommendations on bodies in the Municipal Codes can be implemented by ordinance, without going to the ballot. The Task Force may direct the City Attorney to draft ordinances based on the Task Force’s recommendations that the Task Force can introduce at the Board of Supervisors at any time. These ordinances shall go into effect within 90 days unless rejected by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors (8 of 11 members).

Key Dates

- **Public meetings** where the Task Force will discuss public bodies by policy area:
 - **Sep 3:** Public Safety
 - **Sep 17:** Infrastructure, Climate, and Mobility
 - **Oct 1:** Housing and Economic Development
 - **Oct 15:** Public Health and Wellbeing
 - **Nov 5:** General Administration and Finance
- **By February 1, 2026:** Task Force will finalize recommendations and vote to approve its final report.
- **By March 1, 2026:** City Attorney’s Office will draft a Charter amendment based on the Task Force’s recommendations.
- **By April 1, 2026:** Board of Supervisors will hold a hearing on the Task Force’s final report and recommendations.
- **By July 2026:** Board of Supervisors will decide whether to place a Charter amendment on the November 2026 ballot.
- Task Force can introduce ordinances at the Board of Supervisors at any time, but likely not until **early 2026**



Commission Streamlining Task Force

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chair Ed Harrington and Members, Commission Streamlining Task Force

FROM: Rachel Alonso, Project Director, City Administrator's Office
Hannah Kohanzadeh, Principal Project Analyst, City Administrator's Office
Joanna Bell, Senior Performance Analyst, Controller's Office
Henry O'Connell, Senior Performance Analyst, Controller's Office
Chelsea Hall, Senior Project Analyst, City Administrator's Office

DATE: October 3, 2025

SUBJECT: Criteria-Based Outcomes and Associated Analysis for Public Health and Wellbeing Bodies

Per Proposition E, approved by voters in November 2024, the Commission Streamlining Task Force ("Task Force") is responsible for making recommendations to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors about ways to modify, eliminate, or combine the City's appointive boards and commissions ("policy bodies") to improve the administration of government.

The Task Force will discuss 30 Public Health and Wellbeing bodies at its October 15, 2025, meeting. This memo provides information the Task Force may use to inform the recommendations for these policy bodies.

Staff applied a set of evaluation criteria to each body, which resulted in the "Criteria-Based Outcome" reported at the top of each section. For each body, this memo also provides an overview, a summary of relevant information and analysis, and the application of a template¹ where applicable. City departments, commissioners, and members of the public provided some contextual information that informs these sections.

After reviewing each body, **the application of evaluation criteria results in the recommendation to keep up to 17 bodies and combine or eliminate up to 16 bodies.**

¹ The Task Force created templates for Advisory Committees, Governance Commissions, and Appeals Boards with the goal of providing standards for each type of body. These templates may inform recommended changes to current bodies and the Task Force will determine how to memorialize these templates so that they may inform the creation of future bodies. The templates are available on the Task Force's website <https://www.sf.gov/commission-streamlining-task-force> under "Resources."

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Outcome if Yes
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does state or federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	Keep
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	Go to 1c
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	Consider combining or eliminating
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	Consider eliminating
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	Consider combining or modifying
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	Consider eliminating or combining
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	Consider modifying
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Go to 4b and 4c
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Consider combining or eliminating
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	Consider keeping and expanding scope
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Go to 5B
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Consider combining or eliminating
If the answer is “no” to all criteria, consider keeping the body.		

At its October 15, 2025, meeting, the Task Force may vote to eliminate any or all of these bodies from the charter or code. If the Task Force recommends eliminating a body at the October 15th meeting, the City Attorney will prepare draft legislation removing it from the charter or code. The Task Force will then review the draft legislation at a future meeting and vote on whether to forward it to the Board of Supervisors. The Task Force may amend its decisions at any time before the final legislation is approved.

Comments pertaining to a specific body or bodies will be shared with Task Force members if emailed to commissionstreamlining@sfgov.org 24 hours prior to the Task Force meeting.

Decisions made by the Task Force will be memorialized in an updated “Decision Log” available in the “Resources” section of the Task Force’s website (<https://www.sf.gov/commission-streamlining-task-force>).

Version History

Version	Date	Description
1	10/03/2025	Original
2	10/10/2025	Added current establishing authority to summary table on pages 5-8; Moved Free City College Oversight Committee to Children and Youth policy area; Moved Family Violence Council to Human Rights policy area; Consolidated Disability and Aging Services and Human Services into a new policy area called Human Services Agency Bodies; corrected LGBTQI+ Advisory Committee evaluation criteria result; Made minor edits throughout for clarity and accuracy
3	10/14/2025	Revised the Immigrant Rights Commission summary notes on page 7 to match the full narrative that begins on page 94.

Summary of Recommended Actions for Public Health and Wellbeing Bodies

Name of Body	Department		Establishing Authority	Recommended Action	Notes	Recommended Type
Children and Youth						
Child Care Planning and Advisory Council	DEC	Early Childhood	Code	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Fulfills a state legal mandateNo other body could meet state requirements without significant changes	Advisory
Children and Families First Commission	DEC	Early Childhood	Charter	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Legally required	Other
Children, Youth and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee	DCYF	Children, Youth, and Their Families	Charter	Keep or combine	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Has been borderline inactive but vacancies are being filledPossible to combine with EC COAC, though significant challenges to work through.May also consider keeping since no other body exists to fulfill functions	No recommendation (governance or advisory)
Early Childhood Community Oversight and Advisory Committee	DEC	Early Childhood	Code	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none">May combine with DCYF OAC, though significant challenges to work through.If eliminated, other bodies can absorb its functions	Advisory
Free City College Oversight Committee	DCYF	Children, Youth, and Their Families	Code	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Criteria provide no reason to eliminate	Advisory
Our Children, Our Families Council	DCYF	Children, Youth, and Their Families	Charter	Eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Inactive for 5+ yearsWork can be accomplished by DCYF staff or via passive meeting body	N/A
Service Provider Working Group	DCYF	Children, Youth, and Their Families	Charter	Eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Does not appear to meet Brown Act requirementsShould become a passive meeting body	N/A
Youth Commission	BOS	Board of Supervisors	Charter	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Can't reasonably be combined with other bodies	Advisory

6 | Summary of Recommended Actions for Public Health and Wellbeing Bodies

Name of Body	Department		Establishing Authority	Recommended Action	Notes	Recommended Type
Community Health						
Behavioral Health Commission	DPH	Public Health	Code	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Fulfills a state legal mandate	Advisory
Food Security Task Force	DPH	Public Health	Code	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing either the Human Services Commission or City staff to absorb functionsRole overlaps with HSA's Citywide Food Access TeamSunsets in mid-2026	N/A
Health Commission	DPH	Public Health	Charter	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Fulfills legal requirements impractical to be handled elsewhere	Governance
Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee	DPH	Public Health	Code (voter-approved)	Eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing either the Food Security Task Force or City staff to absorb functions	N/A
Homelessness						
Homelessness Oversight Commission	HOM	Homelessness and Supportive Housing	Charter	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none">May keep and expand scope by absorbing functions of other homelessness-related bodies.	No recommendation (governance or advisory)
Local Homeless Coordinating Board	HOM	Homelessness and Supportive Housing	Code	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Functions are legally required but the body is notFunctions may be absorbed by Homelessness Oversight CommissionMay be kept and expanded by absorbing functions of other advisory bodies	N/A
Our City, Our Home Oversight Committee	CON	Controller's Office	Code (voter-approved)	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Functions should be absorbed by Homelessness Oversight Commission	N/A

7 | Summary of Recommended Actions for Public Health and Wellbeing Bodies

Name of Body	Department		Establishing Authority	Recommended Action	Notes	Recommended Type
Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee	HOM	Homelessness and Supportive Housing	Code	Eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If not eliminated, may be combined with the Homelessness Oversight Commission 	N/A
Shelter Monitoring Committee	HOM	Homelessness and Supportive Housing	Code	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If not eliminated, may be combined with the Homelessness Oversight Commission Scheduled to sunset in 2027 May be kept as a passive meeting body 	N/A
Human Rights						
Commission on the Status of Women	WOM	Department on the Status of Women	Charter	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria do not provide any reason for elimination Only body dedicated to gender equity across City operations Could shift to an advisory role 	No recommendation (governance or advisory)
Family Violence Council	MOVR	Mayor's Office of Victims' Rights	Code	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria do not provide any reason for elimination 	Advisory
Human Rights Commission	HRC	Human Rights Commission	Charter	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria do not provide any reason for elimination Serves as the City's primary equity commission, with capacity to be an umbrella for the work of more specific commissions Could shift to an advisory role 	No recommendation (governance or advisory)
Immigrant Rights Commission	ADM	City Administrator's Office	Code	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria do not provide any reason for elimination Only dedicated City forum for immigrant voices and language access 	Advisory

8 | Summary of Recommended Actions for Public Health and Wellbeing Bodies

Name of Body	Department		Establishing Authority	Recommended Action	Notes	Recommended Type
LGBTQI+ Advisory Committee	HRC	Human Rights Commission	Code	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Body is borderline inactive, but the Task Force should consider keeping Only dedicated forum for LGBTQI+ representation and policy input Vacancy rate, infrequent meetings, and lack of online meeting details raise questions about the body's level of commitment 	Advisory
Human Services Agency Bodies						
Advisory Council to the Disability and Aging Services Commission	HSA	Human Services Agency	Code	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legally required to exist Consider absorbing the Dignity Fund's Oversight and Advisory Committee's functions 	Advisory
Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee	HSA	Human Services Agency	Charter	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing the Advisory Council to the Disability and Aging Commission to absorb functions 	N/A
Dignity Fund Service Providers Working Group	HSA	Human Services Agency	Charter	Combine or eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not appear to meet Brown Act requirements Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing to function as a passive meeting body or external advocacy group. 	N/A
Disability and Aging Services Commission	HSA	Human Services Agency	Charter	Keep or combine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fulfills a legal requirement impractical to be handled elsewhere 	Governance
Human Services Commission	HSA	Human Services Agency	Charter	Keep or combine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could possibly be combined with Disability and Aging Services Commission, though there are reasons not to 	No recommendation (governance or advisory)

9 | Summary of Recommended Actions for Public Health and Wellbeing Bodies

Name of Body	Department		Establishing Authority	Recommended Action	Notes	Recommended Type
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If not combined, should be kept 	
In-Home Supportive Services Public Authority Governing Board	HSA	Human Services Agency	Code	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fulfills a legal requirement May consider alternative means of compliance, but this is likely unnecessary 	No recommendation
Long Term Care Coordinating Council	HSA	Human Services Agency	Neither	Eliminate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Body is inactive 	N/A
Veterans' Affairs Commission	HSA	Human Services Agency	Code	Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate 	Advisory

Policy Area: Children and Youth

Children and Youth Public Bodies Overview

Over the past 35 years, San Francisco has developed a complex governance structure for children's services, shaped by state mandates and local funding initiatives. It began in the 1990s with required bodies like Child Care Planning & Advisory Council (CPAC) and the Children and Families First Commission and expanded over time to include bodies to oversee new funding streams and City departments. The resulting system encompasses seven bodies and is likely not one City leaders would design if starting from scratch but reflects evolving needs and legal constraints. Today, two departments oversee most children's services – the Department of Early Childhood (DEC), serving prenatal to age five, and the Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families (DCYF), primarily serving ages 5 to 24. Each department administers three bodies with related but distinct roles.

Timeline:

Year	Events
1991	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DCYF (Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families) created to administer the newly established Children's Fund. • California law requires each county to establish a local child care and development planning council.
1995	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPAC (Child Care Planning & Advisory Council) established to comply with California law. Focused on child care for ages 0–12.
1996	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth Commission established by voters to advise the Mayor and Board of Supervisors on issues relating to children and youth
1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children and Families First Commission formed to manage Prop 10 tobacco tax funds for early childhood development. Initially part of DCYF, later became a standalone department (First 5). More comprehensive scope than CPAC, including early care/education, health services, and family supports for ages 0-5.
2000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Voters reauthorize the Children's Fund and establish a Children's Fund Citizens' Advisory Committee, which is replaced by a decision-making body (OAC) in 2015.
2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Education Enrichment Fund (PEEF) established by San Francisco voters, including funding for early care and education allocated to First 5.
2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office of Early Care and Education (OECE) created to align early care and education efforts across DCYF, First 5, HSA, and SFUSD.
2014-2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • San Francisco voters reauthorize Children's Fund and PEEF and establish three new bodies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee (OAC) to advise DCYF, oversee Children's Fund allocations, and approve key planning documents ◦ Service Provider Working Group (SPWG) to advise OAC on the needs of service providers ◦ Our Children, Our Families Council (OCOF) to coordinate across City departments, SFUSD, and community-based organizations

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early Childhood Community Oversight and Advisory Committee (EC COAC) created by the Board of Supervisors to advise OECE.
2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City entered into an MOU with City College to fund the Free City College program on a trial basis
2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • San Francisco voters pass Commercial Rents Tax (aka Baby Prop C) to fund early care and education. Funds directed to OECE.
2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City entered into an MOU with City College to fund the Free City College Program through 2029. The Free City College Oversight Committee is established.
2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Early Childhood (DEC) established by merging First 5 and OECE. Both the Children and Families First Commission and EC COAC are retained to govern/advise DEC, holding joint meetings 4x per year.
Legend: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Department, New Funding Source, New Policy Body 	

There are opportunities to streamline these seven groups while maintaining legal compliance, meeting departmental needs, and ensuring continued oversight of children's funding and programming.

- The **Children and Families First Commission** must be kept, as it is state-mandated to oversee Prop 10 funds. It also serves as the de facto governance body for DEC.
- The **Child Care Planning and Advisory Council (CPAC)** should also be kept, as state law is prescriptive and any replacement would closely resemble the existing body.
- The **Youth Commission** should be kept, as it's an effective body and there is no reason to eliminate it.
- The **Our Children, Our Families Council (OCOF)** should be eliminated due to inactivity, with its functions absorbed by DCYF staff and/or a passive meeting body.
- The **Service Provider Working Group (SPWG)**, while effective, does not appear to operate as a public meeting body subject to the Brown Act and should either be removed from the Charter or brought into compliance with the Brown Act and advisory committee template. If eliminated, DCYF should reconstitute it as a passive meeting body so that it can continue operating as-is.
- The Task Force has several options for the **DCYF Oversight and Advisory Committee (OAC)** and the **Early Childhood Community Oversight and Advisory Committee (EC COAC)**.
 - **Consider combining** into a single body with oversight of all children's services. However, combining these groups would be challenging since these services are funded and administered by different departments.
 - **If not combined:**
 - **Consider keeping DCYF OAC**, which provides valuable oversight of DCYF's large grant portfolio.
 - **Consider eliminating EC COAC**, which overlaps completely with the Children and Families First Commission.

1. Child Care Planning and Advisory Council (Department of Early Childhood)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep

Notes:

- Fulfills a legal mandate from the State
- No other body could meet State requirements without changes to scope, membership, and appointing authorities

Primary Department	DEC	Established	1995
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	11
Policy Area	Children and Youth	Members (as of May 2025)	25 total seats 3 vacant seats (12%)
Annual Cost	\$288k ²		

Creates and drives the child care and early education agenda to meet the needs of children birth to age 12 and their families in San Francisco ([Administrative Code § 5.200](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	Yes ³	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	No	Keep
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ⁴	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ⁵	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	

² Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

³ The City must have a local child care and development planning council, with seat qualifications and appointment authority set in state law. But the City could designate another existing child care planning council or coordinated child and family services council as the local planning council.

⁴ Children and Families First Commission, Early Childhood Community Oversight and Advisory Committee, Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee

⁵ Childcare for ages 0-12

Staff Discussion:

The Childcare Planning and Advisory Council (CPAC) fulfills a state legal mandate as San Francisco's local child care and development planning council (LPC). While the City could designate some other body as its LPC, CPAC appears to be a well-functioning group, and no other public body could meet the state requirement without changes to scope, membership, and appointment structures.

In 1991, California passed legislation establishing LPCs in each county, and CPAC was formally established by local ordinance in 1995. Its primary purpose is to advise public officials on childcare issues and to serve as a representative planning and advocacy body to support the maintenance, expansion, and improvement of childcare services citywide. State law requires CPAC to advise on childcare for children up to age twelve, covering both early care and education (ECE) for children under five and out-of-school time (OST) programs for school-aged children.⁶ In practice, CPAC mostly focuses on the ECE system while the Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families (DCYF) leads most OST planning and funding.⁷ CPAC is largely funded through a state pass-through grant administered by the San Francisco Department of Early Childhood (DEC), which CPAC uses to contract for full-time staff support.

CPAC conducts several legally required functions, including conducting childcare needs assessments for San Francisco at least every five years, developing a countywide childcare plan, and setting priorities for state and local funding. In addition to its statutory requirements, CPAC reviews and provides input on key decisions and initiatives related to the City's broader ECE strategy. In the last year, CPAC produced several reports to guide childcare investments, hosted a Mayoral candidate forum, collaborated with SFUSD and DEC on a Universal Pre-Kindergarten plan, and hosted a working group with State and local agencies on Title 5 childcare regulations.

CPAC meetings tend to include input from a diverse group of stakeholders, including parents, providers, educators, and advocates. Typically, CPAC meetings draw 50–70 attendees both in-person and online. In addition, over 150 community members subscribe to receive meeting updates. The number of public commenters varies, with 5–15 comments at a typical meeting, with more engagement in meetings that discuss budget allocations, childcare subsidies, or childcare employee compensation.

Two other bodies advise on the ECE system, though neither could be reasonably combined with CPAC. Both have broader scopes that include topics beyond childcare. Eliminating CPAC or combining CPAC with any of these other bodies would require the combined group to meet the State's membership and appointing requirements for an LPC, which are highly tailored toward childcare. Any combination may also create more work for City employees, who do not currently

⁶ Early care and Education (ECE) programs serve children aged 0–5, and include programs such as childcare, pre-kindergarten, and transitional kindergarten. Out-of-school time (OST) programs serve school-aged children (5–18) and include programs such as afterschool and summer programming.

⁷ The Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families (DCYF) funds most OST programming in San Francisco and conducts a community needs assessment (CNA) every five years. CPAC noted that OST programming was out-of-scope in their latest childcare needs assessment and referenced DCYF's CNA as a comprehensive source of information on the childcare needs of school aged children.

provide staffing or support for CPAC, but do provide staffing and support for related meeting bodies.

If San Francisco were developing a commission system from scratch, it might not choose to create a body solely focused on childcare. However, CPAC was established before any related bodies, in response to a state law, and appears to be functioning effectively. If it were eliminated, some other body would have to assume its responsibilities and adjust their membership and appointing authorities to conform with state law. Combining or eliminating CPAC likely does not make sense.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	25	15 maximum	No	Align to template; reduce to 15 members
Appointing authority	Board of Supervisors, Board of Education ⁸	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	11 members nominated by individual members of the Board of Supervisors and 1 member nominated by the President of the Board of Supervisors are subject to approval by the full Board.	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	3 years	3 years maximum	Yes	
Term limits	2 consecutive terms	Case-by-case ⁹	Yes	
Qualifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20% childcare consumers • 20% childcare providers • 20% public agency representatives • 20% community representatives • 20% discretionary 	None required ¹⁰	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	No change; required by state law

The Task Force may consider partially aligning CPAC with the advisory committee template by reducing its membership from 25 to 15. Any changes must comply with state law, which prescribes CPAC seat qualifications and appointing authority. In order to comply with state law,

⁸ California Welfare and Institutions Code § 10485 requires half of appointments to be made by the Board of Supervisors and half to be made by the County Superintendent of Schools or County Board of Education. In the case of uneven membership, both appointing entities shall agree on the odd-numbered appointee. Currently, the Board of Education appoints 12 seats, the Board of Supervisors appoints 12 seats (1 by each Supervisor and 1 by the BOS President), and 1 seat is appointed jointly

⁹ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹⁰ Advisory committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

the Task Force could choose to eliminate one Board of Supervisors appointed seat and one Board of Education appointed seat from each of the five appointment categories – childcare consumers, childcare providers, public agency representatives, community representatives, and discretionary seats.

The Task Force may also consider deviating from the template for membership size. CPAC regularly meets quorum and its 25-member structure includes representation from all 11 Supervisorial districts and various types of childcare providers. By reducing CPAC's membership to 15, the Board of Supervisors would only be able to appoint 7 members while still complying with state law. San Francisco's ECE ecosystem includes ~1,300 licensed providers and diverse funding streams (city, state, private pay, school district). CPAC's broad membership allows for meaningful representation of this complexity in all recommendations.

The Task Force should not establish a sunset date, since CPAC fulfills an ongoing legal requirement.

Finally, the Task Force should direct the City Attorney's Office to remove outdated references to DCYF providing administrative support for CPAC and re-assign responsibility to DEC.

2. [Children and Families First Commission](#) (Department of Early Childhood)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legally required to exist

Primary Department	DEC	Established	1998
Current Type	Other	Meetings (CY24)	7
Policy Area	Children and Youth	Members (as of May 2025)	9 total seats 2 vacant (22%)
Annual Cost	\$188k ¹¹		

Promotes, supports, and improves the early development of children from the prenatal stage to five years of age and guides the local use of Proposition 10 funds ([Cal. Health & Safety Code §§ 130100 - 130155](#); [Charter § 16.123-4](#); [Admin. Code Chapter 86](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	Yes	Keep
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	

Staff Discussion:

The Children and Families First Commission is legally required to exist under Cal. Health & Safety Code sections 130100 et seq. Its functions cannot be transferred to another body.

¹¹ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

In 1998, California voters adopted Proposition 10, which established a fifty-cent tax on all tobacco products. The proceeds from this tax are used to fund early childhood programming. San Francisco receives about \$5 million or less per year.

The Children and Families First Commission, also known as First 5, is a decision-making body that guides the City's use of Proposition 10 funds. It also reviews and makes recommendations regarding the Department of Early Childhood's (DEC) annual budget submission and may recommend candidates for Director of DEC. DEC was formed in 2022 as a merger of two existing city departments, First 5 and the Office of Early Care and Education (OECE). The Children and Families First Commission previously oversaw First 5. State and local law only grants the Children and Families First Commission with approval authority for Proposition 10 funds, though in practice the Commission exercises approval authority over DEC's entire \$342 million budget and serves as a de-facto governance body for the department. The Commission also approves and re-affirms on an annual basis the department's strategic plan, which includes funding strategies for state and local dollars.

The Task Force could choose to formalize this governance role in the Charter. DEC administers a large grant portfolio impacting a vulnerable population, which may warrant a governance body to oversee the work. Alternatively, the Task Force could choose to scale back the Children and Families First Commission's responsibilities to only fulfil its legally required duties to oversee Prop 10 funds. This body is required by state law to include a member of the Board of Supervisors and several employees from other City departments, which is a unique and perhaps inappropriate structure for a governance body overseeing an executive branch department.

