



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
Chelsea Hall, Senior Project Analyst, City Administrator's Office
Joanna Bell, Senior Performance Analyst, Controller's Office
Henry O'Connell, Senior Performance Analyst, Controller's Office

DATE: October 24, 2025

SUBJECT: Criteria-Based Outcomes and Associated Analysis for General Administration and Finance 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 23 General Administration and Finance bodies at its November 5, 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 16-18 bodies and to consider eliminating or combining 3-7 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."

3 | Capital Planning Committee (City Administrator's Office) | Summary of Recommended Actions for General Administration and Finance Bodies

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 fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	Go to 1c
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill 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 November 5, 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 November 5th 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 commission.streamlining@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>).

Summary of Recommended Actions for General Administration and Finance Bodies

Name of Body	Department		Establishing Authority	Recommended Action	Notes	Recommended Type
Capital Projects and Infrastructure						
Capital Planning Committee	ADM	City Administrator's Office	Code	Keep	Criteria provide no reason to eliminate	Staff Working Group
Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee	CON	Controller's Office	Charter and Code (voter-approved)	Keep or combine	- Criteria suggest eliminating due to high vacancy rate - May not want to eliminate, since oversight increases public trust in bond programs - Criteria also suggest keeping and possibly expanding scope to include revenue bond oversight	Advisory
Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District Public Financing Authority No. 1	CON	Controller's Office	Code	Keep	Legally required to exist	Other
SFMTA Bond Oversight Committee	MTA	Municipal Transportation Agency	SFMTA Board of Directors Resolution	Combine or eliminate	Criteria suggest combining with the Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee or eliminating and allowing MTA staff to absorb functions	Advisory
City Employment and Benefits						
Civil Service Commission	CSC	Civil Service Commission	Charter	Keep	Criteria provide no reason to eliminate	Governance
Health Service Board	HSS	Health Service System	Charter	Keep	Criteria provide no reason to eliminate	Governance or Other
Retiree Health Care Trust Fund Board	RET	San Francisco Employees' Retirement System	Charter	Keep	Legally required to exist	Other

5 | Capital Planning Committee (City Administrator's Office) | Summary of Recommended Actions for General Administration and Finance Bodies

[illegible]

6 | Capital Planning Committee (City Administrator's Office) | Summary of Recommended Actions for General Administration and Finance Bodies

Name of Body	Department		Establishing Authority	Recommended Action	Notes	Recommended Type
Assessment Appeals Board	BOS	Board of Supervisors	Code	Keep	Fulfills state-required functions to hear assessment appeals	Appeals
City Hall Preservation Advisory Committee	ADM	City Administrator's Office	Code	Eliminate	- Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing City staff and other commissions to handle matters - City Hall will continue to be a priority even without the committee	N/A
Commission of Animal Control and Welfare	ADM	City Administrator's Office	Code	Eliminate	Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing Department of Animal Care and Control staff to absorb functions	N/A
Commission Streamlining Task Force	ADM	City Administrator's Office	Charter	Keep	- Criteria provide no reason to eliminate - Sunsets in January 2027	Advisory
Committee on Information Technology (COIT)	ADM	City Administrator's Office	Code	Keep	Criteria provide no reason to eliminate	No recommendation
Law Library Board of Trustees	LLB	Law Library	Charter	Keep	- Legally required to exist - Should be deleted from the Charter, as this is a state body	No recommendation
Refuse Rate Board	CON	Controller's Office	Code (voter-approved)	Keep	Criteria provide no reason to eliminate	Regulatory
State Legislation Committee	MYR	Mayor's Office	Code	Keep	Criteria provide no reason to eliminate	Advisory
Sweatfree Procurement Advisory Group	ADM	City Administrator's Office	Code	Eliminate	City staff possess the expertise needed to administer and enforce the City's sweatfree procurement laws	N/A

7 | Capital Planning Committee (City Administrator's Office) | Summary of Recommended Actions for General Administration and Finance Bodies

Name of Body	Department		Establishing Authority	Recommended Action	Notes	Recommended Type
Public Integrity						
Ethics Commission	ETH	Ethics	Charter	Keep	Criteria provide no reason to eliminate	Governance or other
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	BOS	Board of Supervisors	Code (voter-approved)	Keep	Criteria provide no reason to eliminate	Advisory

Policy Area: Capital Projects and Infrastructure

1. [Capital Planning Committee](#) (City Administrator's Office)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: Criteria provide no reason to eliminate

Primary Department	ADM	Established	2005
Current Type	Staff Working Group	Meetings (CY24)	19
Policy Area	Capital Projects and Infrastructure	Members (as of May 2025)	11 total seats 0 vacancies (0%)
Annual Cost	\$392k ²		

Reviews the proposed capital expenditure plan and monitors the city's ongoing compliance with the final adopted capital plan ([Administrative Code § 3.21](#)).

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 fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	N/A	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill 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?	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>			

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

Staff Discussion:

The Capital Planning Committee (CPC) was created in 2006 to bring long-term strategy, interdepartmental coordination, and transparency to San Francisco's infrastructure investments. The Committee reviews and recommends the City's 10-year Capital Plan, annual Capital Budget, and proposed uses of debt for major capital projects. Its mission is to ensure that investments in public facilities and infrastructure are fiscally responsible, well-prioritized, and aligned with the City's broader policy goals. The CPC prioritizes capital projects, reviews the proposed capital budget before it is submitted to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors, and monitors the City's compliance with the final adopted 10-year plan.

In the past year, CPC reviewed and recommended adoption of the FY 2026–35 10-year Capital Plan, which totals \$52 billion, and the FY 2026–27 Capital Budget, totaling \$403 million. It also oversaw updates and issuances of General Obligation Bonds, including the \$390 million 2024 Healthy, Safe, and Vibrant SF Bond, and reviewed the creation of new financing districts for Treasure Island and Stonestown. The CPC's deliberations are informed by a range of policy considerations, including seismic resilience, climate adaptation, accessibility, affordable housing, and racial equity.

CPC is the only citywide body that evaluates and approves long-term capital and debt proposals across all departments. While individual departments and enterprise agencies have their own governing commissions, the Capital Planning Committee serves as a single forum for aligning these efforts under a unified City strategy. While several bodies provide citizens' oversight over bond expenditures, CPC plans, prioritizes, and coordinates the City's capital investments. Public engagement at meetings varies by topic, but the Committee regularly receives public input on issues such as accessibility, transportation, and climate resilience. The evaluation criteria offer no reason to eliminate or modify the CPC; it remains a vital coordinating body that promotes transparent, disciplined, and equitable capital investment.

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	N/A – membership is ex officio ³	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	N/A given ex officio membership	At will	N/A	
Term length	None	3 years maximum	No	No change
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ⁴	No	No change
Qualifications	N/A given ex officio membership	None required ⁵	N/A	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	No change

The Task Force should not recommend aligning the Capital Planning Committee to a template, since there is no Staff Working Group template. The advisory committee template is shown in the table above for consideration purposes, and there is alignment in terms of size, appointment confirmations, and establishing authority. However, the nature of CPC as a staff working group, and its ex officio membership, makes the concept of member removal, term lengths, term limits, and qualifications irrelevant.

³ Committee members are the City Administrator, President of the Board of Supervisors, Mayor's Finance Director, Controller, and department heads or their designees from City Planning, Public Works, Airport, Municipal Transportation Agency, Public Utilities Commission, Recreation and Parks, and Port.

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

⁵ 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.

2. Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee (Controller's Office)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep or Combine	
Notes: - Criteria suggest combining or eliminating, due to borderline inactivity - May not want to eliminate, since CGOBOC oversight increases public trust and confidence in San Francisco's general obligation bond programs. - Criteria also suggest keeping and possibly expanding scope to include revenue bond oversight	

Primary Department	CON	Established	2002
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	5
Policy Area	Capital Projects and Infrastructure	Members (as of May 2025)	9 total seats 3 vacancies (33%)
Annual Cost	\$133k ⁶		

Informs the public about general obligation bond spending through an active review process and regular reporting. Provides oversight and advises the Controller on service standards and benchmarks, audits, and the Whistleblower Program ([Administrative Code § 5.30](#), [Charter § F1.111](#)).

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 fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill 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 ⁷	
	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	Keep and consider 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	

⁶ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁷ SFMTA Bond Oversight Committee

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

Staff Discussion:

The Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee (CGOBOC) is a nine-member advisory committee that provides public oversight and transparency into San Francisco's General Obligation (GO) bond expenditures through active review and publishing of regular reports.

CGOBOC was established by voter-approved ordinance in 2002 to provide oversight of GO bond expenditures. At the time, residents were concerned that the San Francisco Unified School District had spent significant portions of its bond proceeds on projects voters never authorized. CGOBOC was intended to restore public trust and confidence in San Francisco's bond programs. The following year, voters expanded CGOBOC's scope to review and provide input on the work of the City Services Auditor Division (CSA) of the Office of the Controller, including the Whistleblower Program. In the 20+ year period since CGOBOC's establishment, the voters of San Francisco have approved over \$6 billion of GO bond projects, including new bonds in every major area of City infrastructure—health, parks, public safety, housing, streets and transportation—illustrating a high-degree of public trust in San Francisco's bond programs.

GO bonds are debt instruments issued by the City to fund capital projects that do not directly generate revenue, such as roads, parks, and fire stations. The City generally uses GO bonds to pay for infrastructure that San Franciscans will use for years, instead of routine maintenance that will need to be repeated regularly. GO bonds are backed by the full faith and credit of the City and County of San Francisco and must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the electorate. In addition to GO bonds, the City funds capital projects by several other means, including revenue bonds, general fund revenues, user fees, and Certificates of Participation, which may not require voter authorization.

The Task Force may consider combining CGOBOC with the SFMTA Bond Oversight Committee, which was established by an MTA Board of Directors (MTAB) resolution to provide public oversight of SFMTA revenue bond expenditures and other debt. On the one hand, consolidating these two bodies would create unified oversight over two major forms of indebtedness—GO bonds and SFMTA revenue bonds. If combined, members of the public would have a singular forum to access information about these two types of bond expenditures. On the other hand, GO Bonds and revenue bonds differ in several ways and a combination would represent only partial oversight of the City's debt financing. General obligation bonds are repaid through property taxes and require voter approval, whereas revenue bonds are backed by project-generated income, such as transit fares or parking fees, and are often issued without a public vote. MTAB, with Board of Supervisors concurrence, may issue revenue bonds without voter approval, as may other City entities such as the Port, Airport, Public Utilities Commission, and the Board of Supervisors. None of these entities currently have a revenue bond oversight body; the PUC Revenue Bond Oversight Committee sunset in early 2025 and was not re-authorized. One of CGOBOC's core purposes is to increase public trust that GO bond proceeds will be spent on voter-approved purposes. While oversight and transparency are valuable for all public spending, revenue bonds differ because they are not always subject to voter approval and are repaid through user-generated revenue rather than citywide taxes, making the benefits of a citizen oversight body less clear. Further, combining CGOBOC with the SFMTA Bond Oversight Committee would create only partial oversight of the City's revenue bond programs; the Task Force may wish to expand CGOBOC's scope to include this.

Staff considered a potential combination of CGOBOC and the Capital Planning Committee (CPC), which reviews and submits the City's Capital Plan, Capital Budget, and issuances of long-term debt for approval. However, neither body could reasonably take on the work of the other. CGOBOC is intended to provide independent citizen oversight of bond expenditures, and it would be inappropriate for CPC, a staff working group comprised of City department heads, to participate in this oversight. Similarly, it would not be appropriate for an independent citizens' committee to lead the City's capital planning work in lieu of City leadership.

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 (3 members), Board of Supervisors (3 members), Controller (2 members), Civil Grand Jury (1 member)	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	3-year terms
Term limits	2 consecutive terms	Case-by-case ⁸	Yes	
Qualifications	Seat-specific ⁹	None required ¹⁰	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter and Administrative Code ^{11,12}	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; add 3-year sunset

The Task Force may choose to align CGOBOC to the advisory committee template by establishing a three-year sunset date and extending term lengths from two to three years. It may also consider converting CGOBOC's seat requirements into desirable qualifications to broaden the applicant pool and give appointing authorities greater flexibility in filling vacancies.

⁸ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

⁹ Mayoral and Board of Supervisors appointees: each shall include one member active in a business organization representing the City's business community, one active in a labor organization, and one active in a community organization. Controller appointees: one with expertise in auditing governmental financial statements or public finance law, and one with expertise in construction management. Civil Grand Jury appointee: a member of the Civil Grand Jury or its designee. No City employee, official, vendor, contractor, or consultant performing work funded by City-issued bonds may serve on the committee.

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.

¹¹ CGOBOC is established in Administrative code but assigned certain duties under [Charter § F1.111](#)

¹² Voter-approved, so changes require going back to the voters

3. [Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District Public Authority No. 1 \(Controller's Office\)](#)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: Legally required to exist

Primary Department	CON	Established	2023
Current Type	Other ¹³	Meetings (CY24)	2
Policy Area	Capital Projects and Infrastructure	Members (as of May 2025)	5 total seats 0 vacancies
Annual Cost	\$146k ¹⁴		

Serves as the state-mandated governing body for the City's Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts (EIFDs).¹⁵ Operates as a local agency separate from the City and County of San Francisco whose sole purpose is to make decisions about financing public capital projects and community-serving infrastructure like affordable housing development. Responsible for preparing, adopting, and implementing infrastructure financing plans, directing bond revenues, preparing annual reports for the public, and coordinating annual independent financial audits¹⁶ ([Administrative Code § 5.48-2](#)).

