



## **Draft Minutes – Revision 1**

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

**Daniel Lurie**  
**Mayor**

**Wednesday, June 18, 2025**  
**1:00 pm**

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

Meeting will also be broadcast online and remote public comment will be available via WebEx event. To view the online presentation, join the meeting using the link <https://tinyurl.com/9bwa4njf> and password PropE. Members of the public may use email address [CommissionStreamlining@sfgov.org](mailto:CommissionStreamlining@sfgov.org) to join the WebEx meeting if needed. To join by phone, dial 415-655-0001 and enter access code (webinar ID) 2662 734 6625 followed by ##. See page 3 for additional remote public comment instructions.

### **Agenda**

---

#### **1. Call to Order**

Chair Ed Harrington called the meeting to order at 1:01pm

#### **2. Roll Call**

Present:

- Ed Harrington, Chair
- Jean Fraser, Vice Chair
- Andrea Bruss
- Sophie Hayward
- Natasha Mihal

Lily Moser called roll. With all five members present, a quorum was established.

#### **3. Announcements (Informational Item)**

The meeting was held in hybrid format, with participation available both in person and via WebEx. Technical instructions for public participation via WebEx were provided. Clerk Lily Moser announced that the July 2 meeting was cancelled and confirmed a hard adjournment time of 4:00 p.m. This meeting marked her final appearance as clerk.

#### 4. General Public Comment

One member of the public offered public comment:

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

I've missed joining previous meetings of this Commission Streamlining Task Force, so I missed the 5/21/2025 discussions on "Proposals for Governance Commissions," and separate "Proposals for Advisory Committees". Minutes of your 5/21/2025 meeting state Vice Chair Fraser's proposal questioned the need for "Governance Commissions" "beyond just a select few enterprise departments," and be structured like Boards of non-profit organizations, vs. Chair Harrington's distinction of "General Commissions" having strong public impacts. I remind you, the Health Commission isn't an "Enterprise Department," but it does generate revenue for DPH operations through setting patient hospital rates, and receives Federal Medicare/Medi-Cal revenue. The Health Commission is mandated by Federal Law for eligibility to receive Medicare reimbursement. The Commission is a CMS mandated "Governing Body" over SFGH and Laguna Honda. It has quasi-legislative functions and "Board" duties — like holding "Prop Q" hearings over proposed service elimination, or service reductions, by private-sector hospitals in the City.

#### 5. Consent Calendar (Action Item)

- a) Approve [Minutes Revision #1 – May 21, 2025 meeting](#)
- b) Approve [Minutes – June 4, 2025 meeting](#)

The Task Force reviewed revised minutes for the May 21, 2025 meeting and the minutes for the June 4, 2025 meeting.

##### Public Comment

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

As for the format of your meeting minutes, I read Vice Chair Fraser's concerns in your June 4 meeting minutes about shortening the format and content of your meeting minutes, because of her concern some statements could be taken out of context, if presented in "extended narrative form." I disagree, since less fulsome minutes would invite statements being misconstrued even further using shorter meeting minutes, worsening the problem of lacking context. I agree with Laura, the member of the public who praised the existing minutes as being thorough, and helpful. Please continue reporting your meeting minutes as you have been. So far, they've been terrific. These minutes help prevent members of the public from having to listen to the entire audio recordings of your two-hour meetings.

Chair Ed Harrington noted that the revised minutes were shorter but still complete. The Task Force unanimously adopted both sets of minutes.

#### 6. Decision-Making and Work Planning (Discussion and Possible Action Item)

*Additional materials: Draft [Current State](#), [Start From Zero](#), and [Combined Work Plans](#); [Sorting and Evaluation Criteria \(Combined Approach\)](#)*

Project Director Rachel Alonso emphasized the limited time remaining in the calendar and recommended that the Task Force augment its work between meetings through pre-work and offline engagement to support timely decisions.