Four times per year, the Commission holds joint meetings with the Early Childhood Community Oversight and Advisory Committee (EC COAC), which was formed as an advisory body to OECE in 2015, and now advises DEC. While the meetings are held jointly, the two bodies must independently achieve quorum and vote separately on all issues. As an advisory body, the EC COAC cannot make budget and spending decisions.

Possible Application of Governance Commission Template:

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	9	5-7	No	None
Appointing authority	BOS (5 seats), Mayor (1 seat), and DPH, HSA, DCYF (1 seat each) ¹²	Mayor	No	No change; state law requires Board of Supervisors to appoint all members
Appointment confirmations	Mayoral nominee is subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors	None ¹³	No	No change; state law requires the Board of Supervisors to appoint
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	4 years	4 years	Yes	
Term limits	None	3 terms	No	Align to template; establish term limits for public members
Qualifications	Seat-specific ¹⁴	None required ¹⁵	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter	TBD	No	None
Sunset date	None	None	Yes	
Hiring and Firing Authority	May recommend candidates for Director of DEC to the Mayor	Consultative responsibilities only	Yes	
Contract approval authority	Yes	Retain status quo	Yes	
Budget approval authority	Yes ¹⁶	Yes	Yes	

¹² Board of Supervisors, Mayor, Department of Public Health, Human Services Agency, and Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families.

¹³ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

¹⁴ Three City representatives (DPH, HSA, and DCYF Department Heads or their designees), one member of the Board of Supervisors, one representative from a Mayoral office or other City program for families at risk, one service provider, one member of the Child Care Planning and Advisory Council (CPAC), and two from a long list of eligible categories including early childhood educators, medical professionals, service recipients, SFUSD employees, or community-based organizations.

¹⁵ Governance commissions not required to have specific qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

¹⁶ Legal requirement to approve Proposition 10 spending. As a matter of convenience, reviews and approves the entire DEC budget, though the commission only has advisory authority over non-Proposition 10 funds.

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Employee discipline authority	None	No role ¹⁷	Yes	

The Children and Families First Commission does not neatly align with any of the Task Force’s templates and may best be characterized as “other.” This body has important governance responsibilities that largely align with the governance commission template, but a majority of its members are City employees, which is different from other governance commissions. Some of this body’s governance duties are assigned by the State (approval of Prop. 10 funds) while others are established locally (de facto budget approval authority, and consultation in department head hiring). The State requires a minimum of three City employees to sit on this body.

The Task Force may consider partially aligning to the governance commission template by establishing term limits for public members.

¹⁷ Exceptions if this is currently required by law

3. Children, Youth and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee (Children, Youth, and Their Families)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep or Combine	
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining or eliminating due to borderline inactivity and overlap with other bodies, but also support keeping, since no other body could fulfill its functions if eliminated. Possible to combine with EC COAC, though this would present significant challenges If not combined, recommend keeping: five vacancies recently filled, remaining seats expected to be filled soon, and the body adds value to DCYF. 	

Primary Department	CHF	Established	2015
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	4
Policy Area	Children and Youth	Members (as of September 2025)	11 total seats 5 vacancies (45%)
Annual Cost	\$230k ¹⁸		

Provides a forum for community members and service providers to discuss decisions regarding the Children and Youth Fund. Gives advice to the Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families (DCYF) ([Charter § 16.108-1](#); [Administrative Code § 2A.233](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	Yes	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	No	Consider combining or eliminating
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes	Consider combining or eliminating
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	

¹⁸ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

5	Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ¹⁹	
		5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	Consider keeping

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria support potentially combining the Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee (OAC) with other bodies that oversee children's services, eliminating it entirely due to its borderline inactivity in the last year, or keeping it since its oversight function can't be adequately conducted by another body or City department.

While the OAC had a high vacancy rate in the last year, Mayor Lurie recently appointed five new commissioners, and the Board of Supervisors is actively recruiting members for the five other open seats. On October 6, the Rules Committee [prepared a motion](#) to fill one seat. DCYF expects all seats to be filled in the coming months. The Task Force should not eliminate OAC solely due to its recent borderline inactivity.

The Task Force may consider combining the OAC with other bodies that oversee children's services. Among the five other bodies with related scopes, only the Early Childhood Community Oversight and Advisory Committee (EC COAC) or the Children and Families First Commission seem like plausible candidates to be combined with the OAC; see the table below for details about all bodies considered.

Name of Body	Department	Could This Reasonably be Combined with OAC?
Our Children, Our Families Council	DCYF	No. Inactive body recommended for elimination. Included significant number of City and SFUSD staff who should not be providing oversight of DCYF.
Service Provider Working Group	DCYF	No. Conflict of interest for DCYF-funded organizations to make decisions about DCYF funding.
Childcare Planning Advisory Council	DEC	No. Fulfills a state legal mandate. Much narrower scope than OAC. Cannot assign its duties to OAC without changing OAC's membership and appointing authorities to comply with state law, which is narrowly focused on childcare.
Children and Families First Commission	DEC	Possibly. Legally required to exist. Its functions cannot be transferred to another body, but it could possibly expand its scope.
Early Childhood Community Oversight and Advisory Committee	DEC	Possibly. Parallel structure to oversee and advise on funding and programs for children aged 0-5. Advises a different department (DEC) than the OAC (DCYF). Combination would create a combined oversight structure for both departments and require significant changes to membership from both bodies.

¹⁹ Children and Youth Fund/ children and youth

Of these two possible combinations, the EC COAC may be preferable, since it allows for greater flexibility in how the bodies could be combined. The Children and Families First Commission is required to exist, with its membership and appointing authority constrained by state law and focused on early childhood. While it could possibly expand its scope to include children and youth ages 6-24, this may be a more awkward fit, given state restrictions and past practice.

The EC COAC is an advisory body for the Department of Early Childhood (DEC), which is a department that funds programming for children aged 0-5. The OAC is a governance body for DCYF, which is a department that primarily funds programming for children and youth aged 5-24. Both departments primarily issue grants and do not provide direct services. Combining the OAC and EC COAC into a new children's services body with joint oversight of DEC and DCYF could support a more aligned and coherent funding strategy from prenatal through age 24. It could also create more clarity for parents, guardians, and members of the public who wish to engage in the City's decision-making on children's issues.

However, combining these bodies may prove challenging for several reasons. First, they oversee separate City departments with separate budgets and department heads. Merging oversight bodies may only make sense if the departments were also merged, which is outside the Task Force's purview. A 2022 Charter amendment to create a consolidated Children's Agency failed to qualify for the ballot, which illustrates a lack of support for consolidation in the recent past. Second, early childhood and school-aged programs differ in their goals, funding sources, and legal/regulatory contexts. Members of a combined body would require expertise in a broader range of issues than either body currently requires. This challenge could be addressed by establishing seats for experts in both fields, though a combined body would have less time to dedicate toward each department, possibly weakening oversight and usefulness. Third, the OAC is a decision-making/governance body, while the EC COAC is purely advisory. A merger would require aligning their powers and authorities. While there currently are bodies that advise multiple City departments, there are no governance commissions that oversee more than one department. Finally, the legally-required Children and Families First Commission already exercises de-facto governance duties over DEC. Establishing a new, combined body to oversee DEC and DCYF would create duplicative and potentially confusing lines of accountability. A merger may only make sense if the Children and Families First Commission's duties were scaled back.

If the Task Force wishes to combine the OAC with EC COAC, there are two options – combine them as a governance commission or combine them as an advisory committee. Collectively, DEC and DCYF administer nearly \$700 million per year, which may suggest the need for a governance commission.²⁰ If the Task Force chooses to merge the OAC and EC COAC into a single governance body that aligns with the governance commission template, it would need to either reduce their combined twenty-person membership to seven or start from scratch with seven new appointees. To combine these groups into an advisory body that aligns with the advisory committee template, the Task Force would need to reduce their combined twenty-person membership to fifteen, which could be done proportionally by reducing any three seats from OAC and any two from ECCOAC. Currently, both bodies feature split appointments by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

²⁰ For FY26, this is larger than all but 8 departments – DPH, PUC, AIR, MTA, HSA, POL, ADM, and HOM.

Finally, the Task Force may choose to keep the OAC. The OAC provides oversight of DCYF's large grant portfolio and reviews and approves several planning documents developed throughout DCYF's five-year grantmaking cycle. DCYF finds this input valuable for supporting planning, community engagement, and RFP development. While the OAC does overlap with several children's services groups, the only plausible combination involves a body from a different department that oversees different funding sources and programs. Combining these bodies would be challenging, and the Task Force should consider whether the potential benefits are worth the effort.

Possible Application of Governance Commission or Advisory Committee Templates:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?
Number of Members	11	15 maximum	5-7	Yes - Advisory
Appointing authority	Mayor (6 seats), Board of Supervisors (5 seats)	N/A	Mayor	Yes - Advisory
Appointment confirmations	The Board of Supervisors may hold a hearing on each Mayoral appointee	None	None ²¹	No
Member removal	At will	At will	At will	Yes - Both
Term length	2 years	3 years maximum	4 years	Yes - Advisory
Term limits	2 consecutive terms	Case-by-case ²²	3 terms	Yes - Advisory
Qualifications	Seat-level ²³	None required ²⁴	None required ²⁵	Yes - Both
Establishing authority	Charter	Administrative Code	TBD	No
Sunset date	None	3 years	None	Yes – Governance
Hiring and firing authority	Consultative responsibilities only ²⁶	N/A	Consultative responsibilities only	Yes – Governance
Contract approval authority	Yes – approves DCYF’s proposed grants as a package	N/A	Retain status quo	Yes – Governance
Budget approval authority	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes - Governance

²¹ For Governance Commissions, appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

²² For Advisory Committees, term limits are handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

²³ Two members aged 19 or under, one aged 18-24, one SFUSD parent, one parent of a child aged 0-5, one parent of a child in grades K-8, two members with expertise in children and youth services in low-income communities, one member with expertise in services for children aged 0-5, two members with commitment to improving access to quality services for children, youth, and families

²⁴ Neither Advisory Committees nor Governance Commissions are required to have specific qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

²⁵ See previous note

²⁶ The Oversight and Advisory Committee shall participate in the evaluation of the Director of DCYF, assist in recruitment for the Director when the position is vacant, and may recommend candidates to the Mayor.

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?
Employee discipline authority	No	N/A	No role	Yes - Both

The Task Force may consider aligning the OAC to either the governance commission or advisory committee template. The OAC's authority and responsibilities are currently aligned to the governance commission template, though its size and structure more closely resemble an advisory body. The OAC's structure as a decision-making body reflects a continued evolution toward greater oversight of the Children and Youth Fund. In the 1990s, the Charter delegated oversight authority to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors as part of the regular budget process. In the 2000s, a Charter amendment established a dedicated advisory body to oversee the fund. In 2015, voters established OAC as a decision-making body to approve key planning documents, the DCYF budget, and DCYF grants.

As previously mentioned, if the Task Force chooses to merge the OAC and EC COAC into a single governance body that aligns with the governance commission template, it would need to either reduce their combined twenty-person membership to seven or start from scratch with seven new appointees. If taking the former approach, all nine Board of Supervisors appointments should be eliminated. Among the remaining eleven seats, the Task Force should eliminate two seats from the EC COAC that are currently reserved for service providers. Service providers should not sit on a decision-making body that determines funding priorities or issues grants that affect their organizations. Finally, the Task Force could eliminate any two of the remaining nine seats:

1. A youth 19 years old or younger at the time of appointment for the term, recommended to the Mayor by the Youth Commission.
2. The same qualifications as above
3. A parent or guardian of a youth under the age of 18 years and enrolled in the San Francisco Unified School District.
4. A person with expertise or substantial experience working in services and programs for children ages 5 and younger.
5. A person with expertise or substantial experience working in the field of children and youth services in communities that are low-income or underserved.
6. A person who has demonstrated commitment to improving access and quality of services for children, youth, and families in communities that are low-income or underserved.
7. A parent or guardian of a child who is enrolled in a facility that provides early care and education services, which includes child care, early care, preschool, infant and toddlers care
8. A representative of the San Francisco Unified School District's Early Education Division, or any successor to that division, recommended by the Superintendent of Schools to the Mayor.
9. A representative of an institution of higher education that specializes in early care and education

Alternatively, the Task Force could start from scratch by eliminating all seats and directing staff to work with DEC and DCYF to establish new seat requirements for a combined body.

4. Early Childhood Community Oversight and Advisory Committee (Department of Early Childhood)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or Eliminate	
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining with Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee or eliminating If eliminated, Children and Families First Commission, Childcare Planning and Advisory Council, and Service Provider Working Group can absorb its functions 	

Primary Department	DEC	Established	2015
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	7
Policy Area	Children and Youth	Members (as of May 2025)	9 total seats 1 vacancy (11%)
Annual Cost	\$152k ²⁷		

Advises the Department of Early Childhood (DEC) on providing early care and education for children five years old and younger ([Administrative Code § 5.13-1](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes	Consider combining or eliminating
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes	Consider eliminating

²⁷ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

Staff Discussion:

The Early Childhood Community Oversight and Advisory Committee (EC COAC) is an advisory committee that includes eight members of the public and one employee from the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD). The EC COAC was initially formed in 2015 to advise the Office of Early Care and Education (OECE) but now advises the Department of Early Childhood (DEC), which was formed in 2022 as a merger of two departments: OECE and First 5.

At least four times per year, EC COAC holds joint meetings with the Children and Families First Commission, which acts as a de-facto governance body for DEC. While the meetings are facilitated jointly, each body must independently achieve quorum and vote separately on all items. As an advisory body, EC COAC cannot make binding decisions on the department's budget and spending priorities, nor would this be appropriate as several seats on EC COAC are explicitly reserved for service providers whose organizations may benefit from DEC's funding decisions.

The Task Force may consider eliminating the EC COAC given its significant overlap with the Children and Families First Commission, which is legally required to exist under state law and exercises decision-making authority on the topics EC COAC advises on. If the EC COAC is eliminated, the public may continue to engage with DEC via the Children and Families First Commission. EC COAC includes seats designated for service providers. DCYF's Service Provider Working Group could expand its membership to include child care providers, and these members could provide annual updates to the Children and Families First Commission. Alternatively, early care and education service providers could continue to engage through the Childcare Planning and Advisory Council, which also includes designated seats for service providers.

Alternatively, the Task Force may consider combining the EC COAC with the Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee (OAC) to create a new body with oversight of both DEC and DCYF. The details of this possible combination are discussed further on p. 22. If the Task Force chooses to create a combined oversight body for both departments, it should also scale back the Children and Families First Commission's oversight of DEC to only include decision-making authority over Prop. 10 funds (approximately \$5 million annually).

Name of Body	Department	Could This Reasonably be Combined with EC COAC?
Our Children, Our Families Council	DCYF	No. Inactive body recommended for elimination. Scope was much larger than early childhood.
Service Provider Working Group	DCYF	No. Does not appear to function as a public meeting body. Could possibly absorb childcare providers and advise DEC in addition to DCYF.
Children and Families First Commission	DEC	Possibly. Legally required to exist. Its functions cannot be transferred to another body, but it could possibly expand its scope, especially given overlap/duplication
Childcare Planning Advisory Council	DEC	No. Fulfills a state legal mandate. Narrower scope than EC COAC. Cannot assign its duties to EC COAC without changing EC COAC's membership and appointing authorities to comply with state law, which is narrowly focused on childcare.

Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee	DCYF	Possibly. Parallel structure to oversee and advise on funding and programs for children aged 0-5. Advises a different department (DCYF) than the EC COAC (DEC). Combination would create a combined oversight structure for both departments and require significant changes to membership from both bodies.
--	-------------	---

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	9	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Mayor (5 seats), Board of Supervisors (4 seats)	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	No confirmations ²⁸	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	2 years	3 years maximum	Yes	
Term limits	2 consecutive terms	Case-by-case ²⁹	Yes	
Qualifications	Seat-specific ³⁰	None required ³¹		
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; establish 3-year sunset date

The criteria-based outcome is to combine or eliminate the EC COAC. However, if the Task Force decides to keep the body, it may consider aligning it to the advisory committee template by establishing a 3-year sunset date.

²⁸ Each appointment by the Mayor shall be effective immediately, but may be rejected by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days following transmittal of the Mayor's Notice of Appointment to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

²⁹ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

³⁰ One parent, five service providers, one SFUSD employee, one higher education representative, and one member of Childcare Planning Advisory Council (CPAC)

³¹ Advisory committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

5. Free City College Oversight Committee (Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate

Primary Department	CHF	Established	2019
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	4
Policy Area	Human Services	Members (as of May 2025)	15 total seats 3 vacant seats (20%)
Annual Cost	\$215k ³²		

Provides advice and recommendations to the City and City College regarding the implementation of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) governing the Free City College program ([Administrative Code § 5.2-1](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	No	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	N/A	
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	N/A	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ³³	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	Consider keeping

³² Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

³³ Oversight of the Free City College program

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria do not provide any reason to eliminate the Free City College Oversight Committee. The body oversees the implementation of the MOU between the City and City College to administer the Free City College program.

In 2016, San Francisco voters adopted Proposition W, a real-estate transfer tax increase that campaign proponents promised would allow City College to offer free classes. However, Proposition W was a general tax, which means its revenues flow into the City's General Fund and can be allocated toward any purpose.³⁴ Before the 2016 election, the Board of Supervisors passed a non-binding resolution promising to allocate a portion of the Prop W revenue toward making City College free. From 2017-2019, the City entered into an MOU with City College to fund the Free City College program on a trial basis. In 2019, the City entered into a MOU to fund the program through 2029. The current MOU references, but does not require an oversight body, which means that the Task Force could choose to eliminate this body by deleting it from the Administrative Code. In recent years, elected officials have called for the City and City College to [renegotiate the terms of the MOU](#) before its expiration date. The body is currently scheduled to sunset on June 30, 2029.

There is precedent for an oversight body for an MOU – the Joint Zoo Committee oversees the agreement between the Recreation and Park Department and the San Francisco Zoological Society. Free City College Oversight Committee meetings serve as a public forum for City and City College leadership to review budget allocations, program enrollment, and required audited financial statements, as well as to discuss challenges or disagreements with the implementation of the MOU.

There is currently no other public body to oversee implementation of the MOU. The Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families (DCYF) provides staff support for the committee, but its oversight body (OAC) would not be an appropriate venue for the committee's work since it does not include representatives from all the parties to the MOU. However, there are other governance models the City could adopt. For example, from 2019-2021 the Board of Supervisors, Board of Education, and City College Board of Trustees convened a Joint City, School District, and City College Select Committee, consisting of two members from each respective governance body, which would be an appropriate venue to discuss implementation of the Free City College program. However, recommending that the Board of Supervisors re-activate this committee is outside the Task Force's purview.

In Academic Year 24-25, the Free City College Oversight Committee held six meetings, averaging five public commenters per meeting. While most public comments came from CCSF/Free City students, they offered a variety of opinions and perspectives. The committee has also received public comments from alumni, faculty, and community members.

³⁴ General tax measures have a lower threshold for voter approval (simple majority) than dedicated taxes (2/3 approval).

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	15	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Mayor (3 seats), CCSF Board of Trustees (3 seats), BOS (2 seats), and 1 seat each from the City College Associated Students, SFUSD, Controller, DCYF, CCSF Academic Senate, and CCSF labor union ³⁵	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	No confirmations	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	None	3 years maximum	No	Align to template; institute 3-year term length for public members (seats 13-14), and students (seats 3-5)
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ³⁶	No	Align to template; institute 4-term (12 year) limit for public members and students
Qualifications	Seat-level qualifications requiring most members to be students or faculty of City College or employees of the City or SFUSD ³⁷	None required ³⁸	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	June 30, 2029	3 years	Yes	

³⁵ City College Board of Trustees, Board of Supervisors, City College Associated Students, San Francisco Unified School District, Controller, Department of Children, Youth and Their Families, City College Academic Senate, and the labor organization representing the largest number of classified City College employees

³⁶ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

³⁷ Members include 8 City College leadership and affiliates (Trustees' president or designee; students—including the student trustee; a faculty member; a classified staff representative; and a CCSF employee involved in Free City administration), 3 City officials (Mayor, Supervisors, Controller), 1 DCYF representative, 1 SFUSD representative, and 2 members of the public.

³⁸ Advisory committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

6. [Our Children, Our Families Council](#) (Children, Youth, and Their Families)

Criteria-based outcome: Eliminate
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inactive since 2019/2020 Duties could be carried out by department staff and/or a passive meeting body

Primary Department	CHF	Established	2015
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	0
Policy Area	Children and Youth	Members (as of May 2025)	40 total seats 40 vacancies (100%)
Annual Cost	N/A - inactive		

Aims to align city, school district, and community efforts to improve outcomes for children, youth, and families ([Charter § 16.127-1](#); [Administrative Code § 102.1](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	Yes	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	No	Consider eliminating
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ³⁹	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes	Consider eliminating

³⁹ Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee, Children and Families First Commission, Child Care Planning and Advisory Council, Early Childhood Community Oversight and Advisory Committee, Service Provider Working Group

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria support eliminating the forty-member Our Children, Our Families Council (OCOF Council) since it is currently inactive and its functions could be carried out by staff from the Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families (DCYF).

The OCOF Council was a coordinating body established in 2014 to develop a citywide vision and shared priorities for children's funding and programs. The body consisted of representatives from several City departments, the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD), and community-based organizations, but has not met since 2019 or 2020.

In November 2024, San Francisco voters approved Proposition J, which created additional oversight and accountability for funding children and youth services. Prop J also made several changes to the OCOF Council and established a new OCOF Initiative, consisting of City staff, to support the work of the OCOF Council. The OCOF Initiative is not a policy body.

DCYF is in the process of implementing changes legislated by Prop J. It is possible for these changes to be implemented solely by the OCOF Initiative, without direction and oversight by the OCOF Council. While a well-run OCOF Council may support coordination between the various City agencies that provide children's programming⁴⁰ and the school district, a public meeting body may not be the most effective venue for such coordination.

Similar bodies, known as "children's cabinets," exist in other jurisdictions around the country and are considered a national best-practice for ensuring coordination across local government, school districts, and community-based organizations. However, best practice guidance from the [Local Children's Cabinet Network](#) does not dictate a singular structure, membership, or establishing authority that each cabinet should follow. Instead, communities should make decisions based on their own local context. The Local Children's Cabinet Network notes that establishing the body in legislation can ensure its longevity and mandated participation by a defined group of members; this has not happened in San Francisco, despite the body being established in Charter. A better approach may be to establish a passive meeting body, with a more flexible membership structure that can adjust over time.