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 ¹⁷	Keep
	1B. Does this body fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	Yes ¹⁸	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill this legal requirement?	No	
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 ¹⁹	Consider eliminating or combining

¹³ Quasi-governance

¹⁴ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁵ Potrero Power Station EIFD (formalized); Stonestown EIFD (in process); and 3333/3700 California Street EIFD (in process).

¹⁶ Responsibilities derived from the California Government Code, including Sections 53398.51, 53398.66(j), and 53398.88.

¹⁷ California Government Code Sections 53398.50 and 53398.51.1

¹⁸ It constitutes the required governing body for Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts (EIFDs). Refer to prior note for code sections.

¹⁹ The EIFD Public Authority met only twice in 2024. It is on track to complete four meetings in 2025, but the long-term meeting cadence will likely be 1-2 meetings per year.

	3B. Could these issues be addressed by applying templates?	No ²⁰	
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 ²¹
		5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No Consider keeping

Staff Discussion:

The Task Force should keep the Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD) Public Financing Authority (PFA) because it must exist as long as any EIFD exists in San Francisco and its functions cannot be transferred to another body.

In 2014, the State of California began allowing local governments to establish EIFDs as a means for financing community infrastructure and in response to the dissolution of redevelopment agencies, which previously held that function.²² An EIFD operates by freezing property tax revenues in the year of its establishment and diverting future tax revenues into a separate pool for funding project(s) in a defined geographic area. San Francisco created its first EIFD, the Potrero Power Station, in 2023. Because state law requires EIFDs to have a governing public financing authority, the PFA was also established in 2023. Although it is called the Public Financing Authority "No. 1," it is and will continue to be the only PFA in San Francisco.²³

Currently, the PFA oversees three EIFDs: Potrero Power Station, Stonestown, and 3333/3700 California Street. All three projects are proposed mixed-use redevelopments that include residential, commercial, and community spaces. The latter two projects are currently in the early stages of EIFD formation and the PFA's support staff are in negotiations with their respective developers. The PFA makes financing decisions for each EIFD, including preparing and implementing their respective infrastructure financing plans (IFPs),²⁴ directing the issuance of bonds, and coordinating annual reviews and independent financial audits.

State law mandates that the PFA meet at least once a year to hear the required report and audit. It held two meetings in 2024 and a third meeting was canceled. In 2025, it is on track to meet four times. The current meeting cadence is largely informed by needs related to the formation of the

²⁰ Template application would not affect how often the EIFD PFA needs to meet.

²¹ Narrow topic and area scope: Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts

²² California Government Code Section 53398.50

²³ Upon establishment, the concept of EIFDs in San Francisco was new and staff were unsure if additional PFAs would be needed as the City created more EIFDs. This did not turn out to be true.

²⁴ An IFP is created at the outset of the EIFD and outlines projected incremental tax revenues, which facilities will be financed with those revenues, and the developer's expected reimbursements over time.

Stonestown and California Street EIFDs, which is a more intensive process than the eventual ongoing management of the established EIFDs. Support staff in the Controller's Office expect that the PFA will meet once annually after these two EIFDs are formalized, which they expect to be several years in the future. At that point, one annual meeting will fulfill state requirements and will likely be sufficient for conducting the business of the PFA.

Possible Application of Governance Commission Template:

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	5	5-7	Yes	
Appointing authority	Board of Supervisors ²⁵	Mayor	No	No change; state law grants appointing authority to the legislative body ²⁶
Appointment confirmations	None	None ²⁷	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	4 years	4 years	Yes	
Term limits	None	3 terms	No	Partially align to template; add 3-term limits for public members ²⁸
Qualifications	None ²⁹	None required ³⁰	Yes	Partially align to template; require justification for public members
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	TBD	No	No change
Sunset date	Upon effective dissolution of all EIFDs ³¹	None	No	No change per state law
Hiring and Firing Authority	No	Consultative responsibilities only	No	No change; irrelevant to this body's scope

²⁵ Seats 1-3 are held by BOS members and appointed by the BOS President, who also chooses an alternate member in case one of the three is absent or recused. Seats 4-5 are held by members of the public, nominated by the BOS President and appointed by the BOS.

²⁶ California Government Code Section 53398.51.1

²⁷ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

²⁸ Three seats must be held by current BOS members, who are already subject to two-term limits.

²⁹ District Supervisors (3 seats) and members of the public (2 seats); no other qualifications.

³⁰ 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.

³¹ Unless the Board of Supervisors extends the PFA, it can only sunset when the EIFDs are no longer collecting property tax revenues or when there are no outstanding bonds or other debt, whichever date is later (Administrative Code § 5.48-8).

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Contract approval authority	No ³²	Retain status quo	Yes	
Budget approval authority	No	Yes	No	No change; irrelevant to this body's scope
Employee discipline authority	No role	No role ³³	Yes	

Although the Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District Public Financing Authority (PFA) cannot be categorized squarely as an advisory or governance body, its scope of authority more closely matches a governance role since it oversees the creation and administration of tax districts. However, state regulation directs much of how the PFA operates and there are limited opportunities for template alignment. As such, the Task Force may choose to apply the governance commission template as suggested above—requiring justification for why the two public appointees are qualified and adding three-term limits for public members only, since Board members already have two-term limits—or it may choose not to make changes.

³² The PFA does not currently exercise contract approval authority but its scope of duties may require it after the process for formalizing the Stonestown and California Street EIFDs is complete. However, support staff expect this to happen several years in the future.

³³ Exceptions if this is currently required by law

4. [SFMTA Bond Oversight Committee](#) (Municipal Transportation Agency)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or Eliminate
Notes: Criteria suggest combining with the Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee or eliminating and allowing MTA staff to absorb functions

Primary Department	MTA	Established	2011
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	4
Policy Area	Capital Projects and Infrastructure	Members (as of May 2025)	7 total seats 0 vacancies
Annual Cost	N/A ³⁴		

Ensures accountability and transparency in the expenditure of bond proceeds for transportation projects in San Francisco. Informs the Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) Board of Directors and the public on the status of projects funded by SFMTA revenue bonds and other forms of debt. Oversees SFMTA's implementation of prudent internal controls and practices and ensures that funds are used for authorized purposes ([MTAB Resolution No. 11-154](#)).

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 fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill 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 ³⁵	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	Yes ³⁶	Consider combining or eliminating
	4C. Could this body reasonably take on the work of others in its policy area?	No	

³⁴ The Task Force discovered and added the SFMTA BOC to its scope after the Budget and Legislative Analyst gathered data for its [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

³⁵ Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee (CBOBOC)

³⁶ Yes, CBOBOC could expand to oversee SFMTA revenue bonds.

5	Breadth of Focus	5A. Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Yes ³⁷	
		5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes ³⁸	Consider combining or eliminating

Staff Discussion:

The Municipal Transportation Agency Bond Oversight Committee (SFMTA BOC) is a seven-member advisory committee established by the MTA Board of Directors to oversee revenue bond fund spending. The body's primary responsibilities include monitoring expenditures to ensure that funds are spent for legal purposes, informing the public about the status of funded transportation projects, and preparing annual reports on its activities for the MTA Board of Directors.

The Task Force may consider eliminating the SFMTA BOC for several reasons. First, there have been zero public commenters at the last four public meetings, highlighting that the body may not be fulfilling one of its core duties: public engagement and education. Further, the Port, Airport, Public Utilities Commission, and the Board of Supervisors may also issue revenue bonds, and none of these entities currently have a revenue bond oversight body; the PUC Revenue Bond Oversight Committee sunset in early 2025 and was not re-authorized. Because the SFMTA BOC is focused on a singular funding source, its oversight functions could be absorbed by MTA staff if necessary.

The Task Force may also consider combining the SFMTA BOC with the Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee (CGOBOC), which was established to oversee general obligation (GO) bond spending. On the one hand, consolidating these two bodies would create unified oversight over two major forms of debt—GO bonds and SFMTA revenue bonds. If combined, members of the public would have a singular forum to access information about these two types of bond expenditures. On the other hand, GO bonds and revenue bonds differ in several ways and a combination would represent only partial oversight of the City's debt financing. General obligation bonds are repaid through property taxes and require voter approval, whereas revenue bonds are backed by project-generated income, such as transit fares or parking fees, and are often issued without a public vote. While oversight and transparency are valuable for all public spending, revenue bonds differ from GO bonds because they are not always subject to voter approval and are repaid through user-generated revenue rather than citywide taxes, making the benefits of a citizen oversight body less clear.

³⁷ Funding source: SFMTA Revenue Bonds

³⁸ MTA staff and potentially the Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee (CGOBOC)

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	7	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	MTA Board (3 members), ³⁹ MTA Citizens' Advisory Council (2 members), MTA Transportation Director (1 member), Controller (1 member)	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	No confirmations	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	By a vote of 4 members	At will	No	Add language that allows appointing authorities to remove members at will
Term length	2 years ⁴⁰	3 years maximum	Yes	
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ⁴¹	No	Align to template; add 6-term limits
Qualifications	Specifics for 2 seats ⁴²	None required ⁴³	No	Require appointing authority to submit justifications for why candidates are qualified.
Establishing authority	MTA Board Resolution	Administrative Code	No	Align to template; add to Transportation Code
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; add 3-year sunset

Applying the evaluation criteria suggests that the Municipal Transportation Agency Bond Oversight Committee (SFMTA BOC) should be either eliminated or combined with the Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee. If the Task Force decides to keep the SFMTA BOC, it should recommend that the SFMTA Board of Directors align it with the advisory committee template by adding term limits

³⁹ Recommended by the SFMTA Board Chairperson and approved by the SFMTA Board of Directors.

⁴⁰ Set by the BOC's bylaws; not codified

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 Two seats must be current members of the MTA Citizens' Advisory Council; no qualifications for the remaining 5 seats.

⁴³ 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.

and a sunset clause, requiring justification for appointments to the five seats without qualifications, and codifying the body in the Transportation Code.

Policy Area: City Employment and Benefits

5. [Civil Service Commission](#) (Civil Service Commission)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: Criteria provide no reason to eliminate

Primary Department	CSC	Established	1900
Current Type	Regulatory	Meetings (CY24)	20
Policy Area	City employment and benefits	Members (as of May 2025)	5 total seats 0 vacancies (0%)
Annual Cost	\$1.1M ⁴⁴		

Maintains a fair, credible, and robust merit system of employment for City employees. Creates and adopts rules, policies, and procedures related to the merit system, salary-setting for elected officials, and contracting for personnel services ([Charter § 10.100](#))

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 fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill 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 ⁴⁵	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	Consider keeping

⁴⁴ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁴⁵ Narrow topic: City merit system. Specific demographic: City workers.

Staff Discussion:

The Civil Service Commission (CSC) is one of the oldest public bodies in San Francisco and has been operating in its current structure since 1994. Its functions include policy-making, rule-making, and hearing appeals as part of its oversight of the City's merit system, which ensures fair and equitable hiring and promotive practices in City employment. The Civil Service Commission is both a department and a commission, with 6 employees (FTEs) and a budget of approximately \$1.5M in FY26. CSC partners closely with the Department of Human Resources (DHR); the Commission sets rules and policies related to the merit system which DHR administers and implements.

The Commission has many responsibilities, including:

- Hearing and ruling on appeals of decisions by the HR Director and the Municipal Transportation Director as the final administrative remedy on merit system issues, future employment restrictions, discrimination complaints, sexual harassment, and retaliation.
- Setting the salaries and benefits of elected officials
- Approving the scope of work to be contracted out through Personal Service Contracts
- Overseeing the merit system, which includes undertaking continuous reform, evaluating departmental compliance, and reviewing key performance indicators

The evaluation criteria do not provide any reason to eliminate the Civil Service Commission, a body essential for ensuring the City's employment practices are fair and equitable.

Possible Application of Governance Commission Template:

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	5	5-7	Yes	
Appointing authority	Mayor	Mayor	Yes	
Appointment confirmations	None ⁴⁶	None ⁴⁷	Yes	
Member removal	For cause	At will	No	Align to template; change to at-will removal
Term length	6 years	4 years	No	No change; keep 6-year terms
Term limits	None	3 terms	No	Add 2-term limit
Qualifications	2 seat-specific ⁴⁸	None required ⁴⁹	Yes	Remove requirements
Establishing authority	Charter	TBD	No	None
Sunset date	None	None	Yes	
Hiring and Firing Authority	DHR Director: Hiring nomination and firing veto ⁵⁰	Consultative responsibilities only	No	DHR Director: Remove nomination authority, retain power to veto firing with a supermajority.
	CSC Executive Officer: sole authority to hire and fire			CSC Executive Officer: no changes
Contract approval authority	Yes ⁵¹	Retain status quo	Yes	
Budget approval authority	Yes	Yes	Yes	

⁴⁶ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

⁴⁷ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

⁴⁸ At least two commissioners must be women

⁴⁹ 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.

⁵⁰ Nominates Director of the Department of Human Resources (DHR) candidates for Mayoral appointment and may veto Mayoral removal of the HR Director with 4/5 supermajority vote.

⁵¹ The Civil Service Commission does not approve contracts entered into by its own department; rather, it approves Personal Services Contracts (PSCs) of other City departments, ensuring that the scope of those contracts is consistent with the City's civil service rules.