The first topic discussed was the **process to finalize and record Task Force decisions**. Rachel Alonso proposed that staff provide formal recommendations and supporting memos the Friday before any

decision-making meeting, starting with the upcoming vote on inactive bodies scheduled for July 16. She explained that staff will memorialize all Task Force votes in a “decision log,” which may be shared publicly. Although the only binding actions required are final approval of the Task Force report and draft legislation in early 2026, she encouraged members to treat interim votes as meaningful steps in the process. She also outlined a rotation system for voting order to ensure equity among Task Force members and confirmed that all decisions would require at least three affirmative votes, regardless of attendance.

Andrea Bruss proposed that the Task Force might need to meet more frequently to get through its work. Vice Chair Fraser praised the clarity of the proposed process and confirmed her readiness to vote on inactive bodies on July 16, provided that staff deliver a detailed memo in advance. She emphasized that she cannot attend more than two meetings per month. Chair Harrington noted offline preparation in between meetings may reduce the burden of in-meeting deliberation.

The second topic discussed was **potential approaches for decision-making**. Rachel Alonso presented three approaches for evaluating San Francisco’s public bodies: (1) analyzing by policy area, (2) analyzing by type of body (templates), and (3) a combined approach incorporating both templates and policy-area analysis.

Task Force members discussed the pros and cons of each method:

- Natasha Mihal supported the combined approach, noting that the framework helps decision-making and allows time later for more nuanced template issues like appointments. Later, she emphasized the value of examining overlapping functions across departments (e.g., homelessness).
- Andrea Bruss also supported the combined approach, noting that overlap by function or policy area will be central to her decision-making, while starting with templates would help solidify core, foundational components early on. Later, she committed to being prepared to make decisions about advisory body templates in the next meeting.
- Vice Chair Fraser emphasized the importance of looking at templates—especially for advisory bodies—on July 16. She warned that if the Task Force could not reach consensus on the advisory template by then, continued template development might not be productive. She favored a modified “Analyze by Type of Body” schedule because it would allow for each body to be discussed in two meetings, rather than one.
- Sophie Hayward advocated for discussing inactive bodies and advisory body templates in the next meeting and expressed appreciation for the “compromise report” shown in the slide deck.

The Task Force discussed what role staff should play in making recommendations. Rachel Alonso confirmed that staff could prepare side-by-side comparisons between existing structures and template elements and would be happy to bring forward recommendations if requested.

The Task Force voted to adopt the **combined approach** with modifications:

- July 16: Discuss inactive bodies and templates for advisory and governance bodies.
- August 6: Complete template discussions for regulatory and appeals bodies, and address legally required bodies.
- August 20: Address borderline inactive groups and begin policy-based discussions with housing and economic development bodies.

A motion made by Andrea Bruss and seconded by Sophie Hayward passed 4-1 with Vice Chair Fraser voting against.

In the third section of the presentation, Rachel Alonso introduced a set of **tools intended to ensure Task Force decisions are fair and consistent**, including:

1. **Templates**, which define core characteristics for each body type (e.g., number of members, appointment authority, scope);
2. **Type Sorting Criteria**, a flowchart-style tool to determine which body type (advisory, appeals, governance) is appropriate; and
3. **Evaluation Criteria**, a structured approach to determining the future status of a body—whether to keep, modify, consolidate, or eliminate it.

Rachel Alonso emphasized that these tools would increase transparency, consistency, and efficiency as the Task Force begins making formal decisions. She explained that staff could use these criteria to generate recommendations, with Task Force members reserving discretion to accept or reject the results.

Sophie Hayward supported using templates and criteria not only to evaluate current bodies but also to guide the formation of new ones in the future. Natasha Mihal asked whether the Task Force would vote on each body's outcome (keep, modify, consolidate, or eliminate). Chair Harrington spoke in favor of having staff submit preliminary recommendations for the Task Force to consider and which could resemble a consent calendar—if members agree, no vote is needed; if there's disagreement, specific items would be discussed individually.