⁴⁰ These include the Departments of Children, Youth, and Their Families; Early Childhood; Public Health; Library; Recreation and Parks; Human Services; Juvenile Probation; Homelessness and Supportive Housing; and others

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	40	15 maximum	No	Align to template; reduce to 15 members.
Appointing authority	Mayor	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	None	3 years maximum	No	Align to template; establish 3-year term length for public members
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ⁴¹	No	Align to template; if re-authorized, establish term limits for public members
Qualifications	Seat-specific ^{42,43,44}	None required ⁴⁵	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter	Administrative Code	No	Align to template; remove from Charter
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; establish 3-year sunset date

The criteria-based outcome is to eliminate OCOF. However, if the Task Force chooses to keep the body, it should consider aligning OCOF to the advisory committee template by reducing the number of seats from 40 to 15, adding term limits and lengths, moving the body from the Charter to the Administrative Code, and incorporating a three-year sunset date.

⁴¹ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

⁴² 14 City members: representatives from the Departments of Children, Youth, and Their Families; Public Health; Juvenile Probation; Early Childhood; Planning; Police; Library; Recreation and Parks; City Administrator's Office; Office of Economic and Workforce Development; and Municipal Transportation Agency

⁴³ At least 9 and no more than 14 San Francisco Unified School District representatives: Superintendent, Division Heads for Student Family and Community Support; Early Education; Elementary Schools; Secondary Schools; Chief Academic Officer; Special Education Services; Policy and Operations; and Instruction, Innovation and Social Justice and up to 5 other division heads.

⁴⁴ 14 public members: DCYF Oversight & Advisory Committee member; parent of a K–12 student; Office of Early Care & Education Citizens Advisory Committee member; parent of a child receiving early care & education; Public Education Enrichment Fund Citizen Advisory Committee member; two youth; service provider for children, youth & families (preference for experience with low-income communities); business community representative committed to children, youth & families; housing development/advocacy expert; philanthropic organization/foundation/network representative; economic & workforce development expert; executive of a higher-education institution committed to children, youth & families; one Disconnected Transitional-Aged Youth (18–24).

⁴⁵ Advisory committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

7. [Service Provider Working Group](#) (Children, Youth, and Their Families)

Criteria-based outcome: Eliminate
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing to meet as a passive meeting body

Primary Department	CHF	Established	2015
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	9
Policy Area	Children and Youth	Members (as of May 2025)	295 total seats 0 vacancies (0%)
Annual Cost	\$10k ⁴⁶		

Advises the Oversight and Advisory Committee of the Department of Children, Youth and Their Families on funding priorities, policy development, and other concerns related to the Children and Youth Fund ([Charter § 16.108-1](#); [Administrative Code § 2A.234](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ⁴⁷	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes	Consider eliminating

⁴⁶ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁴⁷ Children and Youth Fund

Staff Discussion:

The Service Provider Working Group (SPWG) is an advisory body comprised of persons actively providing services to children, youth, and their families. It consists of both DCYF-funded organizations and organizations that have never received funding from DCYF. Service providers cannot serve on the Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee (OAC), since it approves decisions about funding priorities and grants that their organizations may benefit from, so SPWG exists to advise the OAC. As the people directly providing services to children, youth, and their families, SPWG provides valuable perspectives and insights to the OAC and to DCYF.

While SPWG has robust membership and engagement, it appears to function much differently from other public meeting bodies. Its most recent materials posted online, from April 2024, show that SPWG was being run as a drop-in meeting with a sign-in sheet for attendees. Typically, about 40 people attended per meeting. In a May 2025 survey of all active bodies, SPWG reported 295 total members. While the Charter confers appointing authority to the Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee (OAC), it is unclear what the 295 total members refers to and whether they were appointed by the OAC. This number may possibly refer to a mailing list of people who've filled out their membership form online at <https://www.sfspwg.org/membership-form>.

SPWG seems to function quite well for sharing information among service providers and gathering their input to inform DCYF's decision-making. However, it's unclear whether SPWG is currently operating in accordance with Brown Act requirements. If the group's true membership is 295, then it cannot meet and conduct official business with less than a quorum of members (148). It also cannot discuss any items that have not been properly noticed and agendized 72 hours in advance, which does not appear to be happening. SPWG reported meeting nine times in 2024 but only posted four meeting agendas on its website. The Brown Act also prohibits a quorum of members from discussing commission business outside of a properly noticed meeting. Even group email exchanges are, for the most part, prohibited under the Brown Act.

The Task Force may consider removing SPWG from code and allowing meetings to continue functioning as-is, rather than requiring SPWG to comply with the Brown Act and conform with the advisory committee template. DCYF or the OAC could establish SPWG as a passive meeting body and continue to engage with members, and SPWG could continue to operate without any changes to its membership or meeting structure. To ensure continued engagement, the Task Force could consider amending the Charter section that establishes SPWG as a formal policy body to instead require DCYF and the OAC to engage with service providers in specific ways. Doing so would preserve the function in law while providing flexibility for SPWG to meet in a less formal setting than is required by a Charter-mandated policy body.

Alternatively, the Task Force may consider keeping SPWG and requiring it to comply with the Brown Act and conform to the advisory committee template.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	295	15 maximum	No	Align to template; reduce to 15 members
Appointing authority	Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee ⁴⁸	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	No confirmations	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	Does not appear to have an official appointment or removal process	At will	No	None
Term length	None	3 years maximum	No	Align to template; institute 3-year term limits
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ⁴⁹	No	Align to template; establish 4 term (12 year) limits if body is re-authorized
Qualifications	Yes – body-level ⁵⁰	None required ⁵¹	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter	Administrative Code	No	Align to template; remove from Charter
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; establish sunset date

The criteria-based outcome is to consider eliminating SPWG. However, if the Task Force chooses to keep the body, it may align SPWG to the advisory committee template by significantly reducing its membership, instituting term lengths and limits, moving its establishing authority from the Charter to the Administrative Code, and including a three-year sunset date. Another option is to keep SPWG largely as it is, but this would require multiple exceptions to the advisory committee model. Because of its size and unusual appointment process, SPWG is a clear outlier among San Francisco's public bodies.

⁴⁸ In practice, members appear to be able to join by completing an online [google form](#)

⁴⁹ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

⁵⁰ All members shall be persons actively providing services to children, youth, and their families

⁵¹ Advisory committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

8. [Youth Commission](#) (Board of Supervisors)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep

Notes:

- Criteria provide no reason to eliminate this body

Primary Department	BOS	Established	1996
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	10
Policy Area	Children and Youth	Members (as of May 2025)	17 seats 2 vacancies (12%)
Annual Cost	\$494k ⁵²		

Advises the Board of Supervisors and Mayor on policies and laws related to young people and provides comment and recommendation on all proposed laws that primarily impact youth before the Board of Supervisors take final action ([Charter §§ 4.122-4.125](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	N/A	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	No	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ⁵³	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	

⁵² Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁵³ Youth

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria provide no reason to eliminate the Youth Commission, which provides a unique opportunity for the voice of young San Franciscans aged 12 to 23 to comment on and help shape City policies and decisions. The Commission is considered a city hub for youth voices and activists and an international model for youth civic engagement. The Youth Commission acts not only as a forum to uplift young advocates' voices but also as a professional development program, training generations of San Franciscans to become public servants and changemakers in their communities. Once commissioners resign their post, they may continue to receive mentoring from Youth Commission staff to further their professional and educational development.

Youth Commission staff hold various trainings for their commissioners and youth representatives on other bodies, such as how to write resolutions, commendation letters, and media interview preparation. Commissioners collaborate with other children-and-youth-focused bodies, such as the Department of Children, Youth, and Families (DCYF) Oversight and Advisory Committee (OAC), to provide insights and raise concerns from youths' perspective. Commissioners worked on campaigns to successfully implement free Muni rides to school, extend summer library hours, eliminate library late fees, and provide Miranda Rights comprehension trainings for youth. In the last three years, the Youth Commission has focused on matters of equity, school safety, transportation, and violence prevention.

Commission staff encourage their commissioners to maintain an independent voice on issues and to advocate for their positions regardless of political pressures, a core value intended to add gravitas and weight to the positions the commissioners advocate for with the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and departments. During budget season, departments with youth programming meet with commissioners to overview how funds and programming will impact youth in San Francisco.

Members are dedicated to the Youth Commission, which meets twice per month and has high levels of attendance. It is a competitive process to become a Youth Commissioner, with 154 applications received in the last cycle.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	17	15 maximum	No	Align to template; 15 maximum
Appointing authority	Mayor (6 seats) and Board of Supervisors (11 seats)	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will ⁵⁴	At will	Yes	
Term length	1 year	3 years maximum	Yes	
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ⁵⁵	No	Align to template; add 2-term limit
Qualifications	Geographic diversity and underrepresented communities ⁵⁶	None required ⁵⁷	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter	Administrative Code	No	Align to template; Move to Administrative Code
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; add sunset date

The Task Force may consider three potential modifications to align the Youth Commission with the advisory committee template: reducing the number of members, changing the establishing authority, and adding a sunset date.

If the Task Force seeks to align membership to the advisory committee template, two seats would need to be eliminated. Possible candidates for removal are the Mayor's one general seat and one of the Mayor's six appointees from underrepresented communities. However, given the consistently high number of applicants for Youth Commission seats, the Task Force may instead consider retaining all seventeen seats.

⁵⁴ Members who officially miss three regularly scheduled meetings of the Commission in any six-month period without due notice prior to their absences are considered resigned from their position.

⁵⁵ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

⁵⁶ Each member of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor appoint one member. The Mayor appoints an additional five members from underrepresented communities to ensure the Youth Commission reflects the City's diversity.

⁵⁷ Advisory committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

The Task Force may also consider moving the Youth Commission's establishing authority from the Charter to the Administrative Code. While this would provide flexibility, it could reduce the Commission's independence and allow legislators to narrow the issues the Commission may address or limit its ability to take positions independent of members' appointing authority's.

Regarding term lengths and term limits, a minimal one-year term is sensible given members are students and may be unable to make a longer commitment. The Task Force may consider adding term limits. On average, approximately five members reapply to serve an additional term. Most members serve one term before attending college or focusing on academics or another extracurricular activity. Given the natural churn occurring in this commission, a two-term limit may be appropriate to adhere to the natural flow of members.

Finally, the Task Force may consider amending the Youth Commission's authorizing language to allow stipends for commissioners. At present, Youth Commissioners are eligible for health insurance through the City, but Charter § 4.123(d) prohibits them from receiving compensation. This restriction has been identified as a barrier for participation for some youth from low-income families who need to earn income in their spare time.

Policy Area: Community Health

9. [Behavioral Health Commission](#) (Department of Public Health)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legally required body

Primary Department	DPH	Established	1993
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	11
Policy Area	Community Health	Members (as of May 2025)	12 total seats 3 vacant seats (25%)
Annual Cost	\$311k ⁵⁸		

Advises the Board of Supervisors, Health Commission, and Department of Public Health as to how the City's mental health services are administered and provided ([Administrative Code section §§ 15.12-15.14](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	Yes ⁵⁹	Keep
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	Yes	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	No	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	N/A
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	N/A
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ⁶⁰	No
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	No	No
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	

⁵⁸ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025.

⁵⁹ California Welfare and Institutions Code Sec. 5604 *et seq.*

⁶⁰ Health Commission; Our City, Our Home Committee (OCH); and the Homelessness Oversight Committee.

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria provide no reason to eliminate the Behavioral Health Commission. State law requires every county to have such a body to review and evaluate the local public mental health system and advise the Board of Supervisors on the delivery of community mental health services.

The Commission ensures San Francisco's behavioral health system meets the needs of residents by carrying out several key responsibilities. It reviews and approves the programs and procedures used to deliver services, ensuring that both the public and subject matter experts are involved in planning. It hears updates on the Department of Public Health (DPH)'s budget related to behavioral health and serves as a forum for public comment (although fewer than five commenters typically attend). Commission staff from DPH also prepare an annual report for review and submission to the Board of Supervisors on the performance and needs of the City's behavioral health system. In addition, the Commission reviews and provides feedback on the County's Three-Year Plans for Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) programming.

With California voters passing Proposition 1 in 2022, 2004's MHSA will transition to the Behavioral Health Services Act (BHSA) beginning July 1, 2026. While the MHSA set goals focused on awareness, early identification, access to treatment, effectiveness of services, reducing institutional care, and eliminate stigma, the BHSA expands that mission to include substance use services and places greater emphasis on housing. As a result, the scope of services on which the Behavioral Health Commission advises will broaden in the coming years.

At times the Commission's work overlaps with other City bodies, including the Our City, Our Home Committee (OCOH), the Homelessness Oversight Committee, and the Health Commission. Each of these bodies engages with behavioral health needs such as mental health illness, substance use disorders, and related services. However, their work remains distinct because their core goals and service delivery models differ, and the Behavioral Health Commission provides dedicated oversight focused specifically on the behavioral health system.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	12	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Board of Supervisors ⁶¹	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	For cause ⁶²	At will	No	Align to template; commissioners serve at will
Term length	3 years	3 years maximum	Yes	
Term limits	2 consecutive terms	Case-by-case ⁶³	Yes	
Qualifications	Yes (see details on next page)	None required ⁶⁴	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	None

The Task Force should align the Behavioral Health Commission with the advisory committee template by clarifying that members serve at will rather than being removable only for cause. Although the template calls for a sunset date, staff do not recommend this change because the Behavioral Health Commission is legally required to exist.

Under Administrative Code § 15.14(a)(7), the Behavioral Health Commission participates in the selection process for the Director of Behavioral Health Services by reviewing applicants and making recommendations. This is an unusual authority for an advisory body but is required under state law.

The Commission's qualifications are complex and include both state and local requirements. Given discussions at recent Task Force meetings, a more detailed breakdown of seat requirements is provided in case the Task Force is interested in making modifications:

⁶¹ Required per state law

⁶² The Board of Supervisors may remove a member from the Behavioral Health Commission for cause or upon the Commission's recommendation if the member's conduct is seriously disruptive of the Commission's functioning. If a member is absent for four meetings in one 12-month period, without Commission approved leave of absence, they will be removed.

⁶³ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

⁶⁴ Advisory committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

Mandatory seat-specific qualifications	Other requirements
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One member of the Board of Supervisors (state requirement) • Half must be consumers or family members (state requirement; local requirement states 6) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ At least three consumers of mental health or substance use services (state requires at least 20% of total membership; local requirement states 3) ○ At least three family members of consumers (state requires at least 20% of total membership; local requirement states 3) ○ At least one member from these subcategories combined must be 25 years old or younger (state requirement) • One veteran or veteran advocate (state requirement) • One child advocate (local requirement) • One employee of a local education agency (state requirement) • Two members from specified mental health professions (local requirement) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaining seats may be filled by individuals with experience in the mental health system (referenced in state law but not mandatory) • Membership must reflect the ethnic and demographic diversity of San Francisco (state requirement) • Members (and their spouses) generally may not be county behavioral health staff, state DHCS staff, or staff/paid board member of a contract behavioral health agency (state requirement) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Exception: consumers employed in roles in which they have no interest, influence, or authority over any financial or contractual matter concerning their employer at these organizations may serve but must recuse from voting on a financial or contractual issue concerning the member's employer, or on issues in which the member has a financial interest, that may come before the Commission. (state allowance, mirrored locally)

10. Food Security Task Force (Department of Public Health)**Criteria-based outcome:** Combine or eliminate**Notes:**

- Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing either the Human Services Commission or City staff to absorb functions
- Sunsets in mid-2026

Primary Department	DPH	Established	2005
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	9
Policy Area	Community Health	Members (as of May 2025)	20 seats 2 vacancies (10%)
Annual Cost	\$60k ⁶⁵		

Makes recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on policies, strategies, and legislation to improve food security in San Francisco. Assists the Department of Public Health in preparing a biennial food security and equity report, which provides recommendations on how to address food insecurity ([Administrative Code § 5.10-1](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ⁶⁶	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes ⁶⁷	Consider combining or eliminating
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	No	

⁶⁵ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁶⁶ Health Commission, Human Services Commission, Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee

⁶⁷ Human Services Commission could absorb functions of Food Security Task Force

5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	N/A
--	-----

Staff Discussion:

The Food Security Task Force (FSTF) is a hybrid of a staff working group and an advisory committee. FSTF was established in 2005 with the mandate to advise the Board of Supervisors on food security. There are 20 members; 8 are City staff who represent departments and divisions involved in food security, 11 are representatives of community-based organizations (CBOs) that operate food access programs, and one public community member. The FSTF meets regularly and develops an annual report of recommendations for how to improve food security citywide.

The criteria-based outcome is to combine or eliminate the FSTF. The Task Force may consider eliminating this body for several reasons. First, the FSTF may have outlived its useful purpose and City staff may be able to take on its work. In 2020, San Francisco's Human Services Agency (HSA) created a Citywide Food Access Team as part of the City's COVID response. This team now has staff dedicated to food security, regularly coordinates City staff working on food access in other departments, and currently contracts with 30 CBOs to deliver food access programs. While initially the FSTF may have been the City's only space for cross-departmental coordination on food access programs, City staff now play this role.

Second, advisory committees should bring outside expertise that would otherwise be missing from government or create pathways for public involvement on an issue. In addition to the expertise HSA staff now bring to the issue of food security, the Department also has a track record of gathering community input, ranging from focus groups to formal community needs assessments. The FSTF has CBO representatives sitting on the commission and non-member FSTF meeting attendees tend to be other City staff or CBO representatives, who have multiple pathways for engagement with the City. This suggests that the FSTF is not the most effective vehicle for general public participation.

Additionally, most FSTF members that are CBO representatives work for organizations that receive City funding to provide food access programming. While their input is valuable, there is a conflict of interest in having these CBO representatives sit on a body whose primary purpose is to develop recommendations that could directly impact their organizations' funding opportunities. For example, [the FSTF's 2025 report](#) recommended the City "ensure adequate funding levels in new and existing contracts."

The FSTF is set to sunset in July 2026, around the same time the Task Force's ordinance will likely take effect. The Task Force could either recommend combining bodies by having the Human Services Commission absorb some functions of the FSTF or it could recommend eliminating the body by explicitly removing it from code in the Commission Streamlining Task Force's final ordinance or by recommending the Board of Supervisors not renew the body upon its sunset date.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	20	15 maximum	No	Align to template, reduce to 15 members.
Appointing authority	Board of Supervisors (11 seats), DPH (2 seats), and 1 each HSA, DCYF, HSH, RPD, SFUSD ⁶⁸	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None; Task Force nominates public members and BOS appoints.	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	None	3 years maximum	No	Align to template, add 3-year terms
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ⁶⁹	No	Align to template, add 4-term limit
Qualifications	Seat-specific ⁷⁰	None required ⁷¹	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	July 1, 2026	3 years	Yes	

The criteria suggest combining or eliminating the Food Security Task Force (FSTF) or allowing it to sunset upon its scheduled sunset date.

If the Task Force recommends retaining the body, it should align it to the advisory committee template by reducing the number of seats and instituting term lengths and term limits. One option would be to recommend reducing the number of public member seats that CBOs occupy from 11 to six. The Task Force may also address potential conflicts of interest by reserving public seats for individuals who currently

⁶⁸ Department of Public Health; Human Services Agency; Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families; Homelessness and Supportive Housing; Recreation and Parks; and San Francisco Unified School District

⁶⁹ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

⁷⁰ Eleven representatives of community-based organizations that provide nutritional support and increase the food security of San Francisco residents, one member of the public, and one employee each of the Department of Benefits and Family Support; Public Health- Nutrition Services; Disability and Aging Services; Public Health – Food Security; Children, Youth and their Families; Homelessness and Supportive Housing; and Recreation and Park’s Urban Agriculture Program.

⁷¹ Advisory committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

rely on food assistance. Other ways to reduce conflicts of interest include revising seat qualifications so that CBO representatives do not receive City funding for food access programming, adding independent subject-matter experts (e.g., academics or healthcare professionals), or requiring recusal from votes or recommendations that may directly affect an organization's own funding. While not part of template components, given the creation of the Citywide Food Access Team, the Task Force may recommend moving administrative responsibilities from DPH to HSA.

11. [Health Commission](#) (Department of Public Health)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fulfills legal requirements impractical to be handled elsewhere

Primary Department	DPH	Established	1985
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	24
Policy Area	Community Health	Members (as of May 2025)	7 total seats 0 vacant seats (0%)
Annual Cost	\$722k ⁷²		

Serves as the governing body of the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH), overseeing the City's hospitals, emergency medical services, and programs that support the physical and mental health of residents ([Charter §4.110](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	Consider combining or eliminating
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	Yes ⁷³	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	Yes ⁷⁴	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ⁷⁵	Consider keeping and expanding scope
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	Yes ⁷⁶	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	No	

⁷² Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁷³ Federal regulations for General Acute Care Hospitals: 42 C.F.R. § 482.12, Health & Safety § 1250(a), and 22 C.C.R. § 70701; Federal regulations for Skilled Nursing Facilities: 42 C.F.R. § 483.70(d).

⁷⁴ The Health Commission's functions may be transferred to another board/commission or to the Board of Supervisors.

⁷⁵ Behavioral Health Commission; Our City, Our Home (OCOH).

⁷⁶ The Health Commission could take on OCOH's budget approval role for DPH's Prop C (2018) funding.

5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	N/A
--	-----

Staff Discussion:

The Task Force should keep the Health Commission; although, legally, the Board of Supervisors or another body could assume its duties, in practice, no other body has the capacity or subject matter expertise required to oversee the Department of Public Health (DPH). DPH is the City's largest department with over 7,626 employees (FTEs) and a \$3.4 billion budget in FY26. It is also one of the City's most complex departments, operating hospitals and clinics, emergency medical services, and a wide array of public health programs in communities across the City. The Health Commission ensures specialized oversight of this work.

The Health Commission meets twice per month and has not canceled a meeting in the last year, underscoring its steady workload. It approves DPH's budget, reviews strategic plans, considers the impact of federal and state policy changes, conducts Proposition Q hearings when hospitals propose service changes, approves policies for Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital (ZSFG) and Laguna Honda Hospital (LHH), and holds closed sessions to review and approve legal settlements. Each month it reviews and approves 10-40 contracts with community-based organizations and other entities to deliver health services. Meetings also serve as a venue for public participation, with attendance ranging from a handful of regular commenters to dozens of participants depending on agenda topics.

The Commission operates four subcommittees which meet monthly: Finance and Planning, ZSFG Joint Conference, LHH Joint Conference Committee, and the community and Public Health Committee. These committees provide detailed oversight of hospital performance metrics and public health programs such as primary care clinics and Jail Health Services. This structure allows for ongoing, detailed monitoring of both clinical operations and community health programs, ensuring that DPH responds to the needs of communities across the City.

