

## Draft Criteria – Combined Approach

Approach is:

- Conduct initial assessment to identify bodies where limited discussion is needed
- Use the Type Sorting Criteria to identify what type of body and template each body should fall under
- Use the Evaluation Criteria to assess each body and determine if it should be kept/modified/consolidated/eliminated

## Initial Assessment

These questions should be answered prior to conducting any additional evaluation or analysis to help narrow the scope of what decisions need to be made. The goal is to identify:

1. Bodies that the Task Force cannot amend because they are required by State or Federal Law
2. Bodies that are inactive that the Task Force can eliminate without further discussion needed [NOTE: this is already being applied as part of preparation for the July inactive bodies vote]

<b>Authorizing Authority</b>			
Goal is to assess if State/Federal government requires either the body itself or the functions of the body.			
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>If yes</b>	<b>If no</b>	<b>Information source</b>
1a) Does State or Federal law explicitly require the existence of this specific body?	Keep, go to 1b)	Go to 1c)	✓ Workbook
1b) Does the charter or code also explicitly require this body?	Task force may discuss if it makes sense to remove from charter/code in order to clean up charter/code, while retaining this body.	Keep. Stop with review except to assess potential consolidation of other bodies/functions into this one.	✓ Workbook Task Force discussion
1c) Does this body currently fulfill a function required by State or Federal law?	Go to 1d)	Continue to next section	✓ Workbook
1d) Could either another body or City staff potentially fulfill this function?	Continue to evaluation criteria. Note that if we later choose to consolidate/eliminate, those functions would need to be reassigned.	Keep. Stop with review except to assess potential consolidation of other bodies/functions into this one.	✓ Workbook

Inactivity			
Criteria	If yes	If no	Information source
2a) Does the body meet our definition of inactive? (No meetings within past year, unless it's a periodic meeting body).	Continue to 2b	Continue to Type Sorting Criteria	✓ Workbook
2b) Does the department provide a clear rationale for keeping this body, or are there any risks (political or other) associated with eliminating this body?	Continue with assessment	Eliminate	<input type="checkbox"/> Department engagement

## Type Sorting Criteria

The goal of these questions is to sort each body in the type that it *should* be. These questions should be applied to each body in order.

### Appeals Boards

Criteria	If yes	If no	Information source
3a) Does the body hear appeals of decisions made by City staff/another body?	Categorize as appeals board, continue to evaluation criteria	Continue with sorting criteria	✓ Workbook
3b) Does the body make discretionary decisions in specific cases for the first time (meaning, not on appeal)?	Categorize as appeals board, continue to evaluation criteria	Continue with sorting criteria	✓ Workbook

### Other Regulatory Bodies

Criteria	If yes	If no	Information source
4a) Holds hearings and makes final determinations based on hearings?	Categorize as Other Regulatory, continue to evaluation criteria		✓ Workbook
4b) Creates rules and regulations?  Binding decisions?  Legal authority to administer a law?  What criteria make sense here?			

## Governance Commissions

Criteria	If yes	If no	Information source
5a) Is the body a decision-making body?	Categorize as governance body and continue with this section	Not a governance body – continue to next section	
<b>Does it make sense to have a governance body that oversees this specific department?</b>			
Criteria	If yes	If no	Information source
6a) Does this body oversee a specific department or office?	Continue with assessment	Continue to next section.	
6b) Does the department that this governance body oversees deliver direct services to the public?	Keep governance body	Change category of body to advisory	✓ Workbook
6c) Is the department an enterprise department?	Keep governance body	Change category of body to advisory	✓ Workbook
6d) Does the body make decisions that personally affect elected city leaders, such as elections or ethics?	Keep governance body	Change category of body to advisory	✓ Workbook Task force assessment
6e) Does the body have a budget over \$100 million?	Keep governance body	Change category of body to advisory	Additional Staff Analysis
<b>Does it make sense to have governance bodies that do not oversee departments?</b>			
Criteria	If yes	If no	Information source
7a) <i>Criteria asking if governance body is appropriate in other situations</i>			