Rachel Alonso presented example flowcharts to show how bodies would be evaluated based on criteria such as:

- Whether they oversee an enterprise department;
- Whether they hear appeals or make discretionary decisions;
- Vacancy and meeting cancellation rates;
- Overlap in policy areas; and
- Legal mandates.

Vice Chair Fraser raised questions about how “number of bodies in a policy area” and “added utility to the City” would be used in the evaluation process, emphasizing that these need clear definitions to be useful decision criteria. Project Director Alonso walked through a sample using homelessness-related bodies to illustrate how type sorting and evaluation could guide recommendations for consolidation or elimination.

Chair Ed Harrington emphasized that these tools codify a rational approach that any layperson would use and should be used flexibly. He also cautioned that stakeholder input needed to include public voices, not just department staff.

There was general agreement among Task Force members that the tools were promising and that further refinement could happen offline. Members agreed to review the draft criteria and provide feedback outside of the meeting. Staff will incorporate member input and return with a proposed draft alongside templates at upcoming meetings

In the fourth section of the presentation, the Task Force continued its work planning discussion by **reviewing the upcoming meeting schedule** and confirming procedural expectations for reviewing bodies and voting.

### Consent Calendar Structure

Natasha Mihal asked her fellow Task Force members to consider how to manage large volumes of decisions efficiently and whether individual members could pull items from the previously discussed “consent calendar” without justification. Chair Harrington confirmed that under the proposed model, members could request discussion of any item for any reason, similar to standard practice for public boards.

Andrea Bruss advised that members should try to notify staff before meetings about which items they plan to raise, to support preparedness and efficiency. She also emphasized that Task Force members—not members of the public—should determine which items are removed from consent. Public comment would still be welcomed on all items, but only Task Force member disagreement would trigger separate discussion. Chair Harrington asked Deputy City Attorney Jon Givner to clarify whether the current practice of members of the public pulling items from consent was a legal requirement or just common practice; Givner confirmed it was the latter. Chair Harrington and Andrea Bruss discussed needing to be prepared to move things off consent on the fly during a meeting at the request of a Task Force member.

Rachel Alonso worked through a hypothetical example using the Housing and Economic Development policy area. Chair Harrington noted that it was acceptable if staff occasionally needed to issue “no recommendation” and defer certain decisions to the Task Force to work out on their own.

### Agenda Posting and Staff Reports

Project Director Alonso stated that staff would provide a list of bodies to be discussed two weeks in advance, and a detailed staff memo with recommendations would be posted the Friday before the meeting. With only a three-day turnaround, Chair Harrington noted they may need to defer decisions on some items if more time or information is needed. Sophie Hayward confirmed that the template framework and evaluation tools would be available at the same time as the staff memo to facilitate well-informed decisions.

The fifth topic discussed was **stakeholder engagement**. Project Director Rachel Alonso first outlined five possible tasks for **engaging with department staff**, requesting direction from the Task Force on which should move forward.

- Task 1 – Attending Existing Citywide Meetings: Chair Harrington confirmed he would attend CFO and procurement advisory meetings in the fall. Other forums such as citywide personnel or technology meetings will not be pursued.
- Task 2 – Department Head Survey: Rachel Alonso proposed conducting a confidential survey of department heads or their designees to collect information about commission operations, impacts on service delivery, and the consequences of modifying or eliminating a body. The survey would aim to inform Task Force decision-making but could be challenging to administer and may yield cautious responses due to its public record status. The Task Force decided not to proceed.
- Task 3 – Inviting Departments to Task Force Meetings: Staff advised against having departments present directly during public meetings, as it would consume limited Task Force time. Members agreed departments should not be requested to make formal presentations, but Chair Harrington expects departments to send senior-level staff to answer any questions during the meeting, especially if something is contentious.
- Task 4 – One-on-One Department Meetings: Rachel Alonso suggested targeted meetings with specific departments on an as-needed basis. While Vice Chair Jean Fraser had previously raised concerns about equity in who gets contacted, Task Force members agreed that selective outreach may be appropriate in areas requiring clarification, such as children’s services bodies.