Possible Application of Governance Commission Template:

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	7	5-7	Yes	
Appointing authority	Mayor	Mayor	Yes	
Appointment confirmations	None	None ⁷⁷	Yes	
Member removal	For cause	At will	No	Align to template; commissioners serve at will
Term length	4 years	4 years		
Term limits	None	3 terms	No	Align to template; add term limits
Qualifications	Yes (body-level) ⁷⁸	None required ⁷⁹	No	Align to template; require appointing authority to submit information on why a candidate is qualified.
Establishing authority	Charter	TBD	No	None
Sunset date	None	None	Yes	
Hiring and Firing Authority	Yes ⁸⁰	Consultative responsibilities only	No	Align to template; consultative only
Contract approval authority	Yes	Retain status quo	Yes	
Budget approval authority	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Employee discipline authority	No	No role ⁸¹	Yes	

⁷⁷ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

⁷⁸ Less than half of the Health Commission can be made up of direct care providers.

⁷⁹ Governance commissions not required to have specific qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

⁸⁰ Submits to the Mayor at least three qualified applicants to be the DPH department head. Responsible for approving the Mayor's request to remove the DPH department head within 30 days of the Mayor's request.

⁸¹ Exceptions if this is currently required by law

The Task Force should consider aligning five components of the Health Commission to the governance commission template by making members removable at-will rather than only for cause, adding a three-term limit for appointees, specifying that the Mayor must submit information on why a candidate is qualified when appointing them, and removing hiring and firing authority. The Task Force will also need to decide whether to keep the Health Commission in the Charter or move it to the Administrative Code.

12. Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee (Department of Public Health)

Criteria-based outcome: Eliminate
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing either the Food Security Task Force or City staff to absorb functions

Primary Department	DPH	Established	2016
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	11
Policy Area	Community Health	Members (as of May 2025)	16 total seats 0 vacant seats
Annual Cost	\$237k ⁸²		

Evaluates and makes recommendations on the Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax, also known as the soda tax, which was passed by San Francisco voters in 2016. Submits annual reports to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors on how the tax has impacted beverage prices, consumer behavior, and public health. The reports also include funding recommendations for new or existing programs that help reduce sugary drink consumption ([Administrative Code § 5.33-1](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ⁸³	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	

⁸² Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁸³ Health Commission, Food Security Task Force

5	Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ⁸⁴	
		5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes	Consider combining or eliminating

Staff Discussion:

The Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee is an advisory committee with 16 members that include both City employees and subject matter experts. Created in 2016 when San Francisco voters approved Proposition V, its primary responsibility is to evaluate and make recommendations on the distribution of revenue from the Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax, which collects about \$15-16 million each year and was included in the same ballot measure. About 22% of the revenue is set aside for specific voter-approved projects. The Committee makes recommendations to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors on how to spend the remaining 78%. The funds are either distributed to City departments who implement programs and services directly or are granted to community-based organizations.

The criteria-based outcome is eliminating the SDDTAC. In particular, the evaluation criteria includes a criterion that specific funds should not have dedicated advisory bodies. Instead, budget decisions about these funds should be part of a department's overall budget processes so that the funds may be considered holistically and in alignment with a department's strategic goals.

Public engagement is minimal, as there are typically only five public commenters at the Committee's meetings. With the requirement to appoint one member under 19 years old and one member who is a parent, the body has a clear and narrow emphasis on the consumption of sugary drinks by youth. If eliminated, this narrow scope of work may be taken up by staff in the Department of Public Health, particularly the Population Health Division, which works to promote health and prevent disease. Alternatively, the City's Food Security Task Force makes recommendations on food access and security and could be a natural fit for administering the soda tax. The Health Commission is much broader in scope and may not have capacity to absorb the Committee's functions.

Though its focus is limited, the Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee helps address the important equity impacts of sugary drink consumption. Data from the Tax Advisory Committee's annual reports show that overconsumption of sugary drinks and the resulting increases in chronic diseases disproportionately affect low-income communities of color. The body reiterates an explicit commitment to reducing these racial disparities. If eliminated, subsuming its responsibilities under the Food Security Task Force, which has a similar focus on racial equity, may be the most appropriate course of action.

Ultimately, while the group does provide a forum for a specific and notable public health issue, City staff or another body such as the Food Security Task Force should be able to perform the functions of the Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee without the need for additional advisory support. However, the decision to eliminate the Committee would need to be approved by the voters in addition to making changes to the Administrative Code, introducing an additional hurdle to

⁸⁴ Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax

its potential dissolution. Although the Committee could legally be repealed without affecting the soda tax, because both were created in the same ballot measure, doing so could create political or public confusion.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	16	15 maximum	No	Align to template; reduce number of members to at most 15
Appointing authority	BOS (8 seats), DPH (3 seats), SFUSD Board of Education (2 seats), and DCYF, OEWD, and RPD (1 seat each) ^{85,86}	N/A	Yes	
Appointment confirmations	No confirmations	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	2 years	3 years maximum	Yes	3-year term length
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ⁸⁷	No	Align to template; 4 term maximum.
Qualifications	Yes (seat-specific) ⁸⁸	None required ⁸⁹	No	For the 3 seats without qualifications, ⁹⁰ align to template by adding requirement that appointing authority must submit justification for why candidate is qualified.

⁸⁵ Board of Supervisors; Department of Public Health; San Francisco Unified School District; Department of Children Youth and Their Families; Office of Economic and Workforce Development; and Recreation and Parks

⁸⁶ Two of the 8 BOS seats must be nominated by the Youth Commission and SFUSD Parent Advisory Council.

⁸⁷ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

⁸⁸ **BOS:** 3 appointees must represent nonprofit organizations that advocate for health equity relating to the consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages; 2 must be medical employees with expertise in related diseases; 1 experienced in services and programs for young children; 1 (nominated by the Youth Commission) must be under 19 years old; and 1 (nominated by the SFUSD Parent Advisory Council) must be the parent of an SFUSD student. **DPH:** 1 appointee must be a DPH employee with expertise in chronic diseases; 1 must have expertise in oral health; and 1 must have expertise in food security or access. **DCYF and RPD:** department employees. **SFUSD Board and OWED:** no qualifications.

⁸⁹ Advisory committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

⁹⁰ OEWD and SFUSD Board of Education seats

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Establishing authority	Administrative Code ⁹¹	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	December 31, 2028	3 years	Yes	

The evaluation criteria suggest that the Task Force should eliminate the Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee. Furthermore, because the Committee is already set to sunset in 2028, within three years of the potential enactment of an ordinance based on Commission Streamlining Task Force recommendations, making structural changes now may have only a short-term effect—unless the Board of Supervisors votes to extend the body beyond 2028.

If the Task Force chooses to keep the body, it may consider aligning the Tax Advisory Committee to the advisory committee template by reducing the number of members from 16 to a maximum of 15 and modifying term length and limits. For the seat removal, the Task Force could consider removing one of the two Board-appointed seats occupied by medical institution employees who are experts in chronic diseases, given that the Department of Public Health (DPH) also appoints an expert in such matters from its own staff. Alternatively, to avoid losing medical practitioner expertise, the DPH seat could be removed.

In addition, the Administrative Code calls on the City Administrator’s Office to provide administrative and clerical support and the Controller’s Office to provide technical and analytical support for the functions of the Tax Advisory Committee. However, in practice, the Department of Public Health fills both roles. If the Tax Advisory Committee is retained and modified by the Task Force, it should also update the Administrative Code to reflect DPH’s actual role.

The Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee’s website does not currently state the members’ positions of employment. If the body is retained, the Task Force should recommend that this information be posted publicly on the Tax Advisory Committee’s homepage to help prevent conflicts of interest in decisions related to departmental and community grant-making.

⁹¹ Although the Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee is present in the Administrative Code, it was established through a voter-approved ballot measure. If the Task Force and Board of Supervisors decide to alter or eliminate the Committee, this decision would need to be approved by the voters.

Policy Area: Homelessness

Homelessness Public Bodies Overview

Homelessness is one of the biggest issues facing the City; in the 2023 City Survey, San Francisco residents cited it as the top issue and 75% of respondents said that homelessness has gotten worse. Both elected officials and San Franciscans want to see improvements to homelessness and many see increased oversight via the creation of public bodies as one mechanism to improve the City's response to homelessness. As a result, there are five public bodies overseeing and advising on homelessness: the Homelessness Oversight Commission (HOC); Local Homelessness Coordinating Board (LHCB); Our City, Our Home Oversight Committee (OCOH); Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee (SGAC); and the Shelter Monitoring Committee (SMC).

The Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) oversees the majority of the City's work on homelessness and acts as the head of San Francisco's Continuum of Care (CoC).⁹² HSH is a relatively new department; the City created it in 2016, combining work done within several City departments. Some bodies pre-date the creation of HSH, which is partially why there is a patchwork of bodies overseeing different components of HSH's work.

It's not clear that having multiple public bodies overseeing homelessness is making the City's homelessness work more effective. Having multiple bodies providing advice and oversight over different components of the City's homelessness response and homelessness funding sources may slow work, hamper implementation of a unified strategy, and divert staff and Director time that may be better spent implementing homelessness policies and programs. According to the Budget and Legislative Analyst (BLA) report, the City spends over \$2 million on homelessness-related bodies, which represents a significant investment of City resources into an oversight network that may not improve the delivery of homelessness services.

This commission streamlining work provides the City with an opportunity to be more intentional about how to organize oversight of homelessness services in San Francisco and determine how to best leverage the benefit that these bodies provide. Each section below provides detailed discussion and the application of the criteria and templates for each body. However, there are three primary options the Task Force may consider when evaluating the bodies holistically.

Option 1: Keep the Homelessness Oversight Commission as a governance body; have it be the only public body overseeing homelessness.

- **Discussion:** Minimal changes required to align HOC to governance commission template. HOC would take on the role of the CoC board, which may require changes to seat requirements.⁹³
- **Outcomes for each body:**
 - **HOC:** Keep; changes to seat requirements and addition of term limits.

⁹² The US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funds local homelessness response through the Continuum of Care program, which tasks communities with coordinating response efforts in order to receive federal funds. See the HUD website for more detail: <https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/coc/>.

⁹³ CoC Board must be representative of the relevant organizations and of projects serving homeless subpopulations; and include at least one homeless or formerly homeless individual. Additional discussion with the City Attorney and HSH is needed to ensure HOC seat requirements would meet federal requirements for the CoC Board.

- **LHCB:** Eliminate; HOC absorbs functions of a CoC board⁹⁴.
- **OCOH:** Eliminate; HOC and the Health Commission integrate decisions on HSH and DPH's portions of Prop C funding into overall budget processes.
- **SGAC:** Eliminate; staff may present to HOC on grievance data and continue to make grievance data available online.
- **SMC:** Eliminate; HOC may include a shelter oversight subcommittee
- **Pros:** Would streamline oversight and be easier to fill seats.⁹⁵
- **Cons:** May be difficult to have HOC remain a governance body while still fulfilling the requirements for a CoC Board.⁹⁶ Could also impact receipt of CoC funding.⁹⁷

Option 2: Keep the Homelessness Oversight Commission as a governance body. Keep one other advisory body to serve as the CoC Board.

- **Discussion:** Aligns to approach of other departments, such as MTA, which have a governance commission and a community advisory committee. Minimal changes required to align HOC to governance commission template. Some changes needed to create the advisory body. Two options: LHCB may expand its purpose to cover the breadth of the homelessness response system or the Task Force may create a new advisory body comprised of a set of 15 members from across the four homelessness-related advisory bodies.⁹⁸
- **Outcomes for each body:**
 - **HOC:** Keep; changes to seat requirements and addition of term limits.
 - **LHCB:** Keep or combine; either all members kept as LHCB expands focus or a subset of LHCB members become part of a new advisory body.
 - **OCOH:** Eliminate; HOC and the Health Commission integrate decisions on HSH and DPH's portions of Prop C funding into overall budget processes. A subset of OCOH members may sit on new advisory body.
 - **SGAC:** Eliminate or combine; either staff will present to HOC on grievance data or SGOC members sit on new advisory body. New advisory body may have a shelter subcommittee.
 - **SMC:** Eliminate or combine; staff and HOC absorb most functions and either HOC may include a shelter oversight subcommittee or SMC members may sit on new advisory committee. New advisory body may have a shelter subcommittee.

⁹⁴ CoC Boards have required memberships, otherwise responsibilities and scope are determined by the CoC head. Details available on [the HUD website](#).

⁹⁵ All these oversight bodies have stringent requirements for who may fill each seat, and it can be difficult to find candidates to fill the 50 seats across all five bodies.

⁹⁶ Governance bodies have more stringent conflict of interest policies than advisory bodies. The CoC Board requires service providers to sit on it, many of whom receive funding from HSH. Those service providers would not be able to participate in discussions around budgets and contracts, which is one of the primary roles of a governance body.

⁹⁷ CoC applications award points based on how well the CoC Board represents the network of organizations serving unhoused people. Having only 7 people on a governance commission rather than 9 providers on an advisory committee may reduce the number of points HSH receives on funding applications.

⁹⁸ Many bodies have restrictive seat requirements. If the Task Force recommends this option, it should direct staff to work with HSH and the City Attorney's Office to develop appropriate seat requirements.

- **Pros:** Would streamline oversight and be easier to fill seats.⁹⁹ Will allow service providers to continue sitting on a public body. Would not impact the points HSH may receive in CoC funding applications.
- **Cons:** Would likely still have redundancies between a governance body and an advisory body.

Option 3: Convert the Homelessness Oversight Commission to an advisory body; expand the membership and the scope to absorb some functions of other advisory bodies.

- **Discussion:** Align HOC to advisory committee template. Act as CoC Board and absorb some functions from other four bodies. Expand membership to 15; one option is to add four members from LHCB, two members from OCOH, and one member each from SGOC and SMC.¹⁰⁰ Rename to "Homelessness Advisory Committee."
- **Outcomes for each body:**
 - **HOC:** Keep; align to advisory committee template. Expand membership to 15
 - **LHCB:** Eliminate; HOC acts as new CoC Board. A subset of members may sit on the new advisory committee.
 - **OCOH:** Eliminate; HSH and the Health Commission integrate decisions on HSH and DPH's portions of Prop C funding into overall budget processes. A subset of members may sit on the new advisory committee.
 - **SGAC:** Eliminate; staff may present to new advisory committee on grievance data. A subset of members may sit on the new advisory committee. New advisory body may have a shelter subcommittee.
 - **SMC:** Eliminate; Staff continue shelter oversight and may present to new advisory committee on shelter conditions. A subset of members may sit on the new advisory committee. New advisory body may have a shelter subcommittee.
- **Pros:** Would significantly streamline oversight and be easier to fill seats.¹⁰¹ Will allow service providers to continue sitting on a public body. Will retain transparency into HSH operations and provide a forum for public input while reducing redundant processes.
- **Cons:** Voters only recently approved the creation of the Homelessness Oversight Commission as a governance body so the Task Force may not find it prudent to substantially change the body so soon after it was approved.

⁹⁹ All these oversight bodies have stringent requirements for who may fill each seat, and it can be difficult to find candidates to fill 50 seats across all five bodies.

¹⁰⁰ Many bodies have restrictive seat requirements. If the Task Force recommends this option, it should direct staff to work with HSH and the City Attorney's Office to develop appropriate seat requirements.

¹⁰¹ All these oversight bodies have stringent requirements for who may fill each seat, and it can be difficult to find candidates to fill 50 seats across all five bodies.

13. [Homelessness Oversight Commission](#) (Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or eliminate
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining or eliminating. May keep and expand scope by absorbing functions of other homelessness-related bodies.

Primary Department	HSH	Established	2022
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	12
Policy Area	Homelessness	Members (as of May 2025)	7 seats 0 vacant (0%)
Annual Cost	\$1.1M ¹⁰²		

Oversees the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing. Manages and directs housing, programs, and services for persons experiencing homelessness in the City, including street outreach, homeless shelters, transitional housing, homeless prevention, and permanent supportive housing ([Charter § 4.133](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ¹⁰³	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes	Consider combining or eliminating
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	Yes	Consider keeping and expanding scope

¹⁰² Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁰³ Local Homeless Coordinating Board; Shelter Monitoring Committee; Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee; Our City, Our Home Oversight Committee

5	Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ¹⁰⁴	
		5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes	Consider eliminating

Staff Discussion:

The Homelessness Oversight Commission (HOC) is the governing body for the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH). HOC is one of five bodies overseeing or advising on components of homelessness services in San Francisco but is the only one with governance functions. It is also the newest body; in 2022 the Board of Supervisors unanimously placed a measure on the ballot to create this body and voters approved it. HOC held its first meeting in May 2023. HOC approves HSH's budget and approves contracts over \$500,000. At meetings, the Director shares updates and staff present public reporting or updates on topics that HOC commissioners specifically request. HOC also appoints members of the Local Homelessness Coordinating Board, Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee, and Shelter Monitoring Committee.

At its best, HOC is a forum for HSH to publicly report on their work, bring in outside expertise to advise on homelessness services, and hear public input. However, HOC does not need governance functions to accomplish these goals and it is not clear that it makes sense for HSH to have a governance body. Because homelessness is a high-profile policy area, it's one that the City and the Mayor are deeply involved in. Task Force members discussed that one of the key purposes of having a governance body overseeing a department is to provide additional oversight at a level of detail that the Mayor cannot provide to all departments. In this case however, the Mayor and his staff are deeply involved in focusing on and directing homelessness policy, and it is very likely that future mayors will have a similar level of engagement in this issue.

Furthermore, it's not clear that the additional oversight functions catch potential issues. For example, there have been several recent high-profile cases Citywide where a nonprofit either misused funds or mismanaged service delivery. In each case, City oversight mechanisms (such as regular contract and nonprofit monitoring and the Controller's Office's audits) caught and corrected these issues, not the departments' commissions.

The criteria-based outcome is to consider combining or eliminating HOC. Combining may include keeping HOC and expanding the scope to absorb some functions of other bodies. It may either remain a governance commission or be aligned to the advisory committee template. The Task Force may consider several options when determining how to make the City's homelessness bodies support more effective and efficient government, as highlighted in the three options presented in the earlier "[Homelessness Public Bodies Overview](#)."

¹⁰⁴ Demographic group: people experiencing homelessness

Possible Application of Governance Commission or Advisory Committee Templates:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?
Number of Members	7	15 maximum	5-7	Yes – Governance
Appointing authority	Split appointments: Mayor (4 seats) and Board of Supervisors (3 seats)	N/A	Mayor	No
Appointment confirmations	BOS confirmations for Mayoral appointees	None	None ¹⁰⁵	No
Member removal	At will	At will	At will	Yes
Term length	4 years	3 years maximum	4 years	Yes – Governance
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹⁰⁶	3 terms	No
Qualifications	Seat-specific ¹⁰⁷	None required ¹⁰⁸	None required ¹⁰⁹	Yes
Establishing authority	Charter	Administrative Code	TBD	No
Sunset date	None	3 years	None	Yes – Governance
Hiring and firing authority	Yes – nominate candidates for and fire director.	N/A	Consultative responsibilities only	No
Contract approval authority	Yes	N/A	Retain status quo	Yes – Governance
Budget approval authority	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes – Governance
Employee discipline authority	No	N/A	No role	Yes - both

¹⁰⁵ For Governance Commissions, appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

¹⁰⁶ For Advisory Committees, term limits are handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹⁰⁷ 2 members must be people who have personally experienced homelessness; 2 must have significant experience providing services to or engaging in advocacy on behalf of persons experiencing homelessness; 1 must have expertise in mental health service delivery or substance use treatment; 1 must have a record of participation in a merchants' or small business association, or neighborhood association; and 1 must have significant experience working with homeless families with children and/or homeless youth.

¹⁰⁸ Neither Advisory Committees nor Governance Commissions are required to have specific qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

¹⁰⁹ See previous note.

The Task Force may choose to align the Homelessness Oversight Commission to either an advisory committee or governance commission template.

To align HOC to the governance commission template, the Task Force should recommend removing split appointments so that the Mayor appoints all members, having appointments be effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18), adding a three-term limit, and removing the hiring and firing authority over the HSH Director. The Task Force would also need to decide whether to keep the Commission in the Charter or move it to the Administrative Code.

To align HOC to the advisory committee template, the Task Force should recommend removing appointment confirmations, reducing term lengths to three years, adding term limits, moving the body from the Charter to the Administrative Code, and removing all department oversight functions (hiring and firing authority, contract approval authority, and budget approval authority).

14. Local Homeless Coordinating Board (Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or Eliminate
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Functions of this body are legally required but may be performed by any other body Criteria suggest combining by eliminating and having the Homelessness Oversight Commission absorb functions or keeping and expanding scope by absorbing some functions of other advisory bodies.

Primary Department	HSH	Established	1996
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	12
Policy Area	Homelessness	Members (as of May 2025)	11 total seats 0 vacancies (0%)
Annual Cost	\$196k ¹¹⁰		

Serves as the Continuum of Care governing body and advises the Homelessness Oversight Commission on issues relating to the City's participation in the Continuum of Care program ([Administrative Code § 5.31-1](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	Yes	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	Yes ¹¹¹	Consider combining or eliminating
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ¹¹²	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes	Consider combining or eliminating

¹¹⁰ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹¹¹ 24 Code of Federal Regulations § 578.5 states that the Continuum of Care must establish a board to act on behalf of the Continuum that must be representative of the relevant organizations and of projects serving homeless subpopulations; and include at least one homeless or formerly homeless individual. In practice, this means any public body may serve this function as long as it complies with the requirements in this section.

¹¹² Homelessness Oversight Commission

		4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	Yes	Consider keeping and expanding scope
5	Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ¹¹³	
		5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes ¹¹⁴	Consider eliminating

Staff Discussion:

The Local Homelessness Coordinating Board (LHCB) is one of five bodies advising or overseeing homelessness services in San Francisco.

LHCB advises HSH around participation in the Continuum of Care program, which is the program the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) runs to fund community responses to homelessness. HSH is the head of San Francisco's CoC and is charged with awarding and disbursing federal funds to nonprofits for homelessness services. HUD has specific requirements about what CoC dollars may fund and specific requirements around tracking and reporting on those dollars. However, CoC funding represents less than 10% of HSH's budget. As part of the CoC requirements, HUD requires that each CoC establish a board to "act on behalf of the Continuum of Care" and outlines specific membership requirements. Applications for CoC funding receive additional points based on the diversity and representativeness of CoC Board Members, so CoC are incentivized to have large and diverse boards.¹¹⁵ The City created LHCB to be the CoC Board and it has met monthly since 1996. In recent meetings, HSH staff have presented on topics concerning the CoC, such as planning for the Point-in-Time count and updates to funding opportunities.