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Employee discipline authority	No ⁵²	No role ⁵³	Yes	

The Task Force should recommend partially aligning the Civil Service Commission to the governance commission template by reducing term lengths from six to four years, adding a three-term limit, and removing the Commission's authority to nominate HR Director candidates. It should also recommend removing the requirement that two members be women. 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.⁵⁴

The Civil Service Commission is responsible for upholding the merit system, which should be insulated from politics. As a result, the Task Force should recommend retaining Board of Supervisors confirmation of the Mayoral appointee for the Director of DHR, the current commissioner removal policy (for-cause removals) and the Commission's power to veto the firing of the HR Director with a 4/5 supermajority. Similarly, the Task Force should not recommend any changes to the hiring and firing authority over the CSC's executive officer.

The Task Force could consider making additional changes to the Civil Service Commission charter language in order to modernize it and give the Commission flexibility to adapt operations as needed over time. This could include removing language about the oath members must take and requirements around meeting operations. This type of information is more typically included in a body's bylaws and does not belong in the Charter.

The Task Force will need to decide whether the Commission should remain in the Charter or move to the Administrative Code.

⁵² The Civil Service Commission does not play a direct role in any employee discipline. It serves as an appellate body to hear and rule on decisions of the Human Resources Director, which may include decisions following EEO complaints, disqualifications from examinations, and future employment restrictions. While the CSC's decisions may impact an employee's employment with the City, they are not deciding whether an employee has engaged in misconduct for purposes of discipline.

⁵³ Exceptions if this is currently required by law

⁵⁴ Charter § 4.101(c): "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."

6. [Health Service Board](#) (Health Service System)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: Criteria provide no reason to eliminate

Primary Department	HSS	Established	1938
Current Type	Other	Meetings (CY24)	13
Policy Area	City employment and benefits	Members (as of May 2025)	7 total seats 0 vacancies (0%)
Annual Cost	\$658k ⁵⁵		

Contracts for and administers health plans for Health Service System members and their dependents. Establishes and maintains detailed historical costs for medical and hospital care and conducts an annual review of such costs, approves rates and benefits on an annual basis, makes rules and regulations for administering the business of the Health Service System, and decides appeals from Health Service System members and those who have contracted to render medical care to the members ([Charter § 12.200](#)).

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 fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill 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 ⁵⁶	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	Consider keeping

⁵⁵ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁵⁶ Health Service System members and their dependents

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria do not provide any reason to eliminate the Health Services Board (HSB), which oversees the Health Services System (HSS) for current and retired City employees and their dependents. HSS is administered by a department of the same name, which has a budget of \$12 million and over 35 employees (FTEs) for FY26. The HSB is the only public body that performs duties related to designing and adopting health plans for City employees (active, early retirees, and retirees) and cannot reasonably be combined with another body.

First established in 1938 to adopt a plan for rendering medical care to HSS members, the scope and responsibilities of HSB have grown over time to include oversight of medical, dental, vision, life insurance, and long-term disability insurance benefits as well as medical and dependent care flexible spending accounts. On an annual basis, the HSB reviews and approves the HSS member rules, rates and benefits plans, budgets, funding policies, Section 125 Cafeteria Plan (governing flexible spending accounts for medical and dependent care), an annual report, and an audit of the Health Service System Employee Benefit Trust Fund. The HSB also hears and decides certain appeals from HSS members.

One of HSB's core responsibilities is reviewing and approving contracts with HSS Plan Administrators. Every year the Board reviews and approves the seven medical/Rx contracts, four dental contracts, and a vision contract after reviewing the adequacy of each plan's benefits and proposed premiums/costs. Less frequently, HSB approves contracts for other HSS benefits programs such as life insurance and disability benefits. HSB may also approve contracts for actuaries, investment managers or advisors, hearing officers, third-party administrators for non-Charter benefits, external information technology consultants, and other service providers as determined by the Board.

Between 2-6 speakers typically provide public comment at each meeting, the majority of whom are retirees or representatives of retiree benefits groups. Comments vary and can include the members' recommendations for benefit plan changes, complaints about plan benefits, network options, and feedback regarding premium costs.

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 (2 seats) Board of Supervisors President (1 seat), Controller (1 seat), and election by HSS members (3 seats)	Mayor	No	No change
Appointment confirmations	Controller's nominee must be approved by the board itself	None ⁵⁷	No	Align to template; no confirmations
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	5 years	4 years	No	Align to template; 4-year terms
Term limits	None	3 terms	No	Align to template; 3-term limit
Qualifications	Seat-level for 6 out of 7 seats ⁵⁸	None required ⁵⁹	Yes	Consider updating qualifications to be desirable rather than required
Establishing authority	Charter	TBD	No	Keep in Charter
Sunset date	None	None	Yes	
Hiring and Firing Authority	Yes – sole authority to hire and fire department head	Consultative responsibilities only	No	No change
Contract approval authority	Yes	Retain status quo	Yes ⁶⁰	
Budget approval authority	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Employee discipline authority	No role	No role ⁶¹	Yes	

⁵⁷ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

⁵⁸ One member of the Board of Supervisors appointed by the President of the Board, one mayoral appointee who regularly consults in the health care field, one mayoral appointee who is a medical doctor, and three members elected by HSS membership from among their number. There are no required qualifications for the Controller's nominee.

⁵⁹ 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.

⁶⁰ HSB has authority under the Charter to adopt and contract for medical plans for HSS members (Charter Sec. 12.200)

⁶¹ Exceptions if this is currently required by law

The Health Service Board is categorized as an “Other” body. The table above compares it against the governance commission template because that is the most relevant template, though in practice the HSB exercises governance, regulatory, and appeals functions.

The Task Force may wish to partially deviate from the governance commission template for appointing authority and/or department head hiring/firing. In its August 6 meeting, the Task Force expressed interest in insulating some public bodies from political influence when a body has oversight of assets or funds requiring long-term outlook to manage appropriately. The Health Service Board meets these criteria and could be insulated from political pressures by maintaining split appointments and retaining the body’s ability to hire and fire the Executive Director. The Task Force may also wish to consider only allowing appointed members to be removed for cause, which would further insulate them from political pressure. The Task Force should also direct the City Attorney’s Office to clarify how elected members may be removed if they engage in serious misconduct.

Finally, the Task Force may consider making the listed qualifications desirable rather than mandatory. This change would broaden the pool of potential Mayoral appointees and be consistent with recent Task Force decisions favoring body-level rather than seat-specific qualifications. The same desirable qualifications could also apply to the Controller’s appointee, who currently serves without specific qualification requirements.

7. Retiree Health Care Trust Fund Board (San Francisco Employees' Retirement System)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep			
Notes: - Legally required to exist - May be combined with the Retirement Board, but that would require significant changes in the existing oversight rules			
Primary Department	RET	Established	2008
Current Type	Other	Meetings (CY24)	5
Policy Area	City Employment and Benefits	Members (as of May 2025)	5 total seats 0 vacancies (0%)
Annual Cost	\$649k ⁶²		

Oversees the city's contribution to the health care premiums of its retirees and their survivors ([Charter § 12.204](#)).

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 fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill 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 ⁶³	
	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 ⁶⁴	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	

⁶² Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁶³ Retirement Board

⁶⁴ Retirement Health Care Trust Fund

Staff Discussion:

The Retirement Health Care Trust Fund (RHCTF) Board must exist with members serving as fiduciaries of the trust. The City could legally combine it with the Retirement Board, creating a single body that oversees both trusts. However, it would require some significant changes in the existing oversight rules and would not result in efficiency gains.

The RHCTF is an irrevocable trust that provides a funding source to defray the cost of the City's and other participating employers' obligations to pay for retiree health coverage. The RHCTF Board was created to oversee the administration of the fund, investment of trust assets, and disbursements from the trust.

Staff investigated a possible combination of the RHCTF Board and the Retirement Board. While legally permissible, a combined body would likely increase workload and lengthen decision/approval timelines. If combined, RHCTF oversight would likely become a committee function under the Retirement Board. The committee would still need to meet regularly, maintaining the current workload for staff and increasing the workload for Board members. Decisions would be delayed, as they would first go through committee before reaching the full Retirement Board for approval. Further, the RHCTF Board and Retirement Board have different missions and different investment strategies. To allow for a potential future merger, the Task Force could add language permitting the two boards to combine if both vote to do so.

Possible Application of Governance Commission Template:

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	5	5-7	Yes	
Appointing authority	Controller (1 member), Treasurer-Tax Collector (1 member), San Francisco Employees Retirement System (1 member), and elections by Health Services System members (2 members)	Mayor	No	No change
Appointment confirmations	None	None ⁶⁵	Yes	
Member removal	N/A ⁶⁶	At will	N/A	
Term length	5 years	4 years	No	Align to template; 4-year terms
Term limits	None	3 terms	No	Align to template; 3-term limits for elected members
Qualifications	Seat-level ⁶⁷	None required ⁶⁸	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter	TBD	No	Keep in Charter
Sunset date	None	None	Yes	
Hiring and firing authority	None	Consultative responsibilities only	No	No change
Contract approval authority	None	Retain status quo	Yes	
Budget approval authority	None	Yes	No	No change
Employee discipline authority	No role	No role ⁶⁹	Yes	

⁶⁵ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

⁶⁶ Specific City officials required to serve. However, designees of those officials can presumably be replaced at will. No process for removal of elected members.

⁶⁷ Controller, Treasurer-Tax Collector, and Executive Director of the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System or their designees; two elected trustees from among active and retired members of the City's Health Service System. One elected member must be an active employee member and one must be a retired member. No member may simultaneously serve as a trustee on the Board and as a member of the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System Board or the Health Service System Board.

⁶⁸ 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.

⁶⁹ Exceptions if this is currently required by law

The Retiree Health Care Trust Fund Board is categorized as an "Other" body. The table above compares it against the governance commission template because it is a decision-making body with fiduciary responsibilities over the RHCTF. However, given the Board's unique purpose, the Task Force should only partially align it with the governance commission template by reducing term lengths and adding term limits for elected members. Its mixed appointment structure remains appropriate to ensure balanced representation and accountability. Since the Board's scope is narrowly limited to oversight of the Trust, it should retain no authority over hiring, firing, or departmental budget approval. The body should remain in the Charter to reflect its fiduciary responsibilities over the Trust. The Task Force should also direct the City Attorney's Office to clarify how elected members may be removed if they engage in serious misconduct.

8. [Retirement Board](#) (San Francisco Employees' Retirement System)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: Legally required to exist

Primary Department	RET	Established	1920
Current Type	Other	Meetings (CY24)	13
Policy Area	City Employment and Benefits	Members (as of May 2025)	7 total seats 1 vacancy (14%)
Annual Cost	\$2.1 M ⁷⁰		

Oversees administration, pension fund investment, member benefits, and actuarial funding of the city employees' retirement plan ([Charter § 12.100](#))

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?	Yes	Keep
	1B. Does this body fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill this legal requirement?	N/A	
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	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	

Staff Discussion:

The Retirement Board must exist with members serving as fiduciaries of the trust. The City could legally combine it with the Retiree Health Care Trust Fund Board, creating a single body that

⁷⁰ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

oversees both trusts. However, it would require some significant changes in the existing oversight rules and would not result in efficiency gains.

The San Francisco Retirement Board was initially created by San Francisco voters on November 2, 1920. Its purpose was to manage the newly created retirement system for City employees. Over time, its authority to invest assets broadened and now the Board spends the majority of its time overseeing investment of the trust fund assets. The Board also oversees the City's deferred compensation plan. Additionally, the Board also serves a governance role for the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System (SFERS), approving its annual budget, updates to its strategic plan, and hiring/firing its Chief Executive Officer/Chief Investment Officer.

Combining the Retirement Board and Retirement Health Care Trust Fund Board likely does not make sense for the reasons listed on page 33.

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 (3 members), President of the Board of Supervisors (1 member), and election by active and retired members of the Retirement System (3 members)	Mayor	No	No change
Appointment confirmations	None	None ⁷¹	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	5 years	4 years	No	Align to template; 4-year terms
Term limits	None	3 terms	No	Align to template; 3-term limits
Qualifications	Yes ⁷²	None required ⁷³	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter	TBD	No	Keep in Charter
Sunset date	None	None	Yes	
Hiring and Firing Authority	Yes – may appoint and remove Executive Director ⁷⁴	Consultative responsibilities only	No	No change
Contract approval authority	No	Retain status quo	Yes	
Budget approval authority	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Employee discipline authority	No role	No role ⁷⁵	Yes	

The Task Force may wish to partially deviate from the Governance commission template for appointing authority and/or department head hiring/firing. In its August 6 meeting, the Task Force expressed interest in insulating some public bodies from political influence when a body has oversight of assets or funds requiring long-term outlook to manage appropriately. The Retirement Board meets these criteria. The

⁷¹ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

⁷² Mayoral appointees shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning or investment portfolio management, or hold a degree of doctor of medicine. The Board President's appointee must be a member of the Board of Supervisors. Only one member may be retired.

⁷³ 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.

⁷⁴ The Board may choose to appoint an Executive Director to serve as a joint Chief Executive Officer-Chief Investment Officer, or as a Chief Executive Officer only.