- Task 5 – Ad Hoc Staff Outreach: The group supported continued, informal contact between Task Force staff and departments to clarify information and address issues on a rolling basis. Natasha Mihal suggested that departments be allowed to submit written input proactively.

Andrea Bruss noted that the Budget and Legislative Analyst is gathering some departmental input already. Natasha Mihal asked whether stakeholder perspectives would be incorporated into the evaluation criteria; Senior Analyst Joanna Bell responded that it would be up to the Task Force.

Chair Harrington raised concern about staff recommendations being published the Friday before the meeting, advocating that people need two weeks' notice. He underscored the need for input if major changes are being considered. Project Director Rachel Alonso responded that providing staff recommendations two weeks in advance makes sense but would limit the ability to begin discussing policy areas before September 3<sup>rd</sup>. The Task Force discussed topics that could be addressed separately and earlier, such as staff working groups, regulatory bodies, or the relatively small public safety policy area.

Next, Rachel Alonso asked for Task Force input on the goals, timing, and methods for **engaging members of the public**. Sophie Hayward emphasized the importance of reaching more diverse voices beyond the existing civic echo chamber and suggested using social media to reach younger residents. She also noted the high level of unsolicited interest she's received from constituents and stakeholders. Natasha Mihal wondered about the risks of waiting until the draft report is released in December, since feedback received then would not directly shape real-time decisions.

Chair Harrington suggested that staff look into regular press engagement, including formal releases, and leverage mailing lists maintained by commissions and the Board of Supervisors. He emphasized that the goal of public engagement is to test whether the Task Force's proposed decisions make sense—not to gather generic input.

Andrea Bruss recommended publishing updates through every available channel, including commission mailing lists, board newsletters, and the City Administrator's Office. She also raised the idea of holding a future evening meeting to accommodate those unable to attend daytime sessions. She supported a website-based feedback tool (such as a suggestion form or button) for public comment.

The Task Force agreed not to pursue in-person outreach to clubs or organizations. Vice Chair Fraser noted that the discussion exemplified the challenges of relying on appointed commissions for broad public input.

In response to a final question from Project Director Alonso, Task Force members decided not to pursue a survey of **current commissioners** to gather their experiences and perspectives.

During preliminary public comment on the first five items, Patrick Monette-Shaw urged Task Force staff to create a new area on its website to organize documents the Task Force has authored — such as a) the three-page “Inactive Bodies List” for future discussion and vote, b) the one-page “Proposals for Governance Commissions,” c) the one-page “Proposals for Advisory Committees” with the side-by-side proposals from Chair Harrington and Vice Chair Fraser, d) the 20-plus page “Proposal for Commission” document dated May 21, and other Task Force-generated summary documents -- co-located in an easy-to-navigate list for easier access by members of the public. He also proposed this new “Documentation” section of the website include any BLA-created documents and potential draft recommendations and analyses by the Project Director and City Controller staff.



The Task Force used the final portion of the meeting to begin its first extended discussion on a specific body type template: **advisory councils**. Project Director Rachel Alonso explained that staff had identified a set of features for discussion, the purpose of which was to begin drafting a shared template that could inform both future advisory body design and the evaluation of existing bodies.

Body Size: Vice Chair Fraser previously proposed a maximum size of fifteen members. While Andrea Bruss felt fifteen was too many, and Natasha Mihal asked about setting a minimum number of seats, the Task Force ultimately agreed with the Vice Chair's proposal.

Establishing Authority: the Task Force discussed whether advisory councils should be permitted to exist in the charter, only the code (via ordinance), or neither (being created only at departments' discretion). Sophie Hayward advocated advisory councils not live in the charter for flexibility. She and Andrea Bruss recommended the Task Force consider whether future advisory bodies needed to be codified by ordinance at all. Chair Harrington noted that to some people, being in the charter is a big deal, and that deciding to prevent future advisory bodies from being created in either the charter or the code was a major decision.