A key role of advisory bodies is to bring in outside expertise and lived experiences that would otherwise be missing from City decision-making. While the advisory bodies in the homelessness space have required qualifications that ensure these bodies are bringing in specific expertise, it's important to note that HSH actively engages the community in decision-making outside of the formal commission structures. For example, to develop their strategic plan, HSH used a robust community engagement process that included surveys, focus groups, input sessions, and interviews with clients, service providers, and community members. HSH also has ongoing engagement, such as monthly provider meetings, neighborhood working groups that engage businesses and residents, ad-hoc focus groups with clients, and ongoing equity work that involves client input.

The criteria-based outcome is to combine or eliminate LHCB. LHCB has a narrow scope in comparison to the breadth of funding and homelessness services work that the City does and it does not necessarily make sense to have LHCB continue as its own body. The Homelessness Oversight Commission (HOC) could integrate decisions and discussion on CoC funding into the broader HSH budget and strategic planning discussions. HOC could also serve as the CoC Board, either as a governance body or as an advisory body.

¹¹³ Demographic group: people experiencing homelessness; funding source: CoC funding from HUD.

¹¹⁴ Another oversight body may perform LHCB's functions.

¹¹⁵ This description of the HUD CoC funding scoring system is accurate through the 2024 two-year funding cycle, although it may change for future funding cycles.

The Task Force may consider several options when determining how to make the City's homelessness bodies support more effective and efficient government, as highlighted in the three options presented in the earlier "[Homelessness Public Bodies Overview](#)."

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	11	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Homelessness Oversight Commission	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	4 years	3 years maximum	No	No change
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹¹⁶	No	Partially align to template; add 3-term limit
Qualifications	Yes ¹¹⁷	None required ¹¹⁸	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Do not add a sunset date

The criteria-based outcome is to combine or eliminate the Local Homeless Coordinating Board (LHCB). However, if the Task Force chooses to keep the body, it should partially align the LHCB to the advisory committee template. Because HUD requires a CoC Board, the Task Force should not add a sunset date, but it should add a three-term limit.

¹¹⁶ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹¹⁷ 1 homeless or formerly homeless person, 10 members who represent people who represent relevant organizations or projects serving one or more homeless subpopulations in San Francisco

¹¹⁸ Advisory committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

15. Our City, Our Home Oversight Committee (Controller's Office)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or eliminate
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining or eliminating by allowing the Homelessness Oversight Commission to absorb functions.

Primary Department	CON	Established	2019
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	5
Policy Area	Homelessness	Members (as of May 2025)	9 total seats 0 vacant seats (0%)
Annual Cost	\$310k ¹¹⁹		

Advises the Mayor and Board of Supervisors on the allocation of the Our City, Our Home fund, directed at homelessness and financed by Proposition C, the Homelessness Gross Receipts Tax Ordinance ([Administrative Code § 5.41-1](#); [Business and Tax Regulations Code § 2810](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	N/A	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ¹²⁰	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes	Consider combining or eliminating
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ¹²¹	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes	Consider eliminating

¹¹⁹ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹²⁰ Homeless Oversight Commission, Health Commission, Local Homeless Coordinating Board

¹²¹ Demographic group: people experiencing homelessness. Single funding source: Our City, Our Home Fund

Staff Discussion:

Our City, Our Home Oversight Committee (OCOH) is an advisory committee that provides recommendations on uses of the Our City, Our Home Fund. Its stated purpose is to “ensure the City uses the Fund in ways that are consistent with the intent of the voters.” OCOH is one of five bodies advising or overseeing homelessness services in San Francisco. Unlike other homelessness-related bodies, the Controller's Office provides administrative and clerical support. This is because the fund legislation specifies the percentages of the fund that goes to the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH), the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), and the Department of Public Health (DPH) for specific uses. OCOH funding makes up approximately 45% of HSH's total budget. The legislation also directs OCOH to conduct a needs assessment every three years.

OCOH meetings include presentations from staff about annual reporting and department work, and members discuss funding recommendations for the upcoming budget cycles.

A key role of advisory bodies is to bring in outside expertise and lived experiences that would otherwise be missing from City decision-making. While the advisory bodies in the homelessness space have required qualifications that ensure these bodies are bringing in specific expertise, it's important to note that HSH actively engages the community in decision-making outside of the formal commission structures. For example, to develop their strategic plan, HSH used a robust community engagement process that included surveys, focus groups, input sessions, and interviews with clients, service providers, and community members. HSH also has ongoing engagement, such as monthly provider meetings, neighborhood working groups that engage businesses and residents, ad-hoc focus groups with clients, and ongoing equity work that involves client input.

The criteria-based outcome is combining or eliminating Our City, Our Home Oversight Committee. In particular, the Evaluation Criteria includes a criterion that specific funds should not have dedicated advisory bodies. Instead, budget decisions about these funds should be part of a department's overall budget processes so that the funds may be considered holistically and in alignment with a department's strategic goals. This holds true for OCOH, where HSH and DPH have other commissions that provide input and budget approval and both departments have regular public engagement practices. Furthermore, the City requires that departments hold public hearings as part of annual budget development. As a result, the Task Force should recommend eliminating OCOH. The Homelessness Oversight Commission (HOC) and Health Commission could integrate decisions and discussion on OCOH funding into the broader HSH and DPH budget and strategic planning discussions. HSH could use the work order with the Controller's Office City Performance Unit to continue conducting the needs assessment and could integrate annual reporting on OCOH performance into HSH's annual reporting. However, because the OCOH legislation is voter-approved, voters would also need to approve changes to the body despite it being in the Administrative Code, introducing an additional hurdle to its potential dissolution.

The Task Force may consider several options when determining how to make the City's homelessness bodies support more effective and efficient government, as highlighted in the three options presented in the earlier [“Homelessness Public Bodies Overview.”](#)

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	9	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Split appointments; 4 Mayor, 4 Board of Supervisors, 1 Controller	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	2 years	3 years maximum	Yes	Align to template, increase to 3 years.
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹²²	No	Align to template; add 4-term limit
Qualifications	Yes ¹²³	None required ¹²⁴	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code, Business and Tax Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; add sunset date

The criteria-based outcome is to combine or eliminate Our City, Our Home Oversight (OCOH) Committee. However, if the Task Force chooses to keep the body, it should partially align it to the advisory committee template by increasing term lengths to three years, instituting four-term limits, and adding a sunset date within three years.

¹²² Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹²³ 1 individual with experience with Homeless housing development or supportive housing services, 1 individual representing families with minor children residing in SRO Units or a family member residing in a SRO Unit, 1 individual with experience providing Homeless services, 1 individual who has experienced homelessness and also has experience advocating for Homeless people, 1 individual with mental health service and/or substance abuse expertise, 2 individuals who have personally experienced homelessness, 1 individual who has experience advocating on Homeless or mental health issues, 1 seat without qualifications.

¹²⁴ Advisory committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

16. Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee (Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing)

Criteria-based outcome: Eliminate
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining with Homelessness Oversight Commission or eliminating

Primary Department	HSH	Established	2022 ¹²⁵
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	4
Policy Area	Homelessness	Members (as of May 2025)	13 total seats 3 vacant seats (23%)
Annual Cost	\$68k ¹²⁶		

Receives and reviews reports relating to the City's Shelter Grievance Policy and complaints regarding the enforcement of shelter rules, as described in [Article XVIII](#) of Chapter 20 of the Administrative Code ([Administrative Code § 5.36-1](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	N/A	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ¹²⁷	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes	Consider combining or eliminating
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ¹²⁸	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes	Consider eliminating

¹²⁵ Formally added to the Administrative Code in 2022. Has been operating in some form since 1992.

¹²⁶ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹²⁷ Homelessness Oversight Commission, Shelter Monitoring Committee.

¹²⁸ Narrow topic: shelter grievance policy

Staff Discussion:

The Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee (SGAC) is one of five bodies advising or overseeing homelessness services in San Francisco and one of two bodies focused exclusively on shelter. The Committee's primary purpose is to provide input on the Shelter Grievance Policy, which is the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing's (HSH) policy outlining processes and procedure for denials of service in San Francisco's shelter system. This policy is codified in the Administrative Code.

HSH implements the Shelter Grievance policy including managing hearings and appeals. This includes funding client advocates to represent clients who appeal their denials of service. Independent volunteer arbitrators hear and determine the outcomes of client appeals. SGAC has a limited role; the body primarily reviews reports on denial-of-service statistics and client advocate reports. It meets quarterly and while the evaluation criteria did not flag it as borderline inactive, the Committee cancelled its June and September 2025 meetings, and recent agendas show members often miss meetings.

The criteria-based outcome is to eliminate the Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee. The Homelessness Oversight Commission (HOC) may absorb some functions by having regular reports on denial-of-service data and hearing and arbitration metrics.

The Task Force may consider several options when determining how to make the City's homelessness bodies support more effective and efficient government, as highlighted in the three options presented in the earlier "[Homelessness Public Bodies Overview](#)."

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	13	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Homelessness Oversight Commission (12 seats), Director of Health (1 seat)	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	4 years	3 years maximum	No	Align to template, reduce terms to 3 years
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹²⁹	No	Align to template, add 4-term limit
Qualifications	Yes ¹³⁰	None required ¹³¹	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	Yes, April 30, 2032	3 years	No	Align to template, reduce sunset date to 3 years

The criteria-based outcome is to eliminate the Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee. However, if the Task Force chooses to keep the body, it should partially align it to the advisory committee template by reducing term lengths to three years, moving the sunset date to within three years, and instituting a four-term limit.

¹²⁹ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹³⁰ 4 current or previous consumer of City temporary shelter services, 4 persons who represent organizations providing shelter services in the City, 1 person who represents an organization or project providing shelter client advocate services in the City, 1 person serving as arbitrator of shelter grievances under the Shelter Grievance Policy, 2 City residents with a demonstrated commitment to temporary shelter services, 1 employee of the Department of Public Health.

¹³¹ Advisory committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

17. Shelter Monitoring Committee (Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or Eliminate			
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest combining with Homelessness Oversight Commission or eliminating May recommend allowing to sunset when scheduled, on July 1, 2027 HSH may also maintain as a passive meeting body 			
Primary Department	HSH	Established	2004
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	11
Policy Area	Homelessness	Members (as of May 2025)	12 total seats 3 vacant seats (25%)
Annual Cost	\$389k ¹³²		

Documents conditions of shelters and resource centers to improve the health, safety, and treatment of residents, clients, and staff ([Administrative Code § 20.305](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	N/A	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ¹³³	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes	Consider combining or eliminating
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ¹³⁴	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes	Consider eliminating

¹³² Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹³³ Homelessness Oversight Commission, Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee

¹³⁴ Narrow topic: Emergency shelter

Staff Discussion:

The Shelter Monitoring Committee is one of five bodies advising or overseeing homelessness services in San Francisco and one of two bodies focused exclusively on shelter. The body meets monthly and tracks conditions of City-funded shelters, primarily conducting site visits, investigating complaints, and reporting their findings.

The criteria-based outcome is to eliminate the Shelter Monitoring Committee. The body is scheduled to sunset on July 1, 2027, approximately one year after the Task Force's ordinance is expected to take effect. The Task Force could recommend removing it from code in the final ordinance or, alternatively, recommend the Board of Supervisors not to renew it when the sunset date arrives.

The Committee launched in 2004 and members are active and engaged. However, City structures around homelessness have changed since 2004 and the committee may have outlived its useful purpose as a codified body. The Committee was a driving force behind the passage of the Standard of Care legislation in 2008, which establishes minimum standards included in all shelter contracts. However, the Committee is no longer needed as a mechanism to ensure contractors follow this policy or follow up on complaints. HSH conducts site visits as part of regular contract monitoring and has a dedicated shelter team overseeing HSH's shelter contracts. Shelter makes up only 24% of HSH's total budget, almost half that of permanent housing, so it's not clear why shelter has two dedicated advisory bodies while other components of the homelessness response system have none.

If the Committee is eliminated, a combination of HSH staff and the Homelessness Oversight Commission (HOC) may absorb its functions. HSH staff can continue with monitoring and visits as part of normal contract monitoring processes. HSH can receive and respond to client complaints regarding shelter through its normal grievance processes. The Department can also leverage the existing contract for shelter advocates, expanding their work to cover shelter complaints that clients feel HSH staff have not adequately resolved. HOC can require regular reporting of shelter conditions and data on complaints so that there is still public visibility on shelter conditions. The Task Force could recommend that the Homelessness Oversight Commission establish a shelter subcommittee that focuses on both shelter monitoring and the shelter grievance policy. If HSH finds the additional engagement of the Committee useful, it may instead or also consider maintaining the Shelter Monitoring Committee as a passive meeting body, meaning it would continue to provide input and recommendations to the Department while not being in the Administrative Code.

The Task Force may consider several options when determining how to make the City's homelessness bodies support more effective and efficient government, as highlighted in the three options presented in the "[Homelessness Public Bodies Overview](#)."

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	12	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Homelessness Oversight Commission	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	2 years	3 years maximum	Yes	Align to template, increase term length to 3 years
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹³⁵	No	Align to template, add limit of 4 terms
Qualifications	Yes ¹³⁶	None required ¹³⁷	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	Yes, July 1, 2027	3 years	Yes	

The criteria-based outcome is to eliminate the Shelter Monitoring Committee. However, if the Task Force chooses to keep the body, it should align it to the advisory committee template by adding term limits. While the two-year term length fits within the advisory committee template, the Task Force may want to increase the term length to three years, in which case a four-term limit would be appropriate.

¹³⁵ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹³⁶ 1 person who is (1) providing direct services to homeless families, or (2) a parent, legal guardian, or caregiver who is personally experiencing or has personally experienced being homeless; 1 person who is homeless or has been homeless within the three years prior to being appointed to the Committee, and who has a disability; 2 persons with experience providing direct services to homeless people through a community setting; 1 person nominated by one or more community agencies that provide behavioral health, housing placement, or other services to homeless people; 1 person who is homeless or formerly homeless, and who has been nominated by one or more nonprofit agencies that provide advocacy or organizing services for homeless people; 2 persons nominated by one or more nonprofit agencies that provide advocacy or organizing services for homeless people; 2 persons who are homeless or formerly homeless, and who have experience providing direct services to homeless people through a community setting; 1 person who is homeless or formerly homeless, and who has been nominated by one or more community agencies that provide behavioral health, housing placement, or other services to homeless people; 1 employee of the Department of Public Health. Commission is encouraged to select people who are bilingual.

¹³⁷ Advisory committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

Policy Area: Human Rights

Human Rights Public Bodies Overview

San Francisco has developed a distinct set of commissions and advisory bodies focused on human rights and equity. These bodies were created at different points in time, often in response to community advocacy or broader civil rights movements, and each brings a specialized focus: gender equity, LGBTQI+ rights, immigrant rights, or human rights more broadly. Together, they provide forums for public engagement, highlight systemic inequities, and influence City policy and funding priorities.

Unlike other policy areas where services are concentrated in a single department, the human rights bodies span multiple departments and are closely tied to evolving political and social priorities. The Human Rights Commission (HRC) governs a Charter department and has the broadest mandate. The LGBTQI+ Advisory Committee is housed under HRC, functioning as a formal advisory body on issues facing the queer community. The Commission on the Status of Women (COSW) oversees the Department on the Status of Women, though the Mayor's FY 2025–26 budget proposed merging that department with HRC. The Immigrant Rights Commission (IRC) advises the Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs, a division within the City Administrator's Office. The Family Violence Council is associated with the Mayor's Office of Victim Rights.

While each of these bodies has elevated critical equity concerns and supported meaningful reforms, their overlapping mandates raise questions about duplication, coordination, and restructuring. Ultimately, all four bodies are important to maintain as forums for equity and representation; the question before the Task Force is whether some should remain governance commissions or if all should be restructured as advisory committees.

18. [Commission on the Status of Women](#) (Department on the Status of Women)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep

Notes:

- Criteria do not provide any reason for elimination
- Only body dedicated to gender equity across City operations
- Could shift to an advisory role

Primary Department	DOSW	Established	1975
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	12
Policy Area	Human Rights	Members (as of May 2025)	7 total seats 0 vacant seats (0%)
Annual Cost	\$324k ¹³⁸		

Strives to make San Francisco a fully gender equitable city by championing the fair treatment and advancement of women and girls across social, economic, and political spheres. Develops and recommends policies, programs, and legislation to address inequities, including those related to violence, employment, and discrimination, both within City government and in the broader community ([Charter § 4.119](#); [Administrative Code Ch. 33](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ¹³⁹	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	

¹³⁸ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹³⁹ Human Rights Commission, Family Violence Council

5	Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ¹⁴⁰	
		5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	Consider keeping

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria do not provide any reason to eliminate the Commission on the Status of Women (COSW), which was established in 1975 by Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 780-75 after years of advocacy on the part of the San Francisco women's community. In 1994, San Francisco voters approved Proposition E, which created the Department on the Status of Women (DOSW) to carry out the policies of the Commission. Former commissioners are very much still active, showing up early in the Commission Streamlining Task Force's process and writing numerous letters to advocate for maintaining the body.

In its early decades, COSW drove major reforms: it pushed San Francisco to adopt the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) ordinance in 1998, making the City the first in the nation to locally implement this global human rights framework. It spearheaded the Justice and Courage Blueprint after the Claire Joyce Tempongko case in 2000, which revealed systemic failures in the City's domestic violence response and led to reforms across police, probation, and the courts. COSW also played a role in creating cross-agency structures like the Family Violence Council and the Sexual Assault Response Team.

COSW provides a consistent forum for survivors of gender-based violence, sexual assault, and domestic violence, along with advocates and community-based organizations, to engage with local government. Public comment averages 4–10 speakers per meeting. In recent years, the Commission has overseen a citywide survey to identify community priorities, advanced grants to safeguard reproductive care after the Dobbs Supreme Court decision, and continued to track women's representation in public spaces, which remains well below the City's 30% goal.¹⁴¹ It has also highlighted public health research on trans women, elevated programs supporting young women of color and girls in sports, engaged women voters, and provided a platform for LGBTQ+ business owners and the Office of Transgender Initiatives to share their work on equity and inclusion. The Commission issued commendations for female leadership in the San Francisco Police Department after supporting efforts to address the Department's lack of lactation spaces for officers. The Commission also reviews regular reports from the Department and makes recommendations to uplift credible information.¹⁴²

¹⁴⁰ Women

¹⁴¹ Ordinance 243-18, passed in 2018, mandated that women be represented in at least 30% of all public spaces, including in art, street names, parks, and buildings. COSW analysis shows that women are still vastly underrepresented, compared to men, in public spaces across San Francisco, only averaging 15 percent of representation in public property.

¹⁴² Reports include the San Francisco Bay Area Abortion Rights Coalition (BAARC) Report, Gender Analysis of Commissions and Boards Report, Community Needs Assessment Report, Representation of Women in Public Property, and Human Trafficking Report.

Last year, the Gender-Based Violence (GBV) grant portfolio was moved to the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development.¹⁴³ COSW still reviews sole-source grants and provides policy oversight, but its direct influence on resource allocation is narrower than in the past. Its current work often centers on research, hearings, and symbolic oversight, such as tracking women's representation in public spaces, reviewing demographic data on City boards and commissions, and spotlighting issues through community presentations. While these are meaningful contributions, they lack the structural and financial weight of COSW's earlier interventions. Even in critical areas like sexual harassment oversight, COSW's role is largely limited to reviewing data reports from the Department of Human Resources rather than driving systemic reform directly.

If the Task Force chooses to keep the COSW – and again, the criteria offer no reason to eliminate the body – it may consider converting it from a governance commission overseeing a department to an advisory body providing input. Such a change could align with recent steps taken in the Mayor's FY 2025–2026 budget, which proposed merging the Department on the Status of Women (DOSW) with the Human Rights Commission department—though DOSW will remain a standalone department unless and until the voters approve a Charter amendment eliminating it or turning it into a division of a larger agency. If DOSW remains a department, COSW could continue as its governance body, similar to how the Human Services Agency includes multiple governance commissions. If DOSW is converted into a division, restructuring COSW as an advisory body would be appropriate. In that case, COSW could function similarly to the LGBTQI+ Advisory Committee to the HRC, maintaining a space for community voices without requiring a full governance commission structure. The Task Force is not responsible for these departmental structure questions, though it may offer a recommendation for City leaders to consider.

Staff considered combining COSW with other commissions or shifting its functions to other agencies, but doing so would diminish the City's focus on gender equity. While COSW's work overlaps with entities such as the Family Violence Council, the Human Rights Commission, and the Mayor's Office of Victims' Rights, it is the only body explicitly charged with advancing gender equity across all City operations. Other departments may address gender issues within their own areas, but COSW—together with DOSW—is the only entity solely focused on the comprehensive advancement, safety, and empowerment of women, girls, and gender-expansive individuals.

¹⁴³ DOSW's GBV grant agreements spanned five years of possible renewals, were initiated in FY 2020–21, and set to sunset on June 30, 2025. The baseline annual funding requirement for the portfolio was \$8,470,743, supporting 27 individual grantees across 39 contracts in six program areas

Possible Application of Governance Commission or Advisory Committee Templates:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?
Number of Members	7	15 maximum	5-7	Yes – Both
Appointing authority	Mayor	N/A	Mayor	Yes – Both
Appointment confirmations	None	None	None ¹⁴⁴	Yes – Both
Member removal	For cause	At will	At will	No
Term length	4 years	3 years maximum	4 years	Yes – Governance
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹⁴⁵	3 terms	No
Qualifications	None	None required ¹⁴⁶	None required ¹⁴⁷	Yes – Both ¹⁴⁸
Establishing authority	Charter	Administrative Code	TBD	No
Sunset date	None	3 years	None	Yes – Governance
Hiring and firing authority	Yes	N/A	Consultative responsibilities only	No
Contract approval authority	Yes ¹⁴⁹	N/A	Retain status quo	Yes – Governance
Budget approval authority	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes – Governance
Employee discipline authority	No	N/A	No role ¹⁵⁰	Yes – Both

If the Task Force chooses to retain the Commission on the Status of Women (COSW), several changes should be made regardless of its designation: members should serve at will, term limits should be established and the Commission's authority to hire and fire the department head should be eliminated. If the Task Force recommends converting COSW from a governance commission to an advisory body, additional modifications would be required, including revisions to term lengths, establishing authority, sunset provisions, and contract and budget approval powers.