#### Staff Working Groups

Criteria	If yes	If no	Information source
8a) Is the group comprised of City staff, with the intention of bringing staffers together to set policy and make recommendations on discrete and specific policy areas, laws, or programs?	Categorize as staff working group	Continue with assessment	✓ Workbook

#### Advisory Council

Criteria	If yes	If no	Information source
9a) Does the body act in a purely advisory role where none of their recommendations or decisions are legally binding to individuals or departments?	Categorize as advisory council	Continue with assessment	✓ Workbook

#### Other

Criteria	If yes	If no	Information source
10a) If none of the above criteria fit, then this is an unusual/unique body and should be considered and discussed individually.	N/A	N/A	✓ Workbook

## Evaluation Criteria:

This is intended to be a tool to fairly and systematically evaluate what the outcome should be for each public body:

- Keep
- Keep but align to template
- Consolidate
- Eliminate

### Criteria that apply to all bodies

<b>Borderline Inactivity</b>			
Goal is to assess at its most basic level if the commission is actively working to meet their mandate			
Criteria	If yes	If no	Information source
1a) Does the commission generally fail to meet on the cadence required under statute or ordinance?	Investigate why, continue to 1b	Continue to 1b	<input type="checkbox"/> Department engagement
1b) Were more than 25% of meetings cancelled in the last calendar year, without being rescheduled?	Investigate why, continue to 1c	Continue with assessment	✓ Workbook <input type="checkbox"/> Department engagement
1c) Are more than 25% of seats vacant?	Investigate why, continue to 1d	If no to 1a-c, body is not borderline inactive. Continue to next section.	✓ Workbook
1d) [If yes to any of 3a-3d] Would these vacancies issues be addressed by applying templates to this body? (E.g., templates may reduce the number of seats, eliminate seat-level requirements, etc.).	Continue with assessment; if final determination is to Keep, then align to templates.	Consider consolidation or elimination unless there are other clear and compelling factors.	<input type="checkbox"/> Task force discussion

<b>Policy Area</b> Goal is to assess if multiple commissions are providing overlapping functions within a policy area.			
Criteria	If yes	If no	Information source
2a) What policy area does this body cover? Are there other bodies that cover this same policy area?	Go to 2b	Continue to next section of assessment - policy area is not a potential trigger for elimination or consolidation.	✓ Workbook
2b) Do those bodies that cover the same policy area provide similar functions?	Consider consolidation or elimination	Consider feasibility of consolidation, continue to 2c	✓ Workbook
2c) Does having this commission separate from others in the same policy area add additional value, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clients, residents, or businesses can take grievances to independent outsiders</li> <li>• Separate types of expertise can be engaged</li> <li>• Supporting fundraising (e.g. arts bodies)</li> </ul>	If yes, keep or keep but align to template.	If no, consider consolidation or elimination	Input from commissioners Task force assessment
3a) Does the body address a policy area that is particularly salient to the public or an area where there has historically been low public trust?	Continue with assessment; may indicate that keeping this body is important even if other responses suggest elimination.	Continue with assessment.	✓ Workbook



**Influence and Interest**

Goal is to assess if the commission is serving broader City interests, or if it is serving the interests of one specific group or population. There are situations where specific commissions may be appropriate (e.g. if giving representation to a historically underserved population) and situations where they are not.

Criteria	If yes	If no	Information source
4a) Is the body related to one specific funding source or to a small interest group, such as a specific neighborhood?	Consider consolidation into Department's primary governance or advisory body or elimination	Continue with assessment	Task force assessment
5a) Do other bodies serve similar constituents/customers?	Consider consolidation or elimination	Continue to next section	Task force assessment

**Clarity of Purpose**

Goal is to assess if there is a clear rationale for why this body should exist, that the purpose of the body has not become muddled over time, and that the body appears to be meeting its purpose