Sunset Dates: the Task Force discussed how advisory bodies are created for either time-limited purposes or ongoing needs, but members broadly supported an automatic maximum three-year sunset clause with the ability for re-authorization. In response to a question from Natasha Mihal, Chair Harrington stated that the renewal of bodies established by ordinance would be at the discretion of the Board of Supervisors.

Removals: the Task Force agreed that members should be removable at the discretion of their appointing authority for any reason (i.e., without a "for cause" requirement).

Appointments: structures were discussed in general terms, with members noting that advisory bodies often involve split appointments between the Mayor and Board of Supervisors, as well as appointments from departments or other entities. Members requested more data from staff on current appointment structures before finalizing a recommendation on whether appointments should remain split in the future.

Term Lengths and Staggering: the group discussed the tension between staggered terms, which promote continuity, and sunset dates, which assume limited duration. Members agreed that three-year terms aligned with the sunset cycle made sense, and that term staggering could be handled on a case-by-case basis during reauthorization.

Qualifications: members supported allowing body-level qualifications, rather than seat-by-seat requirements, to avoid overly rigid criteria. Chair Harrington proposed requiring appointing authorities to submit a brief explanation of why a nominee is qualified to serve, which could support public accountability and ensure relevance of experience.

Conflict of Interest: Deputy City Attorney Jon Givner clarified that advisory bodies are generally not subject to the full set of conflict-of-interest laws that apply to decision-making bodies. However, they are prohibited from participating in discussions about contracts in which they or their organizations have a financial interest.

Compensation: Vice Chair Fraser spoke in favor of nominal stipends to better enable participation by low-income appointees. Natasha Mihal asked whether stipends would be allowable or required. Andrea Bruss said she was open to the idea but questioned whether it needed to be incorporated into the template; Natasha Mihal requested at a minimum it be memorialized in the final Task Force report as an important equity consideration.

No members of the public wished to speak during the second round of public comment.

#### Public Comment

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

As a Task Force tool to aid the public, please consider having your staff create a new section on your web page to organize documents your Task Force have written and authored — such as a) The three-page “Inactive Bodies List” for future discussion and vote, b) The one-page “Proposals for Governance Commissions,” c) The one-page “Proposals for Advisory Committees” with the side-by-side proposals from Chair Harrington and Vice Chair Fraser, d) The 20-plus page “Proposal for Commission” document dated May 21, and other Task Force-generated summary documents co-located in an easy to navigate list of your documents, for easier access by members of the public. Perhaps include in that “Documentation” section of your web site, any BLa-created documents, or potential draft recommendations and analyses by your Project Director Rachel Alonso, along with any documents from the City Controller, including the analysis underway of costs of each Advisory Committee and Commission.

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

Project Director Rachel Alonso reiterated that the Task Force previously agreed to discuss inactive bodies and templates in its July 16<sup>th</sup> meeting. Chair Harrington requested the public be encouraged to submit written comments about inactive bodies in advance; he did not want people to believe the only way they can interact is to attend the meeting in person.

#### Public Comment

Patrick Monette-Shaw submitted the following written summary:

As this Task Force gets closer to taking a vote on recommending what to do with the “Inactive Policy Body’s,” I have additional concerns about eliminating, 1) the “Adult Day Health Care Planning Council,” 2) the “Mayor’s Long-Term Care Planning Council,” and 3) The “Supportive Housing Services Fund Committee.” While each of these three committees may not have met in over a year, I believe some of their assigned oversight responsibilities when they were initially formed had involved valid, serious implications for healthcare policies, that are not being adequately addressed by either the Health Commission, or by other policy and oversight Commissions and Boards. While these three Advisory bodies should potentially be eliminated, their duties should be retained and assigned greater oversight by the Health Commission, which rarely if ever wades into these policy areas.

### **8. General Public Comment – Continued from item 4 if necessary**

Item 8 was not needed, as item 4 did not exceed 15 minutes.



## **9. Adjournment**

Chair Harrington adjourned the meeting at 3:53

---

Minutes prepared by Rachel Alonso, Project Director