¹⁴⁴ For Governance Commissions, appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

¹⁴⁵ For Advisory Committees, term limits are handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹⁴⁶ Neither Advisory Committees nor Governance Commissions are required to have specific qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

¹⁴⁷ See prior note

¹⁴⁸ Charter section 3.100(18) applies (the Notice of Appointment shall include the appointee's qualifications to serve and a statement how the appointment represents the communities of interest, neighborhoods and diverse populations of the City and County)

¹⁴⁹ 3-6 per year in the past three fiscal years

¹⁵⁰ Exceptions if this is currently required by law

19. Family Violence Council (Mayor's Office of Victims' Rights)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep

Notes:

- Criteria do not provide any reason for elimination

Primary Department	MYR	Established	2007
Current Type	Staff Working Group	Meetings (CY24)	4
Policy Area	Human Rights	Members (as of September 2025)	28 total seats 1 vacant seat (4%)
Annual Cost	\$2k ¹⁵¹		

Works to prevent and improve the City's response to family violence by recommending programs, policies, and coordination of City services to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors ([Administrative Code § 5.19-1](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ¹⁵²	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	No	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	N/A	
<i>Outcome: Because the answer is "no" to all applicable criteria, consider keeping.</i>			

¹⁵¹ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁵² Commission on the Status of Women

Staff Discussion:

The Family Violence Council (FVC) is a hybrid staff working group/advisory committee that consists of 25 City employees and 3 members of the public. This body exists to formulate policies and promote communication and coordination across the various City and nonprofit agencies that address family violence. Though the body consists mainly of City employees, its three public members are designated in code as the body's steering committee, informally referred to as the "tri-chairs," who plan and facilitate the meetings. Each tri-chair has expertise in a different focal area – child abuse/neglect, domestic violence, and elder/dependent adult abuse.

FVC produces an annual report that serves as the City's comprehensive landscape analysis of family violence. The report identifies urgent issues/trends, provides recommendations for City agencies and service providers, and includes disaggregated data on victims and perpetrators. FVC and City agencies use the data and recommendations from the annual report to drive policy changes. For example, in the last year FVC worked with the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) to increase staffing of the Special Victims Unit (SVU) and improve SFPD's response to restraining order violations. In prior years, FVC has tackled issues such as trainings for City employees and City-funded service providers, SFPD protocols for domestic violence and elder abuse response, and strategies to address a rise in Anti-Asian Hate crimes.

FVC typically hears from around six public commenters per meeting, including survivors, advocates, and service providers. FVC met virtually during COVID and saw higher levels of public participation.

At its September 17, 2025 meeting, the Commission Streamlining Task Force recommended removing other interdepartmental coordination groups, such as the Committee for Utility Liaison on Construction and Other Projects (CULCOP) and the Municipal Green Building Task Force, from the Administrative Code and reconstituting them as passive meeting bodies. The Task Force reasoned that coordination work can continue without the full obligations of the Brown Act, which some groups have struggled to meet. For similar reasons, the Task Force may elect to apply this approach to FVC, preserving its coordinating function while reducing administrative burden and legal risk. However, staff note that the FVC's structure as a public meeting body with community leadership creates a unique and valuable forum for advocates and service providers to collaborate on equal footing with City agencies.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	28	15 maximum	No	No change; MOVR and CAT are currently working on legislation to reduce this group's membership to 15
Appointing authority	28 different appointing bodies	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	No confirmations	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	6 members appointed by the Steering Committee serve 1-year terms; no terms are set for other council members	3 years maximum	No	No change; suggest that MOVR and CAT include 3-year terms for any public members in their legislation
Term limits	No more than 6 years out of a 9-year period	Case-by-case ¹⁵³	Yes	
Qualifications	Seats designated for 28 elected officials, department heads, nonprofit executives, or their designees ¹⁵⁴	None required ¹⁵⁵	Yes	No change; MOVR and CAT are currently working on legislation to alter this group's membership and qualifications
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	

¹⁵³ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹⁵⁴ Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, Mayor, President of the Board of Supervisors, District Attorney, Chief of Police, Sheriff, President of the Commission on the Status of Women, Chief of Adult Probation, Executive Director of the Department of Emergency Management, Executive Director of the Domestic Violence Consortium, Executive Director of the Human Services Agency, Executive Director of the Consortium for Elder Abuse Prevention, Executive Director of Safe & Sound, Director of the Department of Public Health, Executive Director of the Department of Disability and aging Services, Executive Director off the Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families, Medical Examiner, Director of the Department of Child Support Services, Chief of Juvenile Probation, Public Defender, Director of the Department of Animal Care and Control, Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District, Human resources Director, Chief of the Fire Department, Director of the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, Director of the Department of Early Childhood, Director of the Department of Police Accountability, and Executive Director of the Human Rights Commission

¹⁵⁵ Advisory committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Sunset date	5/1/2027	3 years	Yes	

The Family Violence Council is primarily a staff working group, though it functions similarly to an advisory committee, so alignment to that template is appropriate.

In September 2024, the Mayor’s Office of Victims’ Rights (MOVR) assumed responsibility from the Department on the Status of Women for facilitating FVC. Since then, MOVR has worked with the tri-chairs to reassess the group’s bylaws and membership to streamline operations. MOVR is currently working with the City Attorney’s Office (CAT) on legislation to update the group’s membership and align it more closely with the Task Force’s advisory committee template. If the Task Force elects to keep FVC, they should direct staff to work with MOVR and CAT to ensure legislation is aligned with the advisory committee template.

20. [Human Rights Commission](#) (Human Rights Commission)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep	
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria do not provide any reason for elimination Provides a forum for equity and discrimination concerns, with near-monthly meetings covering oversight, policy, and community recognitions Serves as the City's primary equity commission, with capacity to be an umbrella for the work of more specific commissions 	

Primary Department	HRC	Established	1964
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	10
Policy Area	Human Rights	Members (as of May 2025)	11 total seats 1 vacant seats (9%)
Annual Cost	\$314k ¹⁵⁶		

Enforces San Francisco's anti-discrimination laws and advances equity across the City. Investigates and mediates discrimination complaints; advises City leaders; oversees departments' affirmative-action plans; and helps ensure City contracts, programs, and services comply with civil-rights requirements—using tools like public hearings and subpoenas when needed. Housed within the department, the Office of Racial Equity develops the City's equity framework, analyzes policies and budgets for racial impacts, and supports departments in reducing disparities ([Charter § 4.107](#); [Administrative Code § 12A](#))

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ¹⁵⁷	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	

¹⁵⁶ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁵⁷ Commission on the Status of Women, Immigrant Rights Commission

		4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No
5	Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	No
		5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria do not provide any reason to eliminate the Human Rights Commission (HRC), which was created in 1964 via a Board of Supervisors ordinance amid rising civil rights concerns and added to the Charter in 1990 via Proposition J. Today, HRC governs a department of the same name which has a budget of \$28M and 27 employees (FTEs) for FY26. The Commission provides oversight on discrimination, equity, and human rights issues, ensuring that San Francisco’s policies and practices align with civil rights protections. While there was a high rate of meeting cancellations in the last year, HRC serves as a public, near-monthly forum for community concerns about equity and discrimination.

Based on the ten meetings between January and September 2025, the Commission’s work focuses on a combination of departmental oversight, policy discussions, and community recognitions. Commissioners receive updates from the Acting Executive Director on staffing, audits, and major program initiatives, and they periodically act on budget matters or grant approvals, such as Juneteenth celebration funding or recommendations from advisory committees. Meetings also highlight heritage and awareness months—including Black History, Women’s History, AANHPI Heritage, Disability Pride, Latino Heritage, Transgender History, and Juneteenth—through presentations from staff, commissioners, and community partners. In addition, the Commission hears special presentations on equity issues such as immigrant rights, child homelessness, and pedestrian safety, and it occasionally convenes closed sessions for litigation or personnel matters, including the Executive Director appointment.

Elsewhere in this document, staff discuss options for restructuring related bodies such as the [Commission on the Status of Women](#) and the [Immigrant Rights Commission](#). Because HRC’s scope is broader, it should absorb the narrower functions of other commissions in a potential merger. In that case, HRC seats could be designated to ensure representation of those issue areas. Alternatively, the other bodies could remain as separate advisory bodies—similar to the LGBTQI+ Advisory Committee—providing input to HRC. However, these options do not alter the conclusion that retaining HRC is essential to keeping equity and human rights as visible, central priorities in San Francisco’s governance. In fact, they underscore the importance of maintaining HRC as a stand-alone commission.

Possible Application of Governance Commission or Advisory Committee Templates:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?
Number of Members	11	15 maximum	5-7	Yes – Advisory
Appointing authority	Mayor	N/A	Mayor	Yes - both
Appointment confirmations	None	None	None ¹⁵⁸	Yes - both
Member removal	At will	At will	At will	Yes - both
Term length	4 years	3 years maximum	4 years	Yes - Governance
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹⁵⁹	3 terms	No
Qualifications	None	None required ¹⁶⁰	None required ¹⁶¹	Yes - Both ¹⁶²
Establishing authority	Charter	Administrative Code	TBD	No
Sunset date	None	3 years	None	Yes - Governance
Hiring and firing authority	Yes (may nominate candidates for Executive Director, and has sole authority to fire the Executive Director)	N/A	Consultative responsibilities only	No
Contract approval authority	Yes ¹⁶³	N/A	Retain status quo	Yes – Governance
Budget approval authority	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes – Governance
Employee discipline authority	No	N/A	No role ¹⁶⁴	Yes

¹⁵⁸ For Governance Commissions, appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

¹⁵⁹ For Advisory Committees, term limits are handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹⁶⁰ Neither Advisory Committees nor Governance Commissions are required to have specific qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

¹⁶¹ Same note as above

¹⁶² Charter section 3.100(18) applies (the Notice of Appointment shall include the appointee's qualifications to serve and a statement how the appointment represents the communities of interest, neighborhoods and diverse populations of the City and County)

¹⁶³ HRC's bylaws state the body reviews and approves grants, but in recent practice, the commission has not been exercising this authority

¹⁶⁴ Exceptions if this is currently required by law

The Task Force may consider aligning the Human Rights Commission (HRC) to either the governance commission or advisory committee template. Currently, HRC operates as a governance body, but converting it to an advisory committee might better match its resources and oversight role. Its budget and staff are relatively modest for a Charter commission. Furthermore, it's not clear that the additional oversight functions catch potential issues. Recent audits and reporting showed that the Commission under the former department head approved contracts which violated procurement rules and were alleged to be a misuse of public funds.

HRC currently has 11 seats, which fits well within the advisory committee template. It also appears the body was larger historically—[Administrative Code § 12A.4](#), which dates back to the 1980s and 1990s, still lists HRC membership as 15, while [Charter § 4.107](#) now sets it at 11. The Task Force should address and reconcile that discrepancy legislatively. If the Task Force aligns HRC to the governance commission template, it would need to reduce seats by at least four. Because there are currently no seat-specific qualifications, making that legislative change would be relatively straightforward. As of May 2025, only one seat was vacant.

If HRC remains in the Charter as a governance commission, the Task Force should direct staff to work with the City Attorney's Office to clarify which duties belong to the department and which belong to the commission.

21. [Immigrant Rights Commission](#) (City Administrator's Office)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep

Notes:

- Criteria do not provide any reason for elimination
- Only dedicated City forum for immigrant voices and language access, with strong public participation and multilingual engagement

Primary Department	ADM	Established	1997
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	8
Policy Area	Human Rights	Members (as of May 2025)	15 total seats 2 vacant seats (13%)
Annual Cost	\$210k ¹⁶⁵		

Guides the Mayor and Board of Supervisors on issues and policies that affect immigrants in San Francisco. Duties include holding annual public hearings to gather community input, reviewing state and federal legislation, and coordinating with City departments to improve services for immigrants. Prepares an annual report on immigrant needs and programs and develops public education efforts to highlight immigrants' contributions and advocate for their rights ([Administrative Code § 5.201](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ¹⁶⁶	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ¹⁶⁷	

¹⁶⁵ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁶⁶ Human Rights Commission

¹⁶⁷ Immigrants

5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No
--	----

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria do not provide any reason to eliminate the Immigrant Rights Commission (IRC), which serves as an advisory body to the Office of Civic Engagement & Immigrant Affairs (OCEIA), a division within the City Administrator’s Office. Established in 1997, the IRC’s role expanded in 2001 with the adoption of the Language Access Ordinance (LAO). In 2025, the IRC’s first five meetings drew 39 unique public commenters—an average of eight per meeting—with interpretation provided in multiple languages, including Spanish, Cantonese, Filipino, Arabic, and Mongolian.

The Immigrant Rights Commission (IRC) provides a forum for immigrant communities to share input on City services and policies, complementing the work of the Office of Civic Engagement & Immigrant Affairs (OCEIA). Commissioners, who are drawn from community representatives, bring perspectives that differ from City staff and may help surface concerns from vulnerable populations. The IRC receives quarterly reports from OCEIA on language access complaints and an annual report on citywide LAO compliance. It also hears updates on federal, state, and local legislation and executive actions, and determines which policy positions to recommend for City support or opposition. In recent years, the Commission has been involved in the 2024 amendments to the LAO, issued recommendations on immigrant workforce development, and discussed or supported initiatives such as work permit clinics, worker cooperatives, and community recognition events.

Although the evaluation criteria support retaining IRC as-is, the Task Force may consider two potential consolidation models for the IRC and the Human Rights Commission (HRC). One option would be to merge the IRC fully into the HRC, adding qualifications for a subset of HRC’s 11 seats to ensure representation of immigrant issues. Another option would be to retain the IRC as a separate advisory committee to the HRC, similar to the LGBTQI+ Advisory Committee. This second option would only make sense if OCEIA were moved out of the City Administrator’s Office and placed within the HRC department or newly created Human Rights Agency, which would require department restructuring outside the scope of the Task Force.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	15	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Mayor (4 seats) and Board of Supervisors (11 seats)	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	2 years	3 years maximum	Yes	Increase from 2 to 3 years
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹⁶⁸	No	Align to template; add 4-term limit
Qualifications	Yes (body-level) ¹⁶⁹	None required ¹⁷⁰	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; add a 3-year sunset date

To align with the advisory committee template, the Task Force would increase term lengths, add a four-term limit, and add a three-year sunset date.

¹⁶⁸ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹⁶⁹ At least eight members shall be immigrants to the U.S. All members shall have a demonstrated knowledge of and interest in the health, human service, educational, or employment issues that affect immigrants residing in San Francisco and shall reflect the geographic, ethnic, and sexual orientation populations of San Francisco.

¹⁷⁰ Advisory committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

22. LGBTQI+ Advisory Committee (Human Rights Commission)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Body is borderline inactive, but the Task Force should consider keeping • Provides the City's only dedicated forum for LGBTQI+ representation and policy input • Vacancy rate, infrequent meetings, and lack of online meeting details raise questions about the body's level of commitment

Primary Department	HRC	Established	1975
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	3
Policy Area	Human Rights	Members (as of May 2025)	25 total seats ¹⁷¹ 6 vacant seats (24%)
Annual Cost	\$42k ¹⁷²		

Advises the Human Rights Commission on discrimination against and other issues affecting the queer community ([Administrative Code § 12A.6\(c\)](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	Yes ¹⁷³	Consider eliminating or combining
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	No	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ¹⁷⁴	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ¹⁷⁵	

¹⁷¹ HRC reports membership has been reduced from 25 to 15 seats

¹⁷² Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁷³ Met 3 times in FY24 and canceled 1 meeting

¹⁷⁴ Human Rights Commission

¹⁷⁵ LGBTQI+ individuals

5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No
--	----

Staff Discussion:

The Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, and Intersex Advisory Committee (LGBTQI+AC), was established in 1975 to advise the Human Rights Commission on issues affecting LGBTQI+ communities. Its original purpose was to create a platform for addressing discrimination, advocating for the civil rights, and ensuring access to public services. Over time, its role expanded to include advocacy for people living with HIV/AIDS and to advancing gender identity protections within San Francisco law.

The Committee's work includes reviewing departmental initiatives, advising on housing, employment, health care, and public safety, and supporting subcommittees on transgender initiatives and rights; housing, health, and wellness; and arts and culture. It also plays a key role in budget advocacy for LGBTQI+ services and reviews proposed changes to City codes and ordinances that affect LGBTQI+ rights and protections. In recent years, the Committee's input has shaped policy updates to modernize gender definitions in the Administrative Code and amendments to the Fair Chance Ordinance.¹⁷⁶ It has also influenced initiatives such as the Drag Laureate program and promoted expanded collection of sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI) data to improve City services. These outcomes have aligned City law more closely with the lived realities of LGBTQI+ residents and strengthened protections against discrimination.

The Committee remains one of the few formal avenues for LGBTQI+ representation in City policymaking, offering a structured forum to elevate issues that might otherwise go unaddressed. For many LGBTQI+ residents, it is one of the most reliable pathways into City Hall, helping to build trust and accountability between government and community. Retaining the Committee would preserve a dedicated platform for equity and visibility and ensure that City policy continues to reflect the lived experiences of LGBTQI+ residents.

At the same time, the Committee was flagged as "borderline inactive" because it only met three times in 2024. Its website is inconsistently updated, showing four meetings in 2022, none in 2023 or 2024, and two in 2025 (January and April), which does not align with departmental reporting that four meetings were held in 2024. Membership requirements are also unclear: the Administrative Code specifies three members, the website lists 19, [draft bylaws](#) from January 2025 cite 19, and the department has reported a reduction from 25 to 15 seats. Assuming 19 of 25 seats are filled, current vacancies account for about 24 percent of seats, which is just under the 25 percent borderline inactive threshold. Public attendance is also modest, typically two to five individuals.

Eliminating the Committee could reduce duplication by consolidating its functions under the broader Human Rights Commission, which already has a citywide equity mandate. A subset of the HRC's 11 seats could be designated for LGBTQI+ representation. However, this would dilute the City's focus on queer issues. The Advisory Committee is the only body explicitly charged with addressing LGBTQI+

¹⁷⁶ Passed in 2014, aims to reduce employment and housing discrimination against people with arrest or conviction records

concerns and retaining it as a separate advisory body to the HRC would preserve a dedicated forum for elevating community priorities while clarifying membership and scope.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	25 ¹⁷⁷	15 maximum	No	Specify a maximum of 15 seats in the Administrative Code
Appointing authority	Human Rights Commission	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	None	3 years maximum	No	Align to template; add 3-year terms
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹⁷⁸	No	Align to template; add 4-term limit
Qualifications	Yes (body-level) ¹⁷⁹	None required ¹⁸⁰	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; add a 3-year sunset

The Task Force should recommend aligning the LGBTQI+ Advisory Committee to the advisory committee template. Adding term lengths, term limits, and a sunset date are straightforward changes. Given the lack of clarity around the Committee's membership size, the Administrative Code should be amended to specify that the body can have anywhere between 3 and 15 members, with general qualifications mirroring the [January 2025 draft bylaws](#).

¹⁷⁷ The Administrative Code requires a minimum of three seats. HRC reports the seat count has been reduced from 25 to 15, but draft bylaws from January 2025 list 19 members, as does the body's website.

¹⁷⁸ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹⁷⁹ Under the Administrative Code, members must be City residents who are either publicly identified with the lesbian/gay community or have worked closely with that community. The Commission's bylaws further specify that the Committee "comprises 19 potential seats" with up to ten seats for members of organizations affiliated with the LGBTQI community and the balance of seats for other interested individuals who are affiliated with the LGBTQI community.

¹⁸⁰ Advisory committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

Policy Area: Human Services Agency Bodies

The San Francisco Human Services Agency (HSA) addresses two overarching policy and service areas, each with a unique role in supporting San Franciscans. The Benefits and Family Support (BFS) division provides supportive services to families, children, and single adults, while the Department of Disability and Aging Services (DAS) provides services for older adults, veterans, and people with disabilities. Both the division and the department are under the broader HSA umbrella, which was formed in 2004 to consolidate service delivery, with HSA administrative staff providing support for both departments.

This section includes recommendations for all eight HSA bodies but begins with a brief overview to provide additional background and context on the six disability and aging services bodies, which are more numerous and complex than the other two HSA bodies.

Disability and Aging Public Bodies Overview

Approximately 13% of San Francisco's population is over the age of 62 and 11% identify as having a disability.¹⁸¹ The Department of Disability and Aging (DAS), housed under the Human Services Agency (HSA), is the primary department serving older adults and adults with disabilities. A complex network of federal, state, and local laws and funding sources dictate how the City serves these San Franciscans. The number of public bodies related to disability and aging services is partially due to this complicated set of requirements. There are six bodies in the Task Force's scope that oversee or advise on disability and aging services: the Disability and Aging Services Commission (DASC), the Advisory Council to the Disability and Aging Services Commission (the Advisory Council), the Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee (DF-OAC), the Dignity Fund Service Providers Working Group (DF-SPWG), the IHSS Public Authority Governing Board, and the Long Term Care Coordinating Council (LTCCC). HSA also has a governing body, the Human Services Commission, overseeing its work.

Federal and State Requirements

The Older Americans Act (1965) and the Older Californians Act (1980) established programs and structures at the federal and state levels to direct funding to local agencies serving older adults. Per these acts, the state designates one public or nonprofit agency to act as the "Area Agency on Aging" (AAA), which then receives State and Federal funds and coordinates the provision of services and information for older adults, adults with disabilities, and their caregivers. DAS is San Francisco's AAA. There are specific requirements that each AAA must meet, which include establishing a governing board, an advisory council to that governing board, and conducting community needs assessments. The City established DASC and the Advisory Council to meet these requirements.

In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) is a critical program serving older adults and people with disabilities that San Francisco administers via the IHSS Public Authority. This agency performs its own government functions, separate and distinct from the City and County, and the IHSS Public Authority Governing Board oversees its work. The IHSS Public Authority pays for care providers to support

¹⁸¹ According to the American Community Survey 2023 5-year estimates for San Francisco. Note that we use 62 as a cut-off here due to what data is available. Many services for older adults in San Francisco are available to those 60 and older, while other definitions state that an older adult is age 65 or older.

Medi-Cal eligible older adults and people with disabilities so that they may safely remain in their homes. The State of California established this program and has specific governance requirements, which San Francisco has chosen to meet via the creation of the IHSS Public Authority and its Governing Board.

Local Requirements

There are also local funding sources that support aging and disability services. The largest is the Dignity Fund, which voters approved in 2016 and comprises 11% of DAS's budget for Fiscal Year 2025-2026. The legislation establishing this fund required the creation of the Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee (DF-OAC), which is an advisory body that conducts a community needs assessment (similar to the community needs assessment that the state/federal government requires) and provides additional oversight of fund administration. The legislation also tasks the DF-OAC with creating a Service Providers Working Group to gather service provider and community input in Dignity Fund administration.

Finally, there are other bodies and agencies across San Francisco that support aspects of disability and aging services. These include the Mayor's Office on Disability, which moved under DAS in the most recent budget cycle, the Mayor's Disability Council, which is a passive meeting body and is out of scope for the Task Force's work, and the Long Term Care Coordinating Council, which is an advisory body that voted to disband in 2024 but was unable to due to specific duties the Charter requires it to perform.