⁷⁵ Exceptions if this is currently required by law

Retirement Board and San Francisco Employees Retirement System should be insulated from political pressures by maintaining split appointments and retaining the body's ability to hire and fire the Executive Director. The Task Force may also wish to consider only allowing members to be removed for cause, which would further insulate them from political pressure. The Task Force should also direct the City Attorney's Office to clarify how elected members may be removed if they engage in serious misconduct.

9. [Special Strike Committee](#) (Civil Service Commission)

Criteria-based outcome: Eliminate or Keep			
Notes: - Criteria offer no reason to eliminate; body is inactive by design and only meets when employees strike - May consider eliminating since the authorizing section of Charter has been deemed unlawful by the California Public Employment Relations Board and California Court of Appeals. - May consider keeping given its sensitive nature			

Primary Department	Civil Service Commission	Established	1976
Current Type	Other	Meetings (CY24)	0
Policy Area	City Employment and Benefits	Members (as of May 2025)	6 total seats 6 vacancies (100%)
Annual Cost	\$0 ⁷⁶		

Determines whether employees violated the Charter's strike prohibitions when municipal employees went on strike or planned to do so. Has been ruled unlawful by the California Public Employment Relations Board and Court of Appeals ([Charter § A8.346\(e\)](#)).

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 fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	Yes ⁷⁷	Consider eliminating
	2B. Is there a clear rationale to maintain the body despite its inactivity?	Yes ⁷⁸	Consider modifying
3 Borderline Inactivity	3A. Is this body borderline inactive (Met < 4 times in the past year or > 25% of seats are vacant)?	Yes ⁷⁹	
	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?	No	
	4B. Could this body reasonably be combined with others in its policy area?	No	

⁷⁶ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025, which excluded this body from its analysis. The Committee did not meet in Fiscal Year 2024-2025, so the cost should be \$0.

⁷⁷ Periodic meeting body forms only as needed.

⁷⁸ See prior comment.

⁷⁹ See prior comment.

	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:

San Franciscans added the Special Strike Committee to the Charter in 1976 through a voter initiative.⁸⁰ Before 2023, the Committee was authorized to meet as needed when municipal employees went on strike or planned to do so. The Committee determined whether employees violated the Charter’s strike prohibitions and, if so, could order termination. The presidents of the Airport, Civil Service, Fire, Police, Public Transportation, and Public Utilities Commissions comprise the Special Strike Committee.

In 2023, the California Public Employment Relations Board (PERB) ruled that the Charter’s strike prohibitions in Section A8.346 violated state labor law and were therefore unenforceable, effectively nullifying the Special Strike Committee.⁸¹ The City appealed, but the California Court of Appeal rejected the appeal in May 2025, confirming PERB’s decision. Consequently, the Special Strike Committee can no longer be convened.

Given these rulings, the Task Force may consider eliminating the Special Strike Committee from the Charter to bring City law into compliance with state labor law. Alternatively, rather than addressing this specific section directly, the Task Force could recommend adding a general Charter provision authorizing the City Attorney to remove or repeal Charter sections that have been invalidated by a final court judgment. This approach would modernize the Charter while avoiding the need to revisit individual provisions that are legally obsolete or unenforceable.

⁸⁰ “Historic Overview,” p. 4, Decision 2867-M City and County of San Francisco, California Public Employment Relations Board, July 24, 2023, <https://d2wu03uw2y008c.cloudfront.net/wp-content/uploads/20250606163535/decision-2867m.pdf>.

⁸¹ Decision 2867-M City and County of San Francisco, California Public Employment Relations Board, July 24, 2023, <https://perb.ca.gov/decision/2867m/>.

Possible Application of Governance Commission or Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?
Number of Members	6	15 maximum	5-7	Yes – both
Appointing authority	N/A – membership is ex officio ⁸²	N/A	Mayor	Yes - Advisory
Appointment confirmations	None	None	No confirmations ⁸³	Yes – both
Member removal	N/A given ex officio membership	At will	At will	No
Term length	N/A given ex officio membership	3 years maximum	4 years	No
Term limits	N/A given ex officio membership	Case-by-case ⁸⁴	3 terms	No
Qualifications	N/A given ex officio membership	None required	None required ⁸⁵	Yes – both
Establishing authority	Charter	Administrative Code	TBD	No
Sunset date	None	3 years	None	Yes – Governance
Hiring and Firing Authority	None	N/A	Consultative responsibilities only	Yes - Advisory
Contract approval authority	None	N/A	Retain status quo	Yes - Advisory
Budget approval authority	None	N/A	Yes	Yes - Advisory
Employee discipline authority	Terminate employees	N/A	No role ⁸⁶	No

If the Task force chooses to keep the Special Strike Committee, no template alignment is recommended. The Committee falls under the

⁸² Committee members are the presidents of the Airport, Civil Service, Fire, Police, Public Transportation, and Public Utilities commissions

⁸³ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

⁸⁴ For Advisory committees, term limits are handled on a case-by-case basis if the body is re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

⁸⁵ 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.

⁸⁶ Exceptions if this is currently required by law

"Other" category of public bodies, for which no relevant template exists. Because the body can no longer legally meet and does not fit within the Task Force's template categories, reshaping or aligning it would serve no purpose.

Policy Area: Elections

10. [Ballot Simplification Committee](#) (Elections)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep			
Notes: - Criteria suggest keeping despite the policy overlap with other bodies and narrow focus - Functions are important to supporting San Francisco's fair and free elections.			
Primary Department	REG	Established	1997 ⁸⁷
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	9
Policy Area	Elections	Members (as of May 2025)	5 total seats ⁸⁸ 0 vacancies (0%)
Annual Cost	\$33k ⁸⁹		

Writes summaries of local ballot measures that are short (less than 300 words) and simple (less than 8th grade reading level). The Department of Elections prints its final digests in the Voter Information Pamphlet that it mails to each registered voter ([Municipal Elections Code § 610](#)).

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 fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill 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 ⁹⁰	
	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	

⁸⁷ Added to the Municipal Elections Code in 1997 but the Department of Elections indicates that the Committee has been operating since 1974.

⁸⁸ In addition to the 5 appointed members, The City Attorney, or his or her designated representative, is an ex officio member and has a voice but no vote in committee proceedings.

⁸⁹ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁹⁰ Elections Commission, Elections (Redistricting) 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 ⁹¹	
		5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	Consider keeping

Staff Discussion:

High voter participation is critical to a well-functioning democracy. However, ballot measures in state and local elections across the US are often complex and difficult to understand. Multiple studies have shown that this leads to voters skipping questions or opting out of voting entirely.⁹² San Francisco addresses this problem through the creation of the Ballot Simplification Committee, which plays a critical role in ensuring San Francisco's ballots are easily understandable to voters.

The City has designed the ballot simplification process to ensure that ballot measure language is simple and clear while remaining neutral and accurate so that there is high public trust in the final ballot. The City Attorney's office staff drafts an initial version of the "digest," or summary of each measure. The Ballot Simplification Committee then holds public hearings to refine the text, aiming for under an 8th grade reading level and fewer than 300 words. Members of the public are able to provide comment and suggest edits prior to the Committee voting on the final digest. After the Committee adopts the digest, the public may submit a request for reconsideration if they believe further changes are needed. The Committee's meeting schedule depends on scheduled elections and the measures on the ballot.

The Committee includes two Mayoral appointees, three Board of Supervisors appointees, and a member of the City Attorney's office who participates as a non-voting member. These members bring a specific skillset to the committee: the technical expertise to understand the legal text of each measure and the writing skills to clearly communicate complex information to a wide audience. To ensure the integrity of the process, it is important that the public see these members as neutral and unbiased. To that end, the Elections Code requires specific organizations from a range of industries nominate members for the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to appoint (see the following page for more detail). The result is that San Francisco has widely understandable ballots, written through a transparent and thoughtful public process.

Despite the Committee being one of three elections-related bodies and having a narrow focus, the evaluation criteria result in a recommendation to keep the body. It is unlikely that the Elections Commission or Elections Department staff would be able to take on the work of the Ballot Simplification Committee and produce the same high-quality results the current committee has. Committee members have specific expertise that Commissioners and Elections Department staff do not, and the current transparent process ensures the public sees the final ballot as apolitical and legitimate. Free and fair elections are critical to a functional democracy and there is no reason to change a process that appears to effectively support this goal.

⁹¹ Ballot simplification

⁹² The Center for Civic Design cites many examples in their article on [how to make ballot measures easier to understand](#).

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	5	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Mayor (2 seats) and Board of Supervisors (3 seats) ⁹³	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	
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ⁹⁴	No	Align to template; add six-term limit
Qualifications	Yes (1 seat-specific, 4 body-level) ⁹⁵	None required ⁹⁶	Yes	
Establishing authority	Elections Code	Administrative Code	No	Align to template; add to Administrative Code.
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	None

The Task Force should consider partially aligning the Ballot Simplification Committee with the advisory committee template by adding it to the Administrative Code, consistent with the Task Force’s direction that all public bodies be located in either the Charter or the Administrative Code. The Task Force should not add a sunset date, as the Committee’s work is ongoing and essential to the City’s election process. If two-year terms are retained, a six-term limit should be added; if the Task Force recommends longer terms, the term limit should be adjusted to stay within the 12-year maximum for service.

⁹³ Specific seats must be nominated by specific entities. Mayoral appointee nominations: 1 by the Northern California Newspaper Guild and 1 by the Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District. Board of Supervisors appointee nominations: 2 by the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, Northern California Chapter or the Northern California Broadcasters Association and 1 by the League of Women Voters of San Francisco.

⁹⁴ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

⁹⁵ Each appointive member shall be a registered San Francisco voter, possess an understanding of ballot issues, and possess writing skills and training which provide for a high capability in written communication to the general public. The SFUSD-recommended Mayoral appointee must be an educational reading specialist.

⁹⁶ 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 should not modify the appointment process or qualifications. While it is unusual to explicitly task outside organizations with nominating members, the approach appears to be effective in maintaining the Committee's independence and nonpartisan character. Additionally, the current qualifications promote public confidence that members are selected for their professional expertise rather than political affiliation.

11. Elections Commission (Elections)

Criteria-based outcome: Combine or Eliminate

Notes:

- Criteria suggest combining or eliminating due to high vacancy rate, but Task Force should override the criteria and keep it.
- Essential to the effective operation of San Francisco government.

Primary Department	REG	Established	2001
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	12
Policy Area	Elections	Members (as of May 2025)	7 total seats 2 vacancies (29%)
Annual Cost	\$122k ⁹⁷		

Oversees and sets policies for the Department of Elections. Supports election administration by approving the Director of Elections' written plans before each election, which detail the policies, procedures, and personnel that will be used to conduct the election. After the election, assesses how well the plan succeeded in carrying out a free, fair, and functional election ([Charter §13.103.5](#)).

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 fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill 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 ⁹⁸	
	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	

⁹⁷ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

⁹⁸ Ballot Simplification Committee, Elections (Redistricting) Task Force

Staff Discussion:

While the Elections Commission currently has two vacancies, making it borderline inactive, it met monthly in the past year and supports the effective operation of San Francisco government. Even though the criteria-based outcome is to combine or eliminate the Commission, the Task Force should override the criteria in this case and keep it.

The Elections Commission is the governing body for the Elections Department. Voters created the Elections Commission in 1999 through Proposition J following widespread concern about election mismanagement and the need to ensure independence from political influence. The measure established the Department of Elections as a separate department under an oversight commission to restore public confidence in the integrity, transparency, and professionalism of San Francisco's election administration.

Free and fair elections are critical to a functional democracy, and it is essential that San Franciscans have trust in their Elections Department. Having an oversight body that enables transparency around elections and provides a forum for public input in election-related plans, policies, and reports helps engender trust in San Francisco's elections. The Commission serves in a review, advisory and oversight capacity to support the Department, meaning it approves elections plans, reviews reports, and oversees department performance while the Department manages day-to-day operations.

San Francisco's independent elections governance model is uncommon in California, where most counties administer elections through their elected County Clerk or Registrar of Voters without a separate oversight body. However, large cities such as New York and Chicago have similar independent commissions or boards to safeguard the integrity of election systems and maintain public trust. Having a dedicated public body that provides consistent oversight, transparency, and opportunities for public input serves an important role in maintaining confidence in its elections. There is no reason to combine or eliminate it.

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, Board of Supervisors, City Attorney, Public Defender, District Attorney, Treasurer, and the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District	Mayor	No	No change; retain split appointments
Appointment confirmations	None	None ⁹⁹	Yes	
Member removal	For cause	At will	No	Align to template; change to at-will removal
Term length	5 years	4 years	No	No change; keep 5-year terms
Term limits	2 consecutive terms	3 terms	No	No change; keep consecutive 2-term limit
Qualifications	Specific requirements for 3 seats ¹⁰⁰	None required ¹⁰¹	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter	TBD	No	None
Sunset date	None	None	Yes	
Hiring and Firing Authority	Yes	Consultative responsibilities only	No	No change; retain hiring and firing authority
Contract approval authority	None	Retain status quo	Yes	
Budget approval authority	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Employee discipline authority	None	No role ¹⁰²	Yes	

⁹⁹ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

¹⁰⁰ The Mayor's appointee must have experience in election administration; the City Attorney's appointee in election law; the Treasurer's appointee in financial management; and the remaining appointees must be broadly representative of the general public..

¹⁰¹ 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.

¹⁰² Exceptions if this is currently required by law

The Task Force should not align the Elections Commission to the governance commission template in several ways.