Criteria	If yes	If no	Information source
6a) Does the establishing authority provide a clear purpose and rationale for this body?	Continue to 6c	Continue to 6b	✓ Workbook Additional Charter/Admin Code Review
6b) Does the task force believe there is a clear purpose or rationale for this body?	Continue to 6c	Consider elimination	Qualitative assessment from Task Force
6c) Does the body appear to be meeting their purpose?	Consider keeping. Continue to 7a.	Continue to 6d	Qualitative assessment from Task Force Department Engagement
6d) Would there be changes to either structure or operations that are within the TF's purview to recommend or change that would ensure the body meets its purpose?	Consider keeping but modifying. Continue with assessment.	Consider elimination.	Qualitative assessment from Task Force Department Engagement
7a) Is there one department that the commission is tasked with governing or advising?	Continue with assessment	Modify to align to template (so that it is tied to only one department), consolidate, or eliminate.	✓ Workbook

<b>Value Add to the City</b>			
Goal is to assess if the body is adding value to the City, either by expanding capacity or providing additional space for participation			
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>If yes</b>	<b>If no</b>	<b>Information source</b>
8a) Does the body generate additional information or research that would otherwise not be generated or otherwise have to be done by department staff? Examples include annual reports, engagement with constituents, etc.	Consider keeping, continue with assessment	Continue with assessment	Department Engagement
8b) Does the body substantively increase government transparency, either by surfacing information that may not otherwise be public or by giving public insight into how Citywide decisions are made?	Consider keeping, continue with assessment	Continue with assessment	Task Force evaluation Department Engagement
9a) Does the department feel that the body is adding value or capacity to their policy area or department?	Continue with assessment	Consider consolidation or elimination, continue with assessment	Department Engagement
9b) Do the commissioners feel that the body is adding value or capacity to their policy area or department?	Continue with assessment	Consider consolidation or elimination, continue with assessment	Commissioner Engagement

#### Advisory Committees Only Criteria

Public Engagement			
Criteria	If yes	If no	Information source
10a) Are there other active pathways for public input regarding this policy area?	Consider consolidation or removal	Consider keeping	Department engagement Additional staff analysis
10b) Does this body increase representation in government, especially for underrepresented communities? Or, is the composition of this Board generally reflective of the population it intends to represent?	Consider keeping, but continue with assessment	Continue with assessment	<i>Need to determine how rigorously to assess this</i>
10c) Does this body effectively bring in outside expertise (either professional expertise or lived experiences) that would otherwise be missing?	Consider keeping	Consider elimination	Department engagement

#### Appeals Boards Only Criteria

Potential for Consolidation			
Criteria	If yes	If no	Information source
11a) Are there other appeals boards that cover similar policy areas?	Consider consolidation	Continue with assessment	✓ Workbook
11b) Do meeting cancellations cause delays in hearing appeals or cases?	Changes needed. Assess if consolidation is appropriate.	Keep	Department engagement

### Staff Working Groups

Potential for Consolidation			
Criteria	If yes	If no	Information source
12a) Do staff or departments see any additional value in ensuring this body is in charter or code?	Consider keeping	Eliminate from charter/code. Department retains ownership over body and may continue it as a department-driven initiative.	✓ Workbook

### Other Regulatory

Potential for Consolidation			
Criteria	If yes	If no	Information source
13a) Would it make sense for the Board of Supervisors or City staff to make these decisions in place of this body?	Consider elimination	Keep or modify	✓ Workbook

*Are there any additional body-specific criteria that is needed here?*

Final Cost/Benefit Assessment, Applicable to All Bodies

<b>Cost Benefit/Analysis</b>			
Do the benefits outweigh the costs of this body?			
14a) What are the costs associated with this body, as outlined in the BLA report? List out.			
14b) What are the benefits to the City of the public body? Assess based on answers to above criteria questions. List out.			
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>If yes</b>	<b>If no</b>	<b>Information source</b>
15a) Are there additional benefits not captured in our evaluation?	Add to list in 14a; continue to 15b	Continue to 15b	Department engagement Task Force assessment
15b) If the body were to be eliminated, would any additional cost burden be placed on departments or other City Staff?	Assess and add to list in 14b; continue to 15c	Continue to 15c	Department engagement
15c) Holistically, does the Task Force believe that the benefits of this public body outweigh the associated costs?	Consider if bodies can potentially be consolidated but retain the benefits. Otherwise, keep or modify.	Eliminate or consolidate	Task Force Assessment