Summary of Options

This commission streamlining work provides the City with an opportunity to be more intentional about how to organize oversight of disability and aging services in San Francisco while still fulfilling state and federal legal requirements. The recommended options are:

1. Keep the Disability and Aging Services Commission as a governance commission. This body fulfills the state requirement for an AAA governing board. While another body could theoretically fulfill this requirement, moving the work required of an AAA to another body would be impractical.
2. Combine the Advisory Council and DF-OAC; eliminate LTCCC and DF-SPWG in order to streamline advisory bodies while fulfilling the state and federal requirements for an AAA advisory council.
3. Keep the IHSS Public Authority Governing Board in order to fulfill the state requirements for an IHSS governing board. While there are other options available to fulfill state requirements, this model aligns with other jurisdictions' approaches and functions well.

Each section below provides detailed discussion and the application of the criteria and templates for each disability and aging services-related body.

23. Advisory Council to the Disability and Aging Services Commission (Human Services Agency)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legally required to exist Consider absorbing the Dignity Fund's Oversight and Advisory Committee's functions

Primary Department	HSA (DAS)	Established	1997
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	12
Policy Area	Disability and Aging	Members (as of May 2025)	22 seats 7 vacancies (32%)
Annual Cost	\$ 69,571 ¹⁸²		

Advises the Disability and Aging Services Commission on all matters relating to the development, administration, and operations of its area plan. The California Department of Aging requires all Area Agencies on Aging (AAA) to create an area plan every four years to guide services for older adults and adults with disabilities ([Administrative Code § 5.6-4](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	Yes	Keep
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	N/A	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	Yes ¹⁸³	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	Yes ¹⁸⁴	Consider keeping and aligning to template
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ¹⁸⁵	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes	Consider combining or eliminating
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	Yes	Consider keeping and expanding scope

¹⁸² Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁸³ >25% of seats are vacant

¹⁸⁴ Reducing number of seats may help address vacancies

¹⁸⁵ Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Council, Disability and Aging Service Commission, IHSS Public Authority, Long Term Care Coordinating Council.

5	Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ¹⁸⁶	
		5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	Consider keeping

Staff Discussion:

The Advisory Council to the Disability and Aging Services Commission (Advisory Council) is an advisory group that provides community input and advice to the Department of Disability and Aging Services (DAS), which serves as San Francisco’s Area Agency on Aging (AAA). This advisory body is legally required to exist because it serves as the “Area Agency on Aging Advisory Council,” which is required under the federal Older Americans Act. Federal and State law provide general requirements for the Advisory Council, including its role in advising on area plans and membership requirements.

While the Advisory Council is required to exist and must comply with some broad requirements, there is opportunity to streamline bodies by having the Advisory Council absorb some functions of the Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee (DF-OAC). The Advisory Council provides a forum for community input on the area plan, which each AAA develops every four years to guide service delivery. The Dignity Fund is a voter-approved set-aside that funds specific services for older adults and adults with disabilities. The establishing legislation requires DAS to conduct a community needs assessment every four years to inform which services the Dignity Fund supports. Combining the Advisory Council and the DF-OAC streamlines input into both these processes, ensures that the Dignity Fund allocations are aligned with the City’s strategic goals and priorities, and supports a unified strategy for serving older adults and adults with disabilities.

¹⁸⁶ Demographic group: older adults and adults with disabilities

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	22	15 maximum	No	Align to template; reduce to 15 members
Appointing authority	Disability and Aging Services Commission (11 seats); Board of Supervisors (11 seats)	N/A	N/A	Edit requirements if combined with DF-OAC
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	2 years ¹⁸⁷	3 years maximum	No	Align to template; 3-year terms
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹⁸⁸	No	Align to template; 4-term limit
Qualifications	Yes (body-level) ¹⁸⁹	None required ¹⁹⁰	Yes	Consider editing requirements if combined with DF-OAC
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Do not align to template

The Task Force should recommend some changes to the Advisory Council to the Disability and Aging Commission to align the body to the advisory committee template and to support combining the body with the Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee in a way that meets both the legal requirements for the AAA Advisory Council and the intent of the legislation establishing the Dignity Fund

The Task Force should align the combined advisory body to the template by reducing the number of members to 15, adding term lengths of three years, and four-term limits. The Task Force should not add a sunset date, since this body is legally required.

¹⁸⁷ Determined by the bylaws, not by the Administrative Code.

¹⁸⁸ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹⁸⁹ Members must reflect San Francisco's diverse neighborhood and communities. More than 50 percent of the 11 members shall be persons who are 60 years of age or older. The Council shall include service providers, older persons with the greatest socio and economic need, consumers, and others specified by federal regulation.

¹⁹⁰ Advisory committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

To combine the Advisory Council and DF-OAC and reduce the number of seats, the Task Force should recommend changes to the appointing authority requirements. The body should keep split appointments, but make changes to the appointing authority, with the Board of Supervisors appointing five members, the Mayor appointing five members, and the Disability and Aging Services Commission (DASC) appointing five members, two of whom should be sitting Commissioners. The Advisory Council itself should provide recommendations for DASC appointees, to ensure the body represents broad community interests.¹⁹¹ The term lengths of the commissioners sitting on the Advisory Council should be four years rather than three in order to match their terms on the Commission.

Additionally, the Administrative Code has broad qualifications requirements for the Advisory Council. While the DF-OAC does not require members to have specific qualifications, the intent of the Dignity Fund OAC is to be a diverse representation of San Franciscans involved in implementing or benefitting from the Dignity Fund. The Task Force should direct staff and the City Attorney's Office to work with DAS to create requirements that ensure at least 50% of the members are over the age of 60 and that the body includes robust representation of active service providers, people with disabilities, representatives of organizations serving people with disabilities, low-income members, and any other members needed in order to fulfill both the state and federal requirements for the body's membership and the intent of the DF-OAC.

There are several modifications the Task Force may recommend that are outside of template components. First, the Administrative Code requires the body to meet at least ten times per year. To ensure that the combined advisory committee adequately represents Dignity Fund interests, the Task Force may consider adding language that requires at least four of those meetings focus on Dignity Fund topics. Second, the Charter assigns DASC the responsibility to "establish an Advisory Council to advise the Commission in accordance with federal law and regulations." The Task Force should recommend clarifying that the Advisory Council advises the Department of Aging and Disability Services, not the Commission, since the Department is the AAA. Finally, the Administrative Code refers to the body as only "the Advisory Council;" the Task Force may suggest updating the name to be more specific.

¹⁹¹ Because the Mayor appoints Disability and Aging Services commissioners, having both the Mayor and DASC appoint Advisory Council members could be seen as increased Mayoral influence. Having the Advisory Council provide nominees or recommendations may help ensure the Council is representative of broad community interests.

24. Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee (Human Services Agency)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or Eliminate
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing the Advisory Council to the Disability and Aging Services Commission to absorb functions

Primary Department	HSA (DAS)	Established	2017
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	6
Policy Area	Disability and Aging	Members (as of May 2025)	11 total seats 2 vacancies (18%)
Annual Cost	\$43k ¹⁹²		

Participates in administering the Dignity Fund, which helps seniors and adults with disabilities secure necessary services to age in their own homes and communities ([Charter § 16.128-11](#); [Administrative Code § 5.34-1](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ¹⁹³	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes	Consider combining or eliminating
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ¹⁹⁴	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes	Consider eliminating

¹⁹² Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁹³ Advisory Council to the Disability and Aging Commission, Disability and Aging Service Commission, IHSS Public Authority, Long Term Care Coordinating Council.

¹⁹⁴ Demographic group: older adults and adults with disabilities. Funding source: the Dignity Fund

Staff Discussion:

The Dignity Fund is a voter-approved revenue stream that funds specific services for older adults and adults with disabilities. The Dignity Fund passed in 2016 and was successful due to the community organizing efforts of advocates, community members, and service providers. The Department of Disability and Aging Services (DAS) administers the fund while the Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee (DF-OAC) “monitors and participates in the administration of the Dignity Fund and takes steps to ensure that it is accountable to the community,” according to the OAC’s website. It is one of five bodies overseeing or advising on aspects of the City’s disability and aging services. While DF-OAC has a specific focus on the Dignity Fund, there is overlap in the work and focus of these five bodies, which may lead to disjointed recommendations and both commissioners and City staff doing duplicative or repetitive work.

The criteria-based outcome is to combine or eliminate the DF-OAC. In particular, the Evaluation Criteria includes a criterion that specific funds should not have dedicated advisory bodies. Instead, budget decisions about these funds should be part of a department’s overall budget processes so that the funds may be considered holistically and in alignment with a department’s strategic goals. Considering DAS already has a governance and advisory body, it is sensible for those bodies to provide input on the Dignity Fund instead.

Community involvement is an important component of the Dignity Fund legislation and helps to ensure that the City uses the Dignity Fund to deliver services that meet diverse community needs. However, there is opportunity to streamline DAS-related advisory bodies in order to make the City’s work serving older adults and adults with disabilities more efficient and effective. The Advisory Council to the Disability and Aging Commission is one of the other advisory bodies and is legally required by the state and federal government. It can absorb some functions of the DF-OAC. The Advisory Council provides a forum for community input on the area plan, which each Area Agency on Aging (DAS, for San Francisco) must develop every four years to guide service delivery. The Dignity Fund’s establishing legislation requires DAS to conduct a community needs assessment every four years to inform which services the Dignity Fund supports. Combining the Advisory Council and the DF-OAC streamlines input into both these processes and ensures that the Dignity Fund investments align with broader strategic goals and priorities and support a unified strategy for serving older adults and adults with disabilities.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	11	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Disability and Aging Services Commission (2 seats), Advisory Council to the Disability and Aging Commission (3 seats), Long Term Care Coordinating Council (3 seats), Mayor (3 seats)	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None ¹⁹⁵	No confirmations	No	Align to template; remove ability of BOS to reject Mayoral appointees
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	2 years	3 years maximum	No	Align to template; increase to 3 years
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹⁹⁶	No	Align to template; add 4-term limit
Qualifications	8 members must come directly from the other City bodies that appoint them. Mayoral appointees have no specific qualifications required.	None required ¹⁹⁷	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter and Administrative Code ¹⁹⁸	Administrative Code	No	Align to template; remove from Charter
Sunset date	The end of Fiscal Year 2036-37	3 years	No	Align to template; edit sunset date to be 3 years

¹⁹⁵ Mayoral appointees are “subject to rejection by the Board of Supervisors within 30 days following transmittal of the Notice of Appointment.”

¹⁹⁶ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹⁹⁷ Advisory committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

¹⁹⁸ Established via Proposition I in the November 2016 election, so changes require voter approval

The criteria-based outcome is to combine or eliminate the DF-OAC. The Task Force should combine the DF-OAC with the Advisory Council to the Disability and Aging Commission. The recommended application of the advisory committee template and other proposed edits to help create the new Advisory Council are discussed in detail in the previous template discussion for the Advisory Council to the Disability and Aging Commission on p. 105. However, if the Task Force recommends keeping DF-OAC, then it should align the body to the advisory committee template.

25. Dignity Fund Service Providers Working Group (Human Services Agency)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or Eliminate
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing to function as a passive meeting body or external advocacy group.

Primary Department	HSA (DAS)	Established	2017
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (FY25)	2
Policy Area	Disability and Aging	Members (as of May 2025)	Unknown
Annual Cost	N/A ¹⁹⁹		

Advises the Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee on the Dignity Fund. Includes a broad cross-section of service providers that actively provide services to older adults, adults with disabilities, and their caregivers ([Charter § 16.128-11\(e\)](#); [Administrative Code § 5.34-1](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	Unknown	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	Unknown	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ²⁰⁰	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes	Consider combining or eliminating
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ²⁰¹	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes	Consider eliminating

¹⁹⁹ The Service Providers Working Group was discovered to be in scope after the Budget and Legislative Analyst conducted their [Financial Analysis report](#), released on September 1, 2025

²⁰⁰ Advisory Council to the Disability and Aging Commission, Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee, Disability and Aging Service Commission, IHSS Public Authority, Long Term Care Coordinating Council.

²⁰¹ Demographic group: older adults and adults with disabilities. Funding source: the Dignity Fund

Staff Discussion:

The Dignity Fund Service Providers Working Group (DF-SPWG) is one of two bodies advising or overseeing the Dignity Fund, a voter-approved revenue stream that funds specific services for older adults and adults with disabilities. The Department of Disability and Aging Services (DAS) administers the fund while the Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee (DF-OAC) “monitors and participates in the administration of the Dignity Fund,” according to the OAC’s website. The Charter mandates that the DF-OAC create the DF-SPWG to get input and advice from providers actively delivering services to older adults, adults with disabilities, and their caregivers. The DF-SPWG met twice in Fiscal Year 2024-2025 and is sometimes on the DF-OAC agenda to present topics of recent discussions.

Similarly to the Department of Children, Youth, and Families Service Providers Working Group, the DF-SPWG appears to function much differently from other public meeting bodies. Currently, two outside advocacy groups, the Dignity Fund Coalition and the Coalition of Agencies Serving the Elderly (CASE), manage the meetings. Meetings are open to all service providers, and typical attendance ranges from approximately five to 60 participants. The Charter language states that “two initial co-chairs of the Working Group... shall be responsible for developing the structure of the Working Group and facilitating the meetings.” It is likely that the co-chairs of the DF-SPWG determined that having outside organizations host and facilitate the meetings was the best structure for the group. However, this means that the group is not operating in accordance with Brown Act requirements. The membership is broad and undefined, with members from CASE and the Dignity Fund Coalition hosting and facilitating the meetings and any service provider being welcome to attend and participate. Under the Brown Act, the Working Group must limit discussion to topics that have been properly noticed and agendized 72 hours in advance of a meeting, but it is unclear whether the group follows this requirement.

The criteria-based outcome is to combine or eliminate the DF-SPWG. Having a forum for service providers to gather and provide input to the City is clearly valuable for the service providers, the City, and the people they serve. However, keeping the body as-is would require the body to adhere to the Brown Act, which may actually lessen the effectiveness of the group. Instead, the Task Force may consider removing DF-SPWG from the Charter and allowing it to continue functioning as-is, rather than requiring the Working Group to comply with the Brown Act and aligning the body with the advisory committee template. There are two ways it could continue outside of Charter/Code. The first option is that DAS could establish it as a passive meeting body and perhaps expand the scope, so that service providers give input on topics beyond the Dignity Fund. The second option is that the SPWG could continue to function outside of the City structures. The Dignity Fund Coalition and CASE could continue to run the meetings outside of City requirements and structures but could still request DAS staff presentations and participation when needed. To ensure service providers still give input into City work, DAS could continue to engage CBOs when conducting the community needs assessments as part of normal department operations and ensure that service providers occupy some seats on the Advisory Council.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	Undefined	15 maximum	Unclear	
Appointing authority	Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee	N/A		
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	None	At will	Yes	
Term length	None	3 years maximum	No	Align to template; add 3-year terms
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ²⁰²	No	Align to template; add 4-term limits
Qualifications	Active service providers	None required ²⁰³	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter, Administrative Code ²⁰⁴	Administrative Code	No	Align to template; remove from Charter
Sunset date	The end of Fiscal Year 2036-37	3 years	No	Align to template; adjust the sunset date to be three years

The criteria-based outcome is to combine or eliminate the DF-SPWG. Due to the informal way the group is currently run, there is limited information about the group's structure, so the current state of most template components is unknown. If the Task Force recommends keeping the DF-SPWG, then it should align the body to the advisory committee template.

²⁰² Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

²⁰³ Advisory committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

²⁰⁴ Established via Proposition I in the November 2016 election, so changes require voter approval

26. [Disability and Aging Services Commission](#) (Human Services Agency)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep or Combine
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fulfills a legal requirement impractical to be handled elsewhere

Primary Department	HSA	Established	1973
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	12
Policy Area	Disability and Aging	Members (as of May 2025)	7 total seats 0 vacant seats (0%)
Annual Cost	\$198k ²⁰⁵		

Serves as the governing body of the Human Services Agency’s Department of Disability and Aging Services (DAS), which oversees policy for older adults and adults with disabilities to maximize their self-sufficiency, safety, health, and independence, enabling them to live in the community as long as possible and maintain the highest quality of life ([Charter § 4.120](#), [Administrative Code § 5.6-3](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	Yes ²⁰⁶	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	Yes ²⁰⁷	Consider combining or eliminating
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ²⁰⁸	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes ²⁰⁹	Consider combining or eliminating
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	Yes ²¹⁰	Consider keeping and expanding scope

²⁰⁵ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst’s [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

²⁰⁶ Cal. WIC 9400(c)

²⁰⁷ Human Services Commission

²⁰⁸ Advisory Council to the Disability and Aging Commission, Dignity fund Oversight and Advisory Committee, Human Services Commission, In-Home Supportive Services Public Authority Governance Body, Veterans’ Affairs Commission

²⁰⁹ Could be combined with the Human Services Commission

²¹⁰ See prior note.

5	Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ²¹¹
		5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No

Staff Discussion:

The San Francisco Human Services Agency (HSA) addresses two overarching policy and service areas, each with a unique role in supporting San Franciscans. The Benefits and Family Support (BFS) division provides supportive services to families, children, and single adults, while the Department of Disability and Aging Services provides services for older adults, veterans, and people with disabilities. Both the division and the department are under the broader HSA umbrella, which was formed in 2004 to consolidate service delivery, with HSA administrative staff providing support for both departments.

The Disability and Aging Services Commission (DASC) serves as the governing body of DAS, which employs over 450 people (FTEs) and has a budget over \$548 million in FY26. As a governing body, DASC approves the Department of Disability and Aging's budget and contracts. DASC approves over 250 contracts annually on behalf of the Department of Disability and Aging, underscoring its steady workload.²¹² DASC also plays a role in the other Department of Disability and Aging bodies: it reviews all reports related to the Dignity Fund and Community Living Fund²¹³ and appoints two out of 11 members to the Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee.

Most crucially, DASC fulfills state requirements²¹⁴ to act as the oversight body of the City's Area Agency on Aging²¹⁵ (AAA), which is the Department of Disability and Aging. In this capacity, DASC reviews and approves the Area Plan Update for the California Department of Aging before it is sent to the Board of Supervisors and Mayor. DASC also appoints 11 out of 22 members to the Advisory Council to the DASC, which provides additional community input and advice on the AAA.

DASC meets monthly and operates three subcommittees: Disability and Aging Services Joint Legislative Committee, Nominating Committee for the Department of Aging and Adult Services, and Disability and Aging Services Finance Committee. These subcommittees monitor state and federal legislation to help the City take position on bills, nominate qualified members to serve on the Advisory Council, and provide budget oversight and recommendations to ensure the Department of Disability and Aging best serves San Francisco residents.

Although the City could legally combine DASC with another body, such as the Human Services Commission, this would be impractical. The volume and complexity of state regulations on disability and aging services make it difficult for another body to perform DASC's oversight role. Unless the

²¹¹ Seniors and people with disabilities

²¹² Most of the contracts are on four-year cycles rotating through the DASC for approval.

²¹³ The Dignity Fund and Community Living Fund support services for older adults, people with disabilities, veterans, and caregivers to ensure people can remain in their homes and communities while remaining safe, independent and engaged.

²¹⁴ San Francisco Administrative Code § 5.6-3, Cal. WIC 9400(c).

²¹⁵ State designated entity to coordinate and provide services for older adults and their caregivers within a specific geographic area.

Human Services Commission and the DASC were combined into a single governing body to oversee all the Human Services Agency programs' work, the DASC would need to be kept to legally fulfill the state requirements of having a separate commission to oversee the Department of Disability and Aging Services' work as in its role as the AAA.

Administrative and legal structures also make consolidation challenging. Disability and Aging Services and Benefits and Family Support are two separate departments/divisions, each with their own budget and director. While the two already collaborate within the agency model and share administrative services, no other governance body in the City oversees more than a single departments/. Furthermore, disability and aging services differ from general human services in both funding and legal/regulatory contexts. A combined body would require members with broader expertise across these distinct fields, though specialized seats could address this need.

The Board of Supervisors could serve as the governing body of the Area Agency on Aging Advisory Council to fulfill state requirements. However, taking on this role would create more work for the Board of Supervisors who do not have the same depth of subject matter expertise as the DASC commissioners to provide oversight. Moreover, the volume and complexity of state regulations on disability and aging services would make it difficult for the Board of Supervisors to perform DASC's oversight role.

If DASC is retained, the Task Force should amend Administrative Code § 5.6-2 to reflect current practices where the Department on Disability and Aging serves as the City's AAA and the DASC acts as the state-required body that oversees the department. Currently, the Administrative Code inaccurately describes DASC as the City's AAA.

Possible Application of Governance Commission Template:

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	7	5-7	Yes	
Appointing authority	Mayor	Mayor	Yes	
Appointment confirmations	None	None ²¹⁷	Yes	
Member removal	For cause	At will	No	Align to template; commissioners serve at will
Term length	4 years	4 years	Yes	
Term limits	None	3 terms	No	Align to template; add term limits
Qualifications	3 seat-specific ²¹⁸	None required ²¹⁹	Yes	Mayor should submit information on why candidates are qualified
Establishing authority	Charter	TBD	No	None
Sunset date	None	None	Yes	
Hiring and Firing Authority	Yes ²²⁰	Consultative responsibilities only	No	Align to template; consultative only
Contract approval authority	Yes	Retain status quo	Yes	
Budget approval authority	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Employee discipline authority	No	No role ²²¹	Yes	

The Task Force should consider aligning DASC to the governance commission template by making members removable at-will rather than only for cause, adding a three-term limit, and removing department head hiring and firing authority. The Task Force will also need to decide whether to keep the Commission in the Charter or move it to the Administrative Code. Finally, the three seat-specific qualifications may be revised, and the Mayor must submit information on why the candidates without seat requirements are qualified upon appointment.

²¹⁷ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

²¹⁸ 1 member who is over age 60; 1 adult with a disability; 1 U.S. military veteran. The remaining 4 seats have no qualifications.

²¹⁹ Governance commissions not required to have specific qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

²²⁰ Submits to the Mayor at least three qualified applicants to be department head. Responsible for approving Mayor's request to remove department head within 30 days of the Mayor's request.

²²¹ Exceptions if this is currently required by law

27. In-Home Supportive Services Public Authority Governing Board (Human Services Agency)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fulfills a legal requirement May consider alternative means of compliance, but this is likely unnecessary

Primary Department	HSA	Established	1995
Current Type	Other ²²²	Meetings (CY24)	6
Policy Area	Disability and Aging	Members (as of May 2025)	13 total seats 3 vacant seats (23%) ²²³
Annual Cost	\$76k ²²⁴		

Ensures the delivery of in-home supportive services (IHSS) for older adults and persons with disabilities living in San Francisco to help them remain safely in their own homes. Submits annual reports to the Board of Supervisors on its activities. The establishing code characterizes the Public Authority as a “corporate public body” that performs its own government functions, separate and distinct from the City and County, and the Governing Board provides oversight of the Public Authority ([Administrative Code § 70.2](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	Yes ²²⁵	Keep
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	Yes	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	Yes ²²⁶	Consider combining or eliminating
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	

²²² The In-Home Supportive Services Public Authority is a quasi-governmental agency operating independently from the City and County under the governing board of directors, the latter being the body under consideration.