Because it is important that the Elections Commission and Elections Department be insulated from politics, the Task Force should recommend retaining the current split appointment structure (where there are seven appointing authorities for seven seats), make no changes to the term lengths or limits¹⁰³, and allow the Commission to retain current hiring and firing authority over the Department head. While this should not change the Task Force's recommendation, it's important to note that the current practice of having the Commission determine the Election Director's appointment has had some controversy. In 2022, the Elections Commission made the decision to not renew the Elections Director, despite praise for his performance as the Director, before ultimately backtracking due to pushback from both the public and City officials. While this episode illustrates that having the Commission be responsible for hiring and firing is not a perfect approach, it is still important that elected officials do not own hiring and firing of the department head in order to ensure appropriate neutral and apolitical leadership over San Francisco's elections.

Changing member removal from for-cause to at-will is appropriate given the Elections Commission's broadly distributed appointing structure. Because appointments are made by multiple independent authorities, the Commission's diverse composition already provides sufficient protection against undue influence, allowing for consistency with the governance commission template.

The Task Force will need to decide whether the Elections Commission should remain in the Charter or move to the Administrative Code.

¹⁰³ Currently, the Charter specifies that commissioner terms end on January 1st; the Task Force should retain this specificity so that a Commissioner's term does not end between the primary and general election in an election cycle.

12. Elections Task Force (Elections)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: Criteria provide no reason to eliminate

Primary Department	REG	Established	1996
Current Type	Other	Meetings (CY24)	0 ¹⁰⁴
Policy Area	Elections	Members (as of May 2025)	9 total seats 9 vacancies (100%)
Annual Cost (FY25)	\$0 ¹⁰⁵		

Redraws the district lines to conform to federal, state, and local law. Convenes every ten years if, following the decennial census, the Director of Elections reports to the Board of Supervisors that existing supervisorial districts no longer meet the requirements of federal, state, and local law ([Charter § 13.110](#)).

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	
	1B. Does this body fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill this legal requirement?	N/A	
2 Inactivity	2A. Is this body inactive (did not meet in last year)?	N/A ¹⁰⁶	
	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)?	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 ¹⁰⁷	
	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	

¹⁰⁴ Periodic meeting body that only convenes every 10 years if needed.

¹⁰⁵ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025. The Task Force did not meet in Fiscal Year 2024-2025, so the cost is \$0.

¹⁰⁶ Because this is a periodic meeting body, definitions of inactivity and borderline inactivity are not applicable here.

¹⁰⁷ Ballot Simplification Committee, Elections Commission

Outcome: Because the answer is “no” to all applicable criteria, consider keeping.

Staff Discussion:

The Task Force should keep the Elections Task Force, consistent with the evaluation criteria outcome and because it plays an important role in ensuring fair supervisorial district boundaries. However, this body has a complex history and has faced several reform efforts, including a [proposed redistricting reform measure](#) that was introduced to the Board of Supervisors but did not reach the November 2024 ballot. The Commission Streamlining Task Force must decide the scope of its recommendations: whether to adopt reforms proposed by others, develop its own recommendations based on the templates, make minor administrative changes, or issue no recommendations and leave changes to future reform efforts.

Background

Federal, state, and local laws require San Francisco’s eleven supervisorial districts to have approximately equal populations so that each person has equal voting power. The US census generates detailed population data every 10 years. This means each jurisdiction must re-district, or reevaluate the boundaries of districts, every ten years at minimum. Many laws at the federal, state, and local level govern this process; California’s [Fair and Inclusive Redistricting for Municipalities and Political Subdivisions \(FAIR MAPS\) Act](#) requires local governments to engage communities in redistricting. San Francisco meets this requirement through the Elections Task Force, also sometimes called the Redistricting Task Force, which voters added to the Charter in 1996.

San Francisco’s Process

Per the Charter, within 60 days after the publication of decennial census, the Director of Elections must report to the Board of Supervisors on whether current district boundaries meet the legal requirement for equal populations. If they do not, the Board convenes the nine-member volunteer Elections Task Force. The Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and Elections Commission each appoint three members. In addition to drawing and adopting a new supervisorial map with districts of equal populations, the Charter also requires the Task Force to draw districts that “reflect communities of interest within the City and County,” although it does not define that term. The Clerk of the Board, the Elections Department, the Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs, the City Attorney’s Office, and outside consultants support this process. Because the redistricting process was added to the Charter in 1996, the City has used it three times: after the 2000, 2010, and 2020 censuses.

Challenges with the Current Process

Redistricting often sparks intense debate. State and local governments have a long history of using redistricting to dilute the voting power of minority groups and political parties. As a result, it is critical that the redistricting process be neutral and unbiased in order for the results to be seen as legitimate. San Francisco has not been exempted from redistricting controversy. Local news outlets described the 2022 redistricting efforts as [“a controversial and chaotic process.”](#) with the Elections Task Force bearing the brunt of the criticism. News articles documenting the work as it unfolded described a series of public meetings with infighting, public outrage, late night walkouts, and the impression that Elections Task Force members were pressured to make specific votes to appease their appointing authorities, calling into question the political neutrality of the process. In its final

report, the Elections Task Force itself noted that it “witnessed unprecedented assaults on its independence by political actors, including purportedly nonpartisan actors, invested in a specific outcome.” Although the Elections Task Force ultimately adopted the map now in use, the process sparked calls for reform.

Commission Streamlining Task Force Possible Recommendations

Since 2022, the Elections Task Force, Elections Commission, the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, and other entities have proposed several ideas for reform.¹⁰⁸ In May 2024, the Board of Supervisors introduced a Charter amendment for the November 2024 ballot that was ultimately withdrawn. While there are many potential options for reform, the Commission Streamlining Task Force should approach any proposed changes cautiously, given the public attention, complex history, and potential impact on San Francisco’s democratic process. Given these considerations, the following recommendations may be most appropriate:

- **Recommend minor changes clarifying administrative support and funding.** The lack of sufficient funding and specific, dedicated administrative support is one of the challenges in the redistricting process.¹⁰⁹ While prior processes were smoother, the amount of support required for the redistricting process exceeds the available capacity of the Office of the Clerk of the Board and the costs of staffing, translation, outreach, etc. need dedicated funding to appropriately resource the Elections Task Force. The Commission Streamlining Task Force may recommend that the City develop a formal administrative plan to ensure adequate funding, staffing, and interdepartmental support for future redistricting cycles. This could include identifying additional staff capacity across departments and securing sufficient funding through the regular budget process.
- **Recommend that the City conduct a future reform process to identify appropriate additional changes.** Most changes to the Elections Task Force should be part of a more comprehensive redistricting reform process, which exceeds the scope of the Commission Streamlining Task Force. This could include changes around appointment structure, number of members, and qualifications. While these components align with the types of changes the Task Force is recommending for other bodies, the complexity of this body requires a robust public engagement process to develop appropriate and specific recommendations. While there is not sufficient time for the Task Force to conduct this process as part of commission streamlining work, the Task Force could recommend that the City do this work prior to the next redistricting process.

¹⁰⁸ See [Elections Task Force 2022 Final Report](#) and the [Elections Commission Redistricting Initiative Report](#).

¹⁰⁹ The Office of the Clerk of the Board’s final report includes an estimate that “the Clerk’s staff spent approximately 5,000 hours supporting the Task Force in various capacities, at a total cost of approximately \$500,000 in salary and benefits, including overtime pay.” See Appendix C in the [Elections Task Force 2022 Final Report](#) for more details.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	9	15 maximum	Yes	No change
Appointing authority	Mayor (3 seats), Board of Supervisors (3 seats), Elections Commission (3 seats)	N/A	N/A	No change
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	Duration of the Task Force	3 years maximum	No	No change
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹¹⁰	No	No change
Qualifications	None	None required ¹¹¹	Yes	No change
Establishing authority	Charter	Administrative Code	No	No change
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	No change

The Elections (Redistricting) Task Force falls under the “Other” category of public bodies, which does not have a template. The advisory committee template is shown in the table above for consideration, but the Commission Streamlining Task Force should not align the body to this template. Because the Elections Task Force convenes periodically and plays a critical role in local elections, it should have retain its current term lengths, remain in the Charter, and have no sunset date.

¹¹⁰ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹¹¹ 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: General City Administration

13. Assessment Appeals Board (Board of Supervisors)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: - Fulfills state-required functions to hear assessment appeals. - Impractical for the Board of Supervisors to fulfill the legal requirement, although legally permissible

Primary Department	BOS	Established	1967
Current Type	Regulatory	Meetings (CY24)	553
Policy Area	General City Administration	Members (as of May 2025)	24 total seats 4 vacancies (17%)
Annual Cost	\$1.7 million ¹¹²		

Hears and adjudicates taxpayers' appeals of the Assessor's Office property assessments ([Administration Code § 2B](#), [Cal. Const. art. XIII, pt. XVI](#), Cal. Revenue and Tax Code §§ [1605\(d\)](#), [1620-1628](#)).

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 fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	Yes	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill this legal requirement?	Yes ¹¹³	
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?	No	

¹¹² Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹¹³ Board of Supervisors, Cal. Const. art. XIII, pt. XVI

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

No

Staff Discussion:

The Assessment Appeals Board (AAB) hears and decides property owners' challenges to the values assigned by the Assessor's Office for property tax purposes. Serving as San Francisco County's local board of equalization, it provides an independent forum for taxpayers to contest assessments, as required by state law. Every county must either establish such a board or have its board of supervisors hear appeals; San Francisco fulfills this obligation through the AAB rather than the Board of Supervisors. As of FY26, the AAB operates three boards with support from approximately nine staff (FTEs) within the Clerk of the Board's Office but functions independently from both the Board and the Assessor.

Assessment appeal filings have surged due to real estate market volatility and declining commercial property values following the COVID-19 pandemic. In FY2023-24, 7,939 appeals were filed, a 174% increase from the previous year and a 458% rise from FY2019-20—marking the highest volume since FY1999-2000 and exceeding the Great Recession peak. State law requires all appeals to be resolved within two years; missing this deadline automatically grants the taxpayer's proposed valuation, risking significant reductions in the City's property tax base. Because property taxes fund roughly one-third of the General Fund, the AAB's timely work is essential to the City's fiscal stability.

The Task Force should keep the AAB because it performs a legally required, specialized, and time-sensitive function that no other body can easily fulfill. While the Board of Supervisors could technically serve as the county board of equalization, doing so would be impractical given the volume of cases, statutory deadlines, and the Board's extensive legislative responsibilities. Retaining an independent AAB ensures due process for taxpayers, compliance with state law, and safeguards the City's revenue stream.

Possible Application of Appeals Commission Templates:

Template component	Current State	Appeals Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	24 ¹¹⁴	3-7	No	No change
Appointing authority	Board of Supervisors	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	N/A	Yes	
Member removal	For cause ¹¹⁵	Members are "removeable" - removal is not at will but is at a lower threshold than for cause removals. Details TBD.	Yes	
Term length	3 years ¹¹⁶	4 years	No	No change
Term limits	None	3 terms	No	No change
Qualifications	Body-level ¹¹⁷	Qualifications required; determined by authorizing legislation	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	TBD	No	No change
Sunset date	None	None Evaluate workload/purpose every 5 years.	Yes	

The Task Force should make exceptions for the Assessment Appeals Board (AAB) and not align it to the appeals board template. Both membership size and term length are governed by state law, leaving little flexibility for modification. The Task Force should also refrain from imposing a four-term limit, as the AAB has struggled to fill vacancies over the last five years and must meet state-mandated hearing deadlines. Finally, while the Task Force has not made a template decision regarding establishing authority, there is no reason to move the

¹¹⁴ State law requires three AAB members to sit on each board, so the San Francisco AAB needs a minimum of nine members. Each of the City's three boards requires five regular members and three alternate members (Administrative Code § 2B.3). The AAB has a larger membership pool to ensure sufficient panels can be convened to hear appeals and meet filing demands.

¹¹⁵ Any member of the AAB may be removed for cause by the Board of Supervisors (Cal. Revenue and Tax Code § 1625).

¹¹⁶ Subject to Sections 1623(d) and (e) of the California Revenue and Taxation Code

¹¹⁷ State law requires each member to have a minimum of five years of professional experience in California as one of the following: a certified public accountant or public accountant, a licensed real estate broker, an attorney, or an accredited property appraiser (Cal. Revenue and Tax Code § 1624).

AAB into the Charter; it should remain in the Administrative Code.

14. City Hall Preservation Advisory Committee (City Administrator's Office)

Criteria-based outcome: Eliminate
Notes: - Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing City staff and other commissions to handle matters - City Hall's ongoing maintenance and stewardship remain institutional priorities that do not depend on the Committee's existence

Primary Department	ADM	Established	2004
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	5
Policy Area	General City Administration	Members (as of May 2025)	5 total seats 1 vacancies (20%)
Annual Cost	\$110k ¹¹⁸		

Advises the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, and others on maintenance, repair, and preservation of City Hall ([Administrative Code §§ 5.240-5.244](#)).

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 fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill 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 ¹¹⁹	
	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 ¹²⁰	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes	Consider combining or eliminating

¹¹⁸ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹¹⁹ Historic Preservation Commission, Arts Commission, Planning Commission

¹²⁰ Narrow topic: preservation of one building

Staff Discussion:

Established following the post-Loma Prieta earthquake renovation of City Hall, the City Hall Preservation Advisory Committee (CHPAC) was created to ensure that the building is preserved and maintained in keeping with its historic and architectural significance. The Committee's Code-mandated duties include reviewing proposed alterations or uses of City Hall facilities, advising on maintenance and budgetary matters, and recommending improvements that enhance the building's historic character. It may also solicit donations of funds or artifacts, maintain records of major repairs and modifications, and submit an annual report to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

In practice, the Committee now has minimal activity, limited public engagement, and little measurable impact on City operations. Over nearly two decades, it has received public comment at fewer than ten meetings. Its recent discussions have primarily concerned minor building maintenance and aesthetic topics, such as flooring materials, reupholstery, and routine updates from the Building Manager, with only occasional briefings from other departments, such as the SFMTA's bicycle and pedestrian safety project near City Hall.

The Task Force should recommend eliminating the City Hall Preservation Advisory Committee, which has outlived its useful purpose. Preservation and maintenance functions can continue to be managed effectively by City Hall Building Management staff, with existing commissions providing oversight where appropriate. The Committee's role overlaps with that of other bodies such as the Planning and Historic Preservation Commissions, which review alterations to designated landmarks, and the Arts Commission, which oversees public art and displays within City facilities. These other public bodies already ensure that City Hall's historic and cultural value is protected. As a designated San Francisco landmark and National Historic Landmark, any proposed alteration to City Hall must be reviewed and approved by the Historic Preservation Commission through a Certificate of Appropriateness under Article 10 of the Planning Code. All work must comply with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties, which require that any changes preserve historic features and, where feasible, be reversible so the building's original integrity remains intact.

Eliminating the Committee would streamline City operations without diminishing preservation standards or public accountability. City Hall's ongoing maintenance and stewardship remain institutional priorities that do not depend on the Committee's existence.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	5	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Mayor	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	Yes ¹²¹	No confirmations	No	Align to template; no confirmations
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	4 years	3 years maximum	No	Align to template; 3-year terms
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹²²	No	Align to template; 4-term limits
Qualifications	For 3 seats ¹²³	None required ¹²⁴	Yes	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; 3-year sunset

Applying the evaluation criteria results in the recommendation to eliminate the City Hall Preservation Advisory Committee. However, if the Task Force chooses to keep the body, it should be aligned with the advisory committee template by removing appointment confirmations, reducing term lengths from four to three years, establishing a four-term limit, and incorporating a sunset provision. The Administrative Code currently requires the Committee to meet at least once per month, but records show it convened only five times in 2004; this requirement should also be eliminated.

¹²¹ A majority vote of the Board of Supervisors

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 At least one member shall have expertise in building maintenance and repair. At least one member shall have expertise in historic building preservation. At least one member shall have expertise in the history of City Hall.

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.

15. Commission on Animal Control and Welfare (City Administrator's Office)

Criteria-based outcome: Eliminate
Notes: Criteria suggest eliminating and allowing Department of Animal Care and Control staff to absorb functions

Primary Department	ADM	Established	1973
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	11
Policy Area	General City Administration	Members (as of May 2025)	7 total seats ¹²⁵ 1 vacancy (14%)
Annual Cost	\$11k ¹²⁶		

Holds hearings and makes recommendations to City government on animal control and welfare-related issues. Works with the Tax Collector and Director of the Animal Care and Control Department to maintain dog licensing procedures and recommend fees. Submits quarterly reports with proposed policies, procedures, and legislation that would further animal welfare to the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the City Administrator ([Health Code § 41.2](#)).

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?	No	
	1B. Does this body fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill 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 ¹²⁷	

¹²⁵ This accounts for voting members only. There are also four City staff who are non-voting members and attend meetings as needed. Refer to the membership information in the template application table for more details.

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

¹²⁷ Animal welfare issues

5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes ¹²⁸	Consider combining or eliminating
--	--------------------	-----------------------------------

Staff Discussion:

The Task Force should eliminate the Commission on Animal Control and Welfare because it has outlived its useful purpose. While the group provides a forum for a segment of the interested public to discuss animal-related issues, it was created before the Department of Animal Care and Control and its code-mandated functions are duplicative with the work of the department. City staff can and do perform the necessary functions of the Commission without needing an advisory body.

The Commission on Animal Control and Welfare is an advisory committee that consists of seven voting members of the public and four City employees who attend as non-voting members.¹²⁹ They take public comments on animal issues—usually from the same 1-5 people each meeting—and submit related policy recommendations to the Board of Supervisors in the form of signed informational letters. The most frequently discussed topics at public meetings include feral cats and live animal markets.

The Commission on Animal Control and Welfare was originally formed in 1971¹³⁰ to advise the Board of Supervisors. At the time, the Department of Animal Care and Control (ACC) did not exist; the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA) had contracted with the City to handle animal control services. However, the SPCA received many complaints from residents and the Board created the Commission on Animal Control and Welfare in part to evaluate the SPCA’s performance. Years later in 1989, the City assumed control of animal services by establishing the ACC department. Despite talks to eliminate the Commission due to the formation of the department, the body continued in an advisory capacity. However, many of its initial areas of responsibility are now handled by ACC, including concerns about aggressive dogs and infectious diseases like rabies and enforcing what is now a robust Health Code. Over time, the Commission’s scope has morphed from that of an advisory body to an advocacy group.

The Commission chair describes it as an “orphan” body, as it is not technically part of any City department. It does not provide input on or approval of ACC’s policies, strategic plans, or budgets. Although other departments have non-voting seats on the Commission, the body does not have a formal role in advising the Department of Public Health (DPH), San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), or Recreation and Park Department (RPD). Examples of the Commission’s work in the past year are submitting policy recommendation letters to the Board of Supervisors regarding climate action, horseback riding in Golden Gate Park, and live animal markets. The Commission’s most noteworthy recent accomplishment is cited as its involvement with the Joint Zoo Committee’s 2024 Animal Welfare Advisors’ Report; though the Commission voted in support of this report, it did not have a role in preparing it.

¹²⁸ Department of Animal Care and Control

¹²⁹ Designees from Animal Care and Control, Public Health, Police, and Recreation and Parks

¹³⁰ Note: The year cited in the Administrative Code is 1973 because the Commission was initially formed, then disbanded, and then reformed in 1973.

As it currently operates, the Commission does not significantly contribute to ACC's strategic goals and priorities. Despite the Administrative Code tasking the body with maintaining dog licensing requirements and recommending fees, it does not seem to be currently performing those functions. Maintaining the Commission requires staff time and resources from ACC and other departments, with commissioners sometimes making duplicative requests for data and reporting that have been shared in prior meetings. In addition, one seat on the Commission reserved for a practicing veterinarian has been vacant since January. This seat is historically very difficult to fill, and the remaining voting seats are held by individuals with an interest in animal issues but who are not required to have expertise in such matters.

No other City body focuses specifically on animal issues, but this topic does not require a formal public body when a department already performs its nominal policy and administrative functions. The Commission's primary value lies in providing a forum for community input, as City staff regularly refer residents with animal-related concerns to it. If ACC wishes to preserve this public engagement role, it could re-establish the body as a passive meeting body, which would allow it to continue to meet and provide input without being codified in law or subject to the formal public meeting requirements that apply to official policy bodies.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	7 voting, 4 non-voting	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	BOS (7 voting seats); ACC, DPH, SFPD, RPD (1 non-voting designee each) ¹³¹	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	No confirmations	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	No explicit provisions ¹³²	At will	No	Align to template; specify at-will removal by appointing authorities in the Admin Code
Term length	2	3 years maximum	Yes	
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹³³	No	Change to 6-term limits
Qualifications	Seat-specific; mandatory ¹³⁴	None required ¹³⁵	Yes	
Establishing authority	Health Code	Administrative Code	No	Align to template; move to Admin Code
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; add 3-year sunset

Applying the evaluation criteria results in the recommendation to eliminate the Commission on Animal Control and Welfare. However, if the Task Force chooses to keep the body, it should align it with the advisory committee template by moving it from the Health Code to the Administrative Code, incorporating at-will member removal, and adding term limits and a sunset clause.

¹³¹ The Board of Supervisors (BOS) appoints the seven voting seats and the Department of Animal Care and Control (ACC), Department of Public Health (DPH), Police Department (SFPD), and Recreation and Park Department (RPD) each appoints one non-voting member, who is either the department director or their designee.

¹³² Any member who misses three regularly scheduled meetings of the Commission during each two-year term without the approval of the Commission given at a public meeting will be deemed to have resigned from the Commission. Apart from this, there are no provisions in the Admin. Code covering member removal.

¹³³ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹³⁴ Six BOS appointees must have an interest and experience in animal matters and one additional BOS appointee must be a licensed veterinarian practicing in San Francisco. The four non-voting members must be designees from ACC, DPH, SFPD, and RPD. In addition, no two members can be representatives or employees of the same organization, corporation, or City department.

¹³⁵ 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, based on feedback from ACC staff, the Task Force might consider adding more specific experience qualifications¹³⁶ for the seven BOS appointees and removing the requirement that one be a practicing veterinarian given the difficulties with filling that seat.

Lastly, the establishing code requires the Commission to submit quarterly reports to the Board of Supervisors, but only a 2021 annual report is published on its website. Although ACC staff have confirmed the existence of at least the January-March 2025 and October-December 2024 quarterly reports, it is unclear whether the Commission is producing reports every quarter. Because a quarterly cadence is likely unnecessary given the Commission's scope, if the body is kept, the Task Force could recommend the submittal of annual reports and that all past reports be posted online for transparency.

¹³⁶ As an example, the Task Force could add a qualification (desirable or required) that they be representatives from animal welfare organizations.

16. Commission Streamlining Task Force (City Administrator's Office)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: - Criteria provide no reason to eliminate - Sunsets in January 2027

Primary Department	ADM	Established	2025
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	0
Policy Area	General City Administration	Members (as of May 2025)	5 total seats 0 vacancies (0%)
Annual Cost	N/A ¹³⁷		

Makes recommendations to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors about ways to modify, eliminate, or combine the City's appointive boards and commissions for the more effective, efficient, and economical administration of City and County government ([Charter § 4.100.1](#)).

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 fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill 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 ¹³⁸	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	No	Consider keeping

¹³⁷ Costs were not provided for the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#)

¹³⁸ Commission streamlining

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria offer no reason for the Commission Streamlining Task Force to eliminate itself. Approved by the voters in the November 2024 election via Proposition E, the Task Force was established to make recommendations to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors about ways to modify, eliminate, or combine the City's appointive boards and commissions for the more effective, efficient, and economical administration of City and County government. The Task Force has authority to introduce ordinances for commissions established by ordinance and to propose Charter amendments for commissions established in the Charter. The Task Force will submit its recommendations by February 1, 2026, and will automatically disband on January 31, 2027.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	5	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Mayor, Board of Supervisors President, City Administrator, Controller, and City Attorney (1 seat each)	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	None	3 years maximum	No	No change
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹³⁹	No	No change
Qualifications	Yes ¹⁴⁰	None required ¹⁴¹	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter	Administrative Code	No	No change
Sunset date	2027	3 years	Yes	

Because the Commission Streamlining Task Force will automatically sunset in January 2027, around the same time that any proposed Charter amendment would take effect, it should simply be allowed to expire and not be modified to conform with any template. Once the body has sunset, the City Attorney will direct the publisher to remove it from the Charter.

¹³⁹ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹⁴⁰ The Mayor's appointee must have expertise in open and accountable government. The Board of Supervisors appointee must represent organized labor representing the public sector. The three City employees must be employees of the named departments.

¹⁴¹ 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. [Committee on Information Technology \(COIT\)](#) (City Administrator's Office)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: Criteria provide no reason to eliminate

Primary Department	ADM	Established	2010
Current Type	Staff Working Group	Meetings (CY24)	6
Policy Area	General City Administration	Members (as of May 2025)	18 total seats 0 vacancies
Annual Cost	\$179k ¹⁴²		

Develops and approves citywide Information and Communication Technology (ICT) plans, annual surveillance reports, and technology budgets and projects for all City departments. Reviews and makes funding recommendations to the Mayor's Office for technology project proposals of citywide significance. Guides and advises City departments on technology policy development, such as surveillance technology,¹⁴³ digital accessibility and inclusion standards, and data governance policies ([Administrative Code § 22A.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 fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill 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 ¹⁴⁴	
	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?	No	

¹⁴² Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁴³ In accordance with Chapter 19B of the Administrative Code

¹⁴⁴ Justice Tracking Information System (JUSTIS) Committee Governance Council (recommended for elimination)

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

N/A

Staff Discussion:

The Task Force should keep the Committee on Information Technology (COIT), as the evaluation criteria give no reason to eliminate it. COIT's citywide view of information technology (IT) governance fills a unique role and it has had a clear impact on citywide policies, IT strategies, and technology budgets.

COIT is primarily a staff working group, with 16 employees from various departments and 2 members of the public who are non-voting members. It was designed to establish citywide technology standards to reduce redundancies among departments, evaluate major IT projects for their strategic value and feasibility, and ensure that the City's digital infrastructure supports its broader policy goals. COIT has two subcommittees: the Budget & Performance Subcommittee, which gives funding recommendations on technology projects, and the Privacy & Surveillance Subcommittee, which evaluates surveillance technologies used by the City but whose scope may soon expand to broader technology policy issues. Before COIT makes a final recommendation on any item, the appropriate subcommittee typically reviews and approves it.

The Committee's coordinated approach has proven helpful as technology has become increasingly important for delivering City services, from public safety systems to online permit processing. Its responsibilities have broadened over time: originally focused on hardware procurement and basic IT infrastructure decisions, COIT now oversees complex initiatives like cybersecurity frameworks, data privacy policies, digital equity and accessibility programs, and emerging technologies like artificial intelligence.

Although COIT is designated as a staff working group because it does not oversee a department, it does give input and formal approval on departmental policies, strategic plans, and budgets. For example, it reviewed and approved the City's 2025-27 Technology Project Budget comprising millions of dollars in technology investments. As part of its responsibilities, COIT also reviews and approves technology project budgets for General Fund departments, evaluating close to 100 potential projects each budget cycle. Procurement requests under COIT's purview include software licensing agreements, hardware acquisitions, and system replacements that require significant financial investment or affect interdepartmental workflows. For example, COIT funded and supported the replacement of the Department of Emergency Management's Computer Aided Dispatch System (CAD), which dispatches 9-1-1 calls to the appropriate emergency personnel in several departments.

In addition, COIT has had a meaningful impact on City policy. One of its main responsibilities is to publish the City's five-year Information Communication Technology (ICT) plan, which provides a strategic overview of citywide infrastructure and potential future investments that help guide departmental decision-making. COIT has also proposed and approved clarifying amendments to the City's ordinance governing surveillance technologies,¹⁴⁵ ensuring robust oversight of surveillance

¹⁴⁵ Chapter 19B of the Administrative Code: Acquisition of Surveillance Technology

systems. And in response to the April 2024 U.S. Department of Justice ruling that required compliance with 2018 Web Content Accessibility Guidelines by 2026, COIT implemented the Digital Accessibility and Inclusion Standard (DAIS) and provided comprehensive training to support all departments in making their digital services accessible to people with disabilities.

Despite its wide-reaching role, COIT has had some difficulties with meeting frequency and public engagement. COIT schedules monthly meetings but canceled half of them in 2024 and is on track to do the same in 2025. However, staff are actively working to complete more meetings by expressly inviting departments to bring items to the Committee and through strategic agenda-setting. There are typically only 1-2 speakers who comment during each meeting, but they tend to be diverse stakeholders speaking on a variety of topics.

COIT addresses a key gap in City administration: without it, departmental technology projects and investments would be more siloed and redundant. Although the evaluation criteria support retaining COIT, the Task Force may choose to subsume the body's functions under the Board of Supervisors, the only public body with both a similar citywide scope and the legal ability to make broad decisions about technology governance. However, the Committee's IT expertise infuses a layer of technical focus that the Board of Supervisors could not adequately replicate.

Possible Application of Governance Commission or Advisory Committee Templates:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?
Number of Members	18	15 maximum	5-7	No
Appointing authority	MYR, BOS, CAO, BOS Clerk, CON, HRC, CIO, CISO ¹⁴⁶	N/A	Mayor	Yes – Advisory
Appointment confirmations	None	None	None	Yes – Both
Member removal	No explicit provisions	At will	At will	No ¹⁴⁷
Term length	2 years (only applicable to 8 seats) ¹⁴⁸	3 years maximum	4 years	Yes – Advisory (partially aligned)
Term limits	None	Case-by-case	3 terms	No
Qualifications	Seat-specific; mandatory ¹⁴⁹	None required	None required	Yes – Both
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	TBD	Yes – Advisory
Sunset date	None	3 years	None	Yes – Governance
Hiring and firing authority	None	N/A	Consultative responsibilities only	Yes – Advisory
Contract approval authority	Advisory ¹⁵⁰	N/A	Retain status quo	Yes – Governance
Budget approval authority	Yes ¹⁵¹	N/A	Yes	Yes – Governance

¹⁴⁶ COIT consists of eight permanent members (or their designees): the Mayor, Board of Supervisors President, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, Controller, City Administrator, Human Rights Commission Director, Chief Information Officer, and Chief Information Security Officer. In addition, there are eight non-permanent members who are nominated by the CAO and approved by the permanent members, one from each of the City's major service areas: Public Protection, Human Welfare and Neighborhood Development, Community Health, Culture and Recreation, and General Administration and Finance; and three members representing the Public Works, Transportation, and Commerce service area. There are also two non-voting members selected by the other members who must have IT and technology governance expertise and must not be City employees.

¹⁴⁷ Although member removal defaults to at will if there are no explicit provisions in the code, the Task Force should recommend specifying at will removal for the two non-voting members and any designees.

¹⁴⁸ The eight CAO appointees are subject to two-year terms; the others are permanent members.

¹⁴⁹ Mix of City staff and members of the public with technology expertise. Refer to footnote 146 for details.

¹⁵⁰ COIT may approve contracts, but they may also need to go before the Board of Supervisors for final approval.

¹⁵¹ COIT approves departmental technology budgets as well as the Department of Technology budget.

Employee discipline authority	No role	N/A	No role	Yes – Both
-------------------------------	---------	-----	---------	------------

There is no template for staff working groups. However, the Task Force may choose to align the Committee on Information Technology (COIT) with the advisory committee template, the governance commission template, a mix of both, or neither. Several elements of those templates do not apply to this body. Most notably, codifying at-will member removal, term lengths, and term limits are irrelevant because most members are City employees serving by virtue of their positions. The two public members currently serve two-year terms; to align with the Task Force’s standard 12-year maximum across both templates, a six-term limit could be added for those seats.

If the Task Force applied the advisory committee template, the number of COIT members would already be more closely aligned to the templated 15 maximum. As such, the Task Force could consider removing 1-3 seats from the roster.¹⁵² COIT staff have indicated that the current size and makeup of the Committee is effective for making citywide IT governance decisions. However, the frequency of meetings and speed with which the body makes decisions may be improved if there are fewer high-level members for which to coordinate schedules. In addition, the Committee’s work is ongoing and would not necessitate a sunset clause as suggested by the advisory committee template.

Because COIT has some contract and budget approval authority, it naturally aligns with the governance commission template, though it does not oversee a department. However, there are limited practical opportunities for the Task Force to apply this template. Reducing the number of members from 18 to a maximum of 7 is impractical given COIT’s citywide scope and the potential impacts of its decisions. Instead, it would be prudent to keep a diverse array of voices at the table. As there are no specific department heads under COIT’s purview, hiring and firing authority should not be conferred as suggested by the template. If the Task Force chooses to apply the governance commission template, the main possibility for template alignment would be to expand the number of Mayor-appointed seats to more closely mirror the appointment structure of a governance commission, which could also aid broader Mayoral initiatives for technology transformation.¹⁵³

¹⁵² For example, if discounting the two non-voting seats for a total count of 16 seats, the Task Force might remove one of the three seats representing the Public Works, Transportation, and Commerce service area. If counting the two non-voting seats, the Task Force might remove two of those Public Works, Transportation, and Commerce seats in addition to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors or their designee, which is a seat with potentially less relevance to citywide technology governance than the other members.

¹⁵³ As a possible way to configure this, two of the three members representing the Public Works, Transportation, and Commerce service area could be converted to Mayor-appointed, at-large City staff.

18. Law Library Board of Trustees (Law Library)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep but eliminate from Charter
Notes: - Legally required to exist - Should be deleted from the Charter, as this is a state body

Primary Department	LLB	Established	1870
Current Type	Governance	Meetings (CY24)	4
Policy Area	General City Administration	Members (as of May 2025)	12 total seats 0 vacancies
Annual Cost	N/A ¹⁵⁴		

Mandated by state law to oversee the policy, actions, and affairs of the San Francisco Law Library ([Charter § 8.103](#)).

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 ¹⁵⁵	Keep
	1B. Does this body fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill this legal requirement?	No ¹⁵⁶	
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 ¹⁵⁷	

¹⁵⁴ The San Francisco Law Library declined to submit financial data for the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#). As an autonomous agency under state law, it was not legally required to respond.

¹⁵⁵ California State Assembly Statute 1869-70, Ch. 173, § 1, page 235, uncoded; and CA Business and Professions Code 6363.

¹⁵⁶ Because the Law Library Board of Trustees is not itself a City body, it cannot be combined with City bodies.

¹⁵⁷ Narrow topic: Law Library

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

No

Consider keeping

Staff Discussion:

California law requires each county to maintain a law library governed by an independent board of trustees and funded primarily through court filing fees rather than general tax revenues. These libraries provide specialized legal information, such as statutes, regulations, treatises, and court forms, and support access to justice for lawyers, judges, public agencies, and especially self-represented litigants.

San Francisco's Law Library, established in 1870, is governed by a twelve-member Board of Trustees (BOT) consisting of seven attorneys, four judges, and the Mayor. The Board approves the annual Law Library budget, oversees finances, and works with the director on all departmental policies and strategic planning. Meeting agenda topics typically include discussion of library operations, finances, staffing issues, events, special projects, and community access to justice issues.

The BOT is not a City body and state law sets its powers and duties. California Business and Professions Code § 6361 requires the City to provide sufficient facilities unless the BOT determines it has funds to do so itself. However, the City has given itself additional obligations under Charter Section 8.103 to fund at least the salaries of the Librarian, Assistant Librarian, and Bookbinder and to provide suitable quarters, utilities, and basic operating support. In addition, if the state amends the Business and Professions Code and changes either the general law library requirements or the BOT's structure, powers, or duties in the future, the City would be out of compliance.

The Task Force cannot eliminate the BOT because it is required under state law, but it could recommend removing the Charter provisions referencing the Law Library. Doing so would not affect the Library's existence but would ensure the City's ongoing compliance with state law and could clarify that it is a state-governed entity rather than a City commission. Removing it from the Charter might reduce transparency about the City's ongoing obligations and the Mayor's role on the Board, but it could also relieve the City of the locally imposed salary requirement – although that is a policy call beyond the scope of the Commission Streamlining Task Force.

Staff considered combining the Law Library BOT and the Library Commission to create a unified library oversight body. While this might appear to simplify governance, it would conflict with state law. The BOT operates under a separate statutory framework (Business and Professions Code § 6300 et seq.) and oversees a trust-funded legal research institute serving distinct users and purposes. The Library Commission governs the City's general public library system. Combining the two would blur missions, funding, and legal authority.

Possible Application of Governance Commission Template:

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	12	5-7	No	No change
Appointing authority	LLB Board of Trustees (7 seats), Superior Court (4 ex-officio seats), and Mayor (1 ex-officio seat) ¹⁵⁸	Mayor	No	No change
Appointment confirmations	None	None ¹⁵⁹	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	None	4 years	No	No change
Term limits	None	3 terms	No	No change
Qualifications	Seat-specific ¹⁶⁰	None required ¹⁶¹	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter; originally state law	TBD	No	None
Sunset date	None	None	Yes	
Hiring and Firing Authority	Yes – Law Librarian ¹⁶²	Consultative responsibilities only	No	No change
Contract approval authority	No	Retain status quo	Yes	
Budget approval authority	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Employee discipline authority	No role	No role ¹⁶³	Yes	

Because the Law Library Board of Trustees is governed primarily by state law, the Task Force should not align it with the governance commission template.

¹⁵⁸ Per state law, the Board must consist of the Mayor, the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, three judges of the Appellate Department of the Superior Court (ex-officio), and seven attorney members of the San Francisco bar. Members are appointed by the Board of Trustees itself.

¹⁵⁹ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

¹⁶⁰ Seven attorney members of the San Francisco bar, four judges, and the Mayor

¹⁶¹ 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.

¹⁶² Pursuant to state law, the Board appoints and may remove at-will a Librarian, who is its executive officer.

¹⁶³ Exceptions if this is currently required by law

19. Refuse Rate Board (Controller's Office)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: Criteria provide no reason to eliminate

Primary Department	CON	Established	1932; 2022 ¹⁶⁴
Current Type	Regulatory	Meetings (CY24)	4
Policy Area	General City Administration	Members (as of May 2025)	3 total seats 0 vacancies (0%)
Annual Cost	\$154k ¹⁶⁵		

Sets refuse rates (the fees residents and businesses pay for trash, recycling, and compost collection and disposal). Reviews the costs and operations of San Francisco refuse collectors and adopts rates with the goal of maintaining rate stability and accountability ([Health Code § 290.6](#)).

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 fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill 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?	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>			

¹⁶⁴ The 1932 Refuse Ordinance created the regulatory scheme for refuse collection in San Francisco and included the creation of the Rate Board. In 2022, Proposition F passed, reforming the rate-setting process. This included changing the membership structure of the Refuse Rates Board and re-establishing it as a key oversight mechanism.

¹⁶⁵ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025. The Refuse Rate Board is a periodic meeting body, meaning it only meets when needed to set rates.

Staff Discussion:

In June 2022, San Francisco voters passed Proposition F to reform the City's refuse rate-setting process, which included reconstituting and redefining the Refuse Rate Board. The refuse rate setting process determines how much San Francisco businesses and residents pay for their trash and recycling services. The Refuse Rate Board's role is to hold public hearings to review recommended rate adjustments from the Refuse Rates Administrator (a new role in the Controller's Office), adopt new rate orders to set two-to-five-year rates, and to monitor financial and operational performance of the City's waste hauler.

The Board of Supervisors placed Proposition F on the ballot in response to corruption charges against then Public Works Director Mohammed Nuru, which included a long-running bribery scheme with the City's waste hauler, Recology. Investigation and litigation resulted in two settlements, including a \$101.5 million settlement with Recology to refund overcharges to ratepayers. Before Proposition F, the City's waste hauler would propose new rates to the Director of Public Works, who would then manage a process where the Department of Public Works (DPW) would gather public input through hearings and issue a report and recommendation. The Rate Board, established via ordinance in 1932, would then be responsible for approving the recommendation from the Director of Public Works. This process was problematic: the Director of Public Works also sat on the Rate Board. In practice, this meant the process involved limited public oversight and the Director had significant control over the proposed rates, which contributed to concerns about transparency and accountability.

Proposition F sought address these concerns in part by empowering the Refuse Rate Board as a key oversight mechanism in the new rate-setting process. As a result, the Board serves a unique purpose for the City and plays an important role in restoring and maintaining public trust in refuse rate administration. The new Refuse Rate Board replaced the seat formerly occupied by the Controller with a rate-payer representative and moved the rate-setting oversight and reporting process from DPW to the Controller's Office. This means that currently, the City Administrator (chair), the General Manager of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, and a Mayor-appointed ratepayer representative sit on the Board. The Refuse Rate Board is required to meet annually and meets more frequently during rate-setting years. Since the passage of Proposition F, the City has completed two rate-setting processes, the first in August 2023 and the second in June 2025.

The criteria-based outcome is to keep the Refuse Rate Board. The body serves one clearly defined function yet is broadly impactful for the City; solid waste removal is a critical government service that impacts anyone who lives or works in San Francisco. Furthermore, Recology functions as a monopoly in the City, which means that without a robust rate-setting process, it could overcharge San Franciscans with little City recourse. The Refuse Rate Board's work over the past three years has highlighted the body's value. The most recent rate-setting process resulted in over \$70 million in savings to ratepayers as compared to Recology's proposal and in 2024 its rate monitoring process helped uncover a \$24 million overcharge that Recology refunded to ratepayers, according to estimates from the Refuse Rates Administrator. The Refuse Rate Board is now an important part of a new transparent process that ensures fair rates for both residents and the company, and there is no reason to eliminate it.

Possible Application of Governance Commission Template:

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	3	5-7	No	None
Appointing authority	Mayor, City Administrator, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission ¹⁶⁶	Mayor	No	None
Appointment confirmations	None ¹⁶⁷	None ¹⁶⁸	Yes	
Member removal	At will (Mayoral appointee only)	At will	Yes	
Term length	None	4 years	No	Partially align to template; add one rate-setting cycle term length for public member
Term limits	None	3 terms	No	Align to template; add 3-term limit for public member
Qualifications	Seat-specific ¹⁶⁹	None required ¹⁷⁰	Yes	
Establishing authority	Health Code ¹⁷¹	TBD	No	Add to Administrative Code
Sunset date	None	None	Yes	
Hiring and Firing Authority	N/A	Consultative responsibilities only	N/A	
Contract approval authority	N/A	Retain status quo	N/A	
Budget approval authority	N/A	Yes	N/A	

¹⁶⁶ The Ratepayer Representative (Mayoral Appointee) shall be recommended by the Utility Reform Network or any other entity that is dedicated to protecting ratepayers that the Board of Supervisors has designated by resolution.

¹⁶⁷ Because it is not otherwise stated, appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

¹⁶⁸ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

¹⁶⁹ City Administrator or designee, General Manager of the SFPUC or designee, and the public member must have professionally relevant experience in operations, finance, utilities regulation, the refuse industry, or other related fields.

¹⁷⁰ 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.

¹⁷¹ Voter-approved, so changes require going back to the voters

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Employee discipline authority	N/A	No role ¹⁷²	N/A	

The Refuse Rate Board combines features of a staff working group and a regulatory body. Two of its three members are City officials, and it holds authority to set refuse collection rates. Because no templates exist for regulatory bodies or staff working groups, staff compared the Refuse Rate Board to the governance commission template. The Task Force should keep the Board's current membership size and appointing structure but partially align it to the governance commission template by setting the public member's term to one rate-setting cycle (which occurs once every two to five years) and limiting that member to three terms. The Task Force should also amend the Administrative Code to include language describing the Refuse Rate Board, consistent with the Task Force's direction that all public bodies appear in either the Charter or the Administrative Code.

¹⁷² Exceptions if this is currently required by law

20. State Legislation Committee (Mayor's Office)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: Criteria provide no reason to eliminate

Primary Department	MYR	Established	1939
Current Type	Staff Working Group	Meetings (CY24)	8
Policy Area	General City Administration	Members (as of May 2025)	7 total seats 0 vacancies (0%)
Annual Cost	\$58k ¹⁷³		

Evaluates how proposed state laws may impact San Francisco's residents, operations, and policy priorities, and recommends whether the City should support or oppose specific bills ([Administrative Code Article III, § 5.5 – 5.11](#)).

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 fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill 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?	No	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?		
<i>Outcome: Because the answer is "no" to all applicable criteria, consider keeping.</i>			

¹⁷³ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria provide no reason to eliminate the State Legislation Committee (SLC). The SLC coordinates how the City and County of San Francisco responds to bills pending before the California State Legislature, ensuring the City takes informed, unified, and strategic positions. Departments present proposed state legislation for review, share their subject matter expertise, and answer questions before the Committee votes on whether to recommend that the City support, oppose, or monitor a bill.

The SLC is a Staff Working Group composed of seven employees representing five departments and no members of the public. All elected offices participate through representatives from the Mayor's Office, the City Attorney, the Controller, the Assessor, the Treasurer, and two members of the Board of Supervisors. Without the SLC, each office would need to evaluate legislation independently, duplicating and creating inconsistent messaging. Jointly developed positions carry more gravitas in Sacramento than those issued by individual offices.

While public comment at SLC meetings is rare, the Committee provides transparency into how the City forms its legislative positions. The SLC could theoretically function as a passive meeting body, which would reduce its administrative requirements. However, removing the SLC from the Administrative Code could weaken interdepartmental coordination and diminish the City's ability to influence state legislation. Because nearly all other California cities and counties maintain similar legislation coordination bodies, retaining the SLC ensures San Francisco remains aligned and effective in shaping state policy.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	7	15 maximum	N/A	
Appointing authority	Board of Supervisors (2 seats) and 1 seat each Mayor, Assessor, City Attorney, Controller, and Treasurer/Tax Collector	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	N/A	
Member removal	At will	At will	N/A	
Term length	None	3 years maximum	N/A	
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹⁷⁴	N/A	
Qualifications	None	None required ¹⁷⁵	N/A	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	N/A	
Sunset date	None	3 years	N/A	

The State Legislation Committee is a Staff Working Group. Since there is no staff working group template, staff assessed whether conformance to the advisory committee template is appropriate in the table above for the Task Force's consideration. Staff do not recommend aligning the SLC to the advisory committee template. The section of the Administrative Code has not been updated since 1939, so the City Attorney's Office will propose some minor clean-up in the Task Force's future legislation.

¹⁷⁴ Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹⁷⁵ 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.

21. Sweatfree Procurement Advisory Group (City Administrator's Office)

Criteria-based outcome: Eliminate			
Notes: - Criteria suggest eliminating the body - City staff possess the expertise needed to administer and enforce the City's sweatfree procurement laws			
Primary Department	ADM	Established	2005
Current Type	Advisory	Meetings (CY24)	3
Policy Area	Human Rights	Members (as of May 2025)	11 total seats 5 vacancies (45%)
Annual Cost	\$22k ¹⁷⁶		

Evaluates the implementation, administration, and enforcement of the Sweatfree Contracting Ordinance. Evaluates the industries engaged in the manufacture and sale of goods to determine whether contracts for any goods in addition to apparel, garments, and textiles should be targeted for enforcement. Determines how the City and County may maximize its purchase of goods produced in San Francisco ([Labor and Employment Code § 151.7](#)).

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 fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill this legal requirement?	No	
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	Consider eliminating or modifying
	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?	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 ¹⁷⁷	

¹⁷⁶ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁷⁷ Sweatfree contracting

5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes ¹⁷⁸	Consider combining or eliminating
--	--------------------	-----------------------------------

Staff Discussion:

Established in 2005, the Sweatfree Procurement Advisory Group (SPAG) advises the City on evaluating whether contracts for goods, including apparel and garments, should be considered for enforcement review of the City's sweatfree procurement laws. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, SPAG met monthly, but the group is now supposed to meet quarterly¹⁷⁹ due to quorum¹⁸⁰ and membership challenges. Over the last three years, SPAG members have repeatedly asked its appointing authorities (the Mayor and Board of Supervisors) to fill the body's numerous vacancies, but no new appointments have been made. The Administrative Code requires SPAG to meet a minimum of once per year.

While SPAG initially played a significant role in providing subject matter expertise for the City, it has outlived its useful life. Over the past twenty years, City departments and staff have developed sufficient expertise. SPAG does not perform investigations to ensure manufacturers comply with labor and human rights standards. The City holds a contract with the Worker Rights Consortium (WRC), an international nonprofit that conducts global, on-site factory inspections and recommends remedies for violations. SPAG does not have approval authority over the City's contract with WRC. If the Task Force eliminated SPAG, the City's partnership with WRC and enforcement of sweatfree procurement standards would continue uninterrupted.

San Francisco is one of seven jurisdictions in the Sweatfree Purchasing Consortium,¹⁸¹ yet most peer jurisdictions do not have an equivalent body codified in law. For example, the City of Los Angeles, which has historical ties to the garment industry, requires contractors to follow a sweatfree code of conduct but does not have an advisory group. The City of New York, another jurisdiction with historical ties to the garment industry, has ethical contracting policies but neither a specific sweatfree procurement ordinance nor an advisory body.

Based on meeting minutes from 2024 and 2025, SPAG's recent activity has been largely informational rather than operational. Most meetings consist of status updates from the WRC on factory investigations and corrective actions, and from the Office of Contract Administration (OCA) on contract compliance and administrative improvements. SPAG members mainly receive these reports, ask clarifying questions, and offer limited feedback, but there is little evidence the group initiates policy changes, drafts recommendations, or leads new projects.

¹⁷⁸ Office of Labor Standards Enforcement (OLSE) and Office of Contract Administration (OCA) staff

¹⁷⁹ In 2024, SPAG met in Feb, Jun, and Oct. In 2025, meetings have occurred in May, Jun, and Sep. This means seven months elapsed between the October 2024 and May 2025 meetings. No additional meetings are scheduled for 2025; the next meetings are scheduled for Jan 8, 2026 and April 9, 2026.

¹⁸⁰ SPAG's bylaws define quorum as "a simple majority of the number of serving members."

¹⁸¹ Jurisdictions in the Sweatfree Purchasing Consortium include Austin, TX; Berkeley, CA; Los Angeles, CA; Madison, WI; Portland, OR; and Seattle, WA.

"Members," Sweatfree Purchasing Consortium. <https://buysweatfree.org/members>.

Recent improvements to the City's sweatfree procurement process, such as modernized supplier disclosure forms, tracking for incomplete factory data, and coordination with other jurisdictions to share monitoring resources, were led by OCA and not by SPAG. Recurring SPAG agenda topics, including incomplete supplier data, WRC updates, and interjurisdictional coordination, have appeared across multiple meetings with incremental progress but no new direction. In mid-2025, SPAG's discussions shifted toward responding to the proposed Open for Business Contract Streamlining Act, including potential impacts on the ordinance, advocacy tactics, and reputational risks if oversight were reduced.

Overall, SPAG's recent work has focused on receiving updates and maintaining communication rather than advancing substantive policy or operational changes. Given that City departments and the WRC now perform the core functions SPAG once provided, the Task Force should consider whether maintaining this advisory body continues to add value to the City's sweatfree procurement efforts.

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	Mayor (5 seats), Board of Supervisors (5 seats), Controller (1 seat)	N/A	N/A	
Appointment confirmations	None	No confirmations	Yes	
Member removal	At will	At will	Yes	
Term length	None	3 years maximum	No	
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ¹⁸²	No	
Qualifications	Seat-specific ¹⁸³	None required ¹⁸⁴	Yes	
Establishing authority	Labor and Employment Code	Administrative Code	No	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	

The criteria-based outcome is to consider eliminating the Sweatfree Procurement Advisory Group. If the Task Force chooses to keep the body, it should align SPAG to the advisory committee template by adding three-year term lengths, four-term limits, moving to the Administrative Code, and adding a three-year sunset date.

¹⁸² Handled on a case-by-case basis if the body re-authorized. Suggested maximum service per member is 12 years total (4 terms).

¹⁸³ Mayoral and Board of Supervisors appointees must have significant experience in at least one of the following areas: representing employees in labor matters, acquiring goods or services for a public entity, and advocating for human rights or the poor. The Controller's appointee must have significant experience in finance, financial auditing, or accounting.

¹⁸⁴ 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: Public Integrity

22. [Ethics Commission](#) (Ethics)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep			
Notes: Criteria provide no reason to eliminate			
Primary Department	ETH	Established	1993
Current Type	Governance/ Regulatory	Meetings (CY24)	9
Policy Area	General City Administration	Members (as of May 2025)	5 total seats 0 vacancies (0%)
Annual Cost	\$162k ¹⁸⁵		

Responsible for the independent and impartial administration and enforcement of laws related to political campaigns, lobbying, conflicts of interest, governmental ethics, open meetings, and public records ([Charter § 15.100](#), [Appendix 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 fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill 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 ¹