²²³ The Governing Board roster decreased from 10 to 9 as of its September 9, 2025 meeting. The representative from the Mayor’s Disability Council (MDC) is no longer serving on the MDC and is thus ineligible to fill the seat. Until the seat is occupied again, the vacancy rate has increased to 31% and the body is borderline inactive.

²²⁴ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst’s [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

²²⁵ California Welfare & Institutions Code § 12301.6 and 12302.25; The Governing Board must exist, and its functions cannot be transferred to another board or commission—unless (1) the Board of Supervisors designates itself as the governing body and establishes a state-mandated advisory body, or (2) the City and County contracts with a nonprofit consortium to deliver in-home supportive services.

²²⁶ The Board of Supervisors could designate itself as the state-mandated governing body and establish a new advisory body, or the City could contract with a nonprofit consortium to deliver in-home supportive services.

3	Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	Yes ²²⁷	Consider combining or eliminating
		3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	Yes ²²⁸	Consider modifying
4	Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ²²⁹	
		4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	
		4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5	Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ²³⁰	
		5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	

Staff Discussion:

The purpose of the In-Home Supportive Services Public Authority’s Governing Board (“Governing Board”) is to provide advice and recommendations on the in-home supportive services (IHSS) administered in San Francisco to the Public Authority’s Executive Director, staff, and other relevant agencies. Established in 1995 and the first such public authority in California to have an independent governing board, the IHSS Public Authority has an administrative staff of seven and an annual budget of roughly \$100M. Its chief responsibilities are to hire, train, and maintain a central registry of qualified care providers; support Medi-Cal eligible residents who need independent living services and do not have a chosen care provider (“consumers”) and pay for their care; match them with trained care providers; and generally advocate for care providers and IHSS consumers.²³¹ It also operates a mentorship program that connects enrollees with current or prior IHSS participants who provide personalized guidance in hiring and retaining independent homecare providers and navigating the larger IHSS system.

The Governing Board approves the Public Authority’s annual audits, budgets, and its two contracts with the Disability and Aging Services Department and generally evaluates whether the IHSS program is effectively serving its intended population. Governing Board members include consumers of IHSS services, providers, and advocates, ensuring diverse perspectives. It usually holds 6-9 public meetings annually and discussion topics include program, policy, and legislative changes that affect IHSS, Medi-Cal, or the disability/aging community; new or changing service delivery models; and managing nonprofit partnerships.

²²⁷ Though the Governing Board had a 23% vacancy rate as of May 2025, it recently lost a board member and the vacancy rate is 31% as of September 2025. Refer to footnote 223 for more details.

²²⁸ Applying the governance commission template’s 7-member maximum would solve the vacancy issue.

²²⁹ All other bodies in the Disability and Aging policy area have some overlap: Advisory Council to the Disability and Aging Commission; Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee; Disability and Aging Services Commission; Long Term Care Coordinating Council.

²³⁰ In-home care for older adults and persons with disabilities

²³¹ California Welfare & Institutions Code § 12301.6

The main concerns regarding the Governing Board are its vacancies and public meeting participation. The member roster decreased from 10 to 9 as of its September 9, 2025 meeting; the representative from the Mayor's Disability Council (MDC) is no longer serving on the MDC and is thus ineligible to fill the seat. Until the seat is occupied again, the vacancy rate has increased to 31% and the body is borderline inactive. It does not appear that membership has exceeded 10 people since at least 2022, the earliest year for which meeting minutes are available online. In addition, in the past 10 years, there has only been one person who has attended the meetings and made public comment.

Though criteria like these suggest combining, modifying, or eliminating the Governing Board, the Task Force should recommend keeping it so that it may continue its state-mandated functions.

The California Welfare and Institutions Code does provide for other means of compliance: either the Board of Supervisors could designate itself as the governing body for IHSS services and establish a separate advisory body, or the County could contract with a nonprofit consortium to coordinate the provision of IHSS services.²³²

California counties have opted for a mix of all three approaches to fulfilling the state law. The Task Force may consider the strategy taken up by counties like Alameda, Contra Costa, San Mateo, and Santa Clara by recommending that the BOS designate itself as the governing board of the Public Authority and create a separate consumer advisory committee. The Task Force may also consider recommending the establishment of a nonprofit consortium to assume the legal responsibilities of both the Public Authority and its Governing Board. However, these alternatives would be burdensome to implement, requiring significant coordination, and a rationale for changing the current model is unclear. The existing Governing Board is suited to its purpose, reflects the model chosen by other large counties (e.g., Los Angeles), and adequately ensures the City and County of San Francisco's compliance with state law.

²³² California Welfare & Institutions Code § 12301.6 and 12302.25

Possible Application of Governance Commission Template:

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	13	5-7	No	Align to template; 7 members maximum
Appointing authority	Board of Supervisors	Mayor	No	No change; state law grants authority to the Board of Supervisors ²³³
Appointment confirmations	None	None ²³⁴	Yes	
Member removal	At will ²³⁵	At will	Yes	
Term length	3 years	4 years	No	Align to template; increase term length to 4 years
Term limits	3 terms	3 terms	Yes	
Qualifications	Seat-specific ²³⁶	None required ²³⁷	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	TBD	No	None
Sunset date	None	None	Yes	
Hiring and Firing Authority	Yes – can hire/fire the Executive Director of the Public Authority.	Consultative responsibilities only	No	No change
Contract approval authority	Yes	Retain status quo	Yes	

²³³ California Welfare & Institutions Code § 12301.6(b)(1)

²³⁴ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

²³⁵ Administrative Code requires that conditions for member removal are included in the Authority's [bylaws](#). The bylaws state, "The Board, by an affirmative vote of two-thirds (2/3) of the Board members in office, excluding the vote of the member in question, may remove a Board member if he or she: (1) has missed three consecutive meetings; (2) no longer satisfies the requirements for "qualified applicants" set forth in the Ordinance; or (3) is convicted of a crime."

²³⁶ 3 appointees must be over 55 years old, with 2 representing disability and aging-related organizations; 3 appointees must be between 18 and 60 years old, with 2 representing disability-related organizations; 1 appointee must be 18 or older; 1 must be a caregiver or independent provider of services; 1 must represent the bargaining unit for IHSS providers; and 1 member each from the Human Services Commission, Commission on Aging, Public Health Commission, and Mayor's Disability Council. At least half of members must be current or past users of personal assistance services and/or recipients of IHSS; these are indicated in the Administrative Code as all seats with an age requirement.

²³⁷ Governance commissions not required to have specific qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Budget approval authority	Yes – the governing board approves the budget for the Public Authority.	Yes	Yes	
Employee discipline authority	No role	No role ²³⁸	Yes	

The In-Home Supportive Services Public Authority Governing Board cannot be categorized squarely as an advisory or governance body. However, its scope of authority more closely matches a governance role. If it is kept, the Task Force may choose to apply the governance commission template as suggested above, the advisory committee template, or it may choose not to apply a template. Aligning the Governing Board with the governance commission template would require reducing the body from 13 members to a maximum of seven and increasing term lengths to four years.

California Welfare & Institutions Code § 12301.6 requires that at least 50% of Governing Board members be current or past users of personal assistance services and/or recipients of IHSS. It does not mandate the number of seats or any other qualifications. If pursuing template alignment, the Task Force may consider removing the three currently vacant seats from the roster (representatives from the Mayor’s Disability Council, Human Services Commission, and Public Health Commission²³⁹—leaving one City commissioner from the Commission on Aging—plus three additional seats. For these, one option would be to remove the appointee who must be 18 or older, one appointee who must be over 55 years old, and one appointee who must be between 18 and 60 years old. These suggestions would be an appropriate way to align with the governance commission template given the high number of at-large seats with expansive age requirements while maintaining compliance with state law.²⁴⁰

²³⁸ Exceptions if this is currently required by law

²³⁹ The Human Services Commission seat has been vacant since 2023 and the Mayor’s Disability Council and Public Health Commission seats have been vacant since at least 2022, the earliest year for which meeting minutes are available on the body’s website.

²⁴⁰ In this hypothetical case, the current or past users of IHSS/personal assistance services would be the 2 older members and 2 younger members, who together would make up 57% of the 7-member body.

28. Long Term Care Coordinating Council (Human Services Agency)

Criteria-based outcome: Eliminate
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria suggest eliminating. Body is inactive.

Primary Department	HSA (DAS)	Established	2004
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	Unknown
Policy Area	Disability and Aging	Members (as of May 2025)	40 total seats 40 vacant seats (100%)
Annual Cost	\$0 ²⁴¹		

Advises the Mayor and city on policy, planning, and service delivery issues for older adults and people with disabilities (not established in Charter or Administrative Code).²⁴²

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	Yes	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	No	Eliminate
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	N/A	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ²⁴³	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes	Consider combining or eliminating
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes	

²⁴¹ Body is inactive so had no costs to report.

²⁴² Former Mayor Gavin Newsom created the LTCCC and it is not established in the Charter or Code. However, the City Attorney's Office advised that the LTCCC is within the Task Force's scope because the Charter and Code confer specific functions.

²⁴³ Advisory Council to the Disability and Aging Commission, Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee, Disability and Aging Service Commission, IHSS Public Authority.

Staff Discussion:

The Long Term Care Coordinating Council (LTCC) is one of five public bodies advising or overseeing aspects of the Department of Disability and Aging Service (DAS). LTCC focused specifically on issues within the long-term care system.

LTCC is inactive and the Task Force considered the body as part of the discussion on inactive bodies in the July 16th meeting. In that meeting, the Task Force decided to defer decision making until the October 15th meeting in order to discuss it in context with the other DAS-related bodies.

LTCC voted to disband in March 2024 due to significant overlap with other policy bodies and difficulty meeting quorum. However, the body has some specific duties under the Charter and Administrative Code and cannot be eliminated without voter approval. Examples include appointing members to the Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee ([Charter § 16.128-6](#)), providing input to DAS on the uses of the Community Living Fund ([Administrative Code § 10.100-53](#)), and reviewing drafts of the Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessments ([Charter § 16.128-6](#)).

The Task Force should recommend that this body be eliminated, transfer appointing authority for the DF-OAC seats, and remove the references to providing input on the Community Living Fund and Dignity Fund Community Needs Assessments. See discussion on the Advisory Council to the Disability and Aging Commission template application on p. 103 for more detail.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	40	15 maximum	No	
Appointing authority	Mayor	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	Unknown	No confirmations	Unknown	
Member removal	Unknown	At will	Unknown	
Term length	Unknown	3 years maximum	Unknown	
Term limits	Unknown	Case-by-case ²⁴⁴	Unknown	
Qualifications	Unknown	None required ²⁴⁵	Unknown	
Establishing authority	None	Administrative Code	N/A	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	

LTCC voted to disband in March 2024 and has not met since. The Task Force should recommend eliminating this body. Therefore, staff did not consider aligning LTCC to any template.

²⁴⁴ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

²⁴⁵ Advisory committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

29. [Human Services Commission](#) (Human Services Agency)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep or Combine
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could possibly be combined with Disability and Aging Services Commission, though there are reasons not to • If not combined, should be kept

Primary Department	HSA	Established	1937
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	11
Policy Area	Human Services	Members (as of May 2025)	5 total seats 1 vacant seats (20%)
Annual Cost	\$147k ²⁴⁶		

Oversees the Human Services Agency's Benefits and Family Support Division, which plans and administers a variety of federal, state, and local programs to meet basic human needs and ensure protection of the City's most vulnerable residents, including through public assistance, employment services, and child welfare programs ([Charter § 4.111](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes	Consider combining or eliminating
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	Yes	Consider keeping and expanding scope
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	No	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	N/A	

²⁴⁶ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

Staff Discussion:

The San Francisco Human Services Agency (HSA) addresses two overarching policy and service areas, each with a unique role in supporting San Franciscans. The Benefits and Family Support (BFS) division provides supportive services to families, children, and single adults, while the Department of Disability and Aging Services (DAS) provides services for older adults, veterans, and people with disabilities. Both the division and the department are under the broader HSA umbrella, which was formed in 2004 to consolidate service delivery, with HSA administrative staff providing support for both departments.

The Human Services Commission, created in 1937 to oversee the City's Public Welfare Department, now serves as the governing body for BFS, which employs approximately 1,600 people and has a budget of over \$550 million in FY26. As a governing body, the Human Services Commission (HSC) approves the BFS budget, the goals and objectives reflected in the annual budget submission and five-year strategic plan, and the HSA administrative budget (\$169 million). The body also reviews and approves all contracts/grants over \$29,000.

Despite this formal authority, much of HSC's work is advisory in nature. Agendas include many staff presentations and the approval of contracts and grants that are already shaped by state and federal requirements. Many of these funding streams come with strict eligibility rules, formulas, and program design elements dictated by higher levels of government, leaving little room for the Commission to influence the outcome. In practice, the body functions as a forum for reviewing and endorsing staff-prepared items.

In most meetings there is no public comment. In fact, members of the general public rarely attend commission meetings. Attendance is usually limited to HSA staff and representatives of community-based organizations that have grants/contracts being submitted for approval by the Commission. However, the Commission serves as the only regular forum where BFS contracts, budgets, and policy priorities are reviewed in an open meeting, creating an avenue for vulnerable populations to have their needs considered in a public setting.

In the last few years, when the Commission has heard public comment, it has usually been urging commissioners to approve food-support grants. If the Food Security Task Force is eliminated and the HSC kept, the HSC should expand its scope to include a more explicit emphasis on food security. For example, the Commission could require HSA's Citywide Food Access Team to prepare regular food security reports and present them to the Commission.

The evaluation criteria support potentially combining this body with other public bodies that focus on human services. The Disability and Aging Services Commission is a governance body that oversees the DAS department and could possibly be combined with the Human Services Commission to create a single governance commission over HSA. However, there are several reasons not to do so. First, because the Disability and Aging Services Commission is the legally required governance body for DAS, which is the City's Area Agency on Aging under state law, any merger would need to ensure continued compliance with California regulations; this could make consolidation more legally and administratively complex. Second, DAS and BFS are two separate departments/divisions, each with their own budget and directors. While the two already collaborate as part of the agency model, and they receive shared administrative support services, no other governance body in the City oversees more than a single department. Third, disability and aging services are distinct from human

services more broadly, and DAS/BFS programs differ in their funding sources and legal/regulatory contexts. Members of a combined body would require expertise in a broader range of issues than either body currently requires—though this challenge could be addressed by establishing seats for experts in both fields. Finally, older adults and people with disabilities are large, important constituencies in San Francisco that may benefit from a distinct body/public forum focused on their needs, rather than a combined body focused on human services more generally.

Unlike San Francisco, which maintains two separate governance commissions for its Human Services Agency departments, other jurisdictions bring multiple human services functions together and rely on advisory bodies for community input rather than separate governance commissions. For example, Santa Clara County's [Social Services Agency](#), which covers aging and adult services, family and children's services, and benefits administration, has a [Social Services Advisory Commission](#), while [San Diego County's Health and Human Services Agency](#) and [Los Angeles County's Department of Public Social Services](#) also rely on advisory [boards](#) or [bodies](#) instead of multiple governance commissions. These examples illustrate that San Francisco's dual-governance commission model may be unusual and suggest that if the Task Force were to consider consolidating San Francisco's commissions, there is precedent in other counties for broader human services functions being addressed effectively by one body.

While the Human Services Commission provides accountability for one of the City's largest departments and serves as a public forum for vulnerable populations, its authority is constrained by state and federal requirements that limit its decision-making power, leaving the Task Force to weigh the value of transparency and oversight against questions of efficiency and redundancy.

Possible Application of Governance Commission or Advisory Committee Templates:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?
Number of Members	5	15 maximum	5-7	Yes – Both
Appointing authority	Mayor	N/A	Mayor	Yes – Both
Appointment confirmations	None ²⁴⁷	None	None ²⁴⁸	Yes – Both
Member removal	For cause	At will	At will	No
Term length	4 years	3 years maximum	4 years	Yes – Governance
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ²⁴⁹	3 terms	No
Qualifications	None required	None required ²⁵⁰	None required ²⁵¹	Yes – Both
Establishing authority	Charter	Administrative Code	TBD	No
Sunset date	None	3 years	None	Yes – Governance
Hiring and firing authority	May nominate candidates for Executive Director of BFS, who is appointed by the Mayor and can be removed by the commission.	N/A	Consultative responsibilities only	No
Contract approval authority	Yes ²⁵²	N/A	Retain status quo	Yes – Governance
Budget approval authority	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes – Governance
Employee discipline authority	No	N/A	No role	Yes - Both

The Task Force may consider aligning the Human Services Commission to either the governance commission or advisory committee template. In either case, the Task Force should allow the Mayor to remove members at will and institute term limits. If aligning to the governance commission template, the Task Force should also change the Commission's hiring/firing authority to be consultative. If aligning

²⁴⁷ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

²⁴⁸ For Governance Commissions, appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

²⁴⁹ For Advisory Committees, term limits are handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

²⁵⁰ Neither Advisory Committees nor Governance Commissions are required to have specific qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

²⁵¹ Same as above

²⁵² Reviews all grants and contracts that exceed \$29,000. In FY24-25, reviewed 58 grants and contracts

to the advisory committee template, the Task Force should establish a 3-year sunset date, reduce term lengths to 3 years, remove the body's contract approval and budget approval authority, and move the body from the Charter to the Administrative Code.

30. Veterans' Affairs Commission (Human Services Agency)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria provide no reason to eliminate

Primary Department	HSA	Established	1982
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	11
Policy Area	Human Services	Members (as of May 2025)	13 total seats 2 vacant seat (15%)
Annual Cost	\$35k ²⁵³		

Advises the Mayor and Board of Supervisors on issues affecting United States military veterans living in San Francisco and coordinates economic development, health care, and social services programs to address their needs ([Administrative Code § 5.100](#)).

Evaluation Criteria

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Result	Outcome
1 Required by state or federal law	1A. Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfil some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfil this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	No	
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	N/A	
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	No	
	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	N/A	
4 Overlap with other bodies	4A. Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Yes ²⁵⁴	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	Consider keeping
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	
5 Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ²⁵⁵	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	Consider keeping

²⁵³ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

²⁵⁴ Human Services Commission, Disability and Aging Services Commission

²⁵⁵ Veterans

Staff Discussion:

The Veterans' Affairs Commission (VAC) is an advisory body with 13 members that holds hearings and makes recommendations to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors on issues of employment, finances, health, housing, and social services for veterans. The Commission meets about once a month, and public comment usually comes from two or three regular attendees who speak at most meetings.

VAC engages with local organizations, connects veterans to available resources, receives regular reports from the County Veterans Service Office (CVSO) regarding the number of claims filed and benefits processed, and advocates for policies that address veterans' housing needs, such as securing a veterans' preference in the City's affordable housing lottery and ensuring set-asides in several recent development projects. Additional discussion topics include upcoming veteran events; honors, achievements, and contributions of local veterans; and monitoring City military monuments and statues for upkeep needs.

The Commission's work and operations are closely integrated with that of the broader Human Services Agency (HSA). Department staff facilitate the Commission's meeting discussions, and in turn, the Commission's activities supplement HSA's mission by advocating for essential services for a specific vulnerable group, one whose unique needs are not currently represented by any other City body.

As such, the evaluation criteria do not provide any reason to eliminate the Veterans' Affairs Commission. The Task Force could consider combining or subsuming the Commission's functions under either the Human Services Commission or the Disability and Aging Services Commission, both of which have strong relevance for veterans. However, preserving a standalone body ensures independent coordination with both HSA departments to more holistically address the distinct challenges and needs of San Francisco's veterans.

Alternatively, given its low public engagement and overlap with other existing public bodies, the Task Force may choose to eliminate the Veterans' Affairs Commission.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	13	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	BOS ²⁵⁶ (9 seats), Mayor (4 seats)	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	No confirmations	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	4 years	3 years maximum	No	Align to template; reduce term length to 3 years
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ²⁵⁷	No	Align to template; 4 term maximum
Qualifications	5 seats have qualifications related to veteran status; 8 seats have no qualifications ²⁵⁸	None required ²⁵⁹	No	For the 8 seats without qualifications, align to template by adding requirement that appointing authority must submit justification for why candidate is qualified
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; establish 3-year sunset date

If the Veterans' Affairs Commission is retained, the Task Force should align it with the advisory committee template by reducing term lengths, adding term limits, and establishing a sunset date. It should also be renamed, since in general advisory bodies should not be referred to as "commissions."

²⁵⁶ Board of Supervisors

²⁵⁷ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

²⁵⁸ 1 Board of Supervisors (BOS) appointee must be a spouse, domestic partner, or widow/widower of a veteran; 2 appointees—one selected by the BOS and one by the Mayor—must be women veterans; 2 appointees—one by the BOS and one by the Mayor—must be veterans with physical disabilities. The remaining 8 seats have no qualifications.

²⁵⁹ Advisory committees are not required to have qualifications. However, if there are no explicit requirements, the appointing authority must submit some information on why a candidate is qualified.

In addition, the Task Force could consider removing the requirement that two members be women in order to remove gender-specific seat qualifications in the Administrative Code. The Charter already establishes City policy for all appointments to policy bodies, stating that they should reflect the interests and contributions of a diverse array of people including protected groups.²⁶⁰

Lastly, the Administrative Code requires the Commission to submit annual reports of its activities to the Board of Supervisors, but only the 2022 report is published on its website. As it currently operates, the Commission seems to respond to issues and policy opportunities in an ad-hoc manner, which may render consistent strategic goals and reporting unnecessary or ill-suited to its function. The Task Force could recommend that the Commission make its annual reports publicly available for increased transparency or consider deleting the reporting requirement from the Administrative Code altogether.

²⁶⁰ Charter language: "It shall be the official City policy that the composition of each appointive board, commission, or advisory body of any kind established by this Charter or legislative act of the United States of America, the State of California, or the Board of Supervisors shall reflect the interests and contributions of people of all races, ethnicities, ages, sexes, gender identities, sexual orientations, and types of disabilities. The voters therefore urge in the strongest terms all City officers and agencies involved in nominating, appointing, or confirming members of those appointive boards, commissions, or advisory bodies to consider and as appropriate support the nomination, appointment, or confirmation of women, people of color, seniors, people with disabilities, and people that reflect a range of sexual orientations and gender identities to fill seats on those bodies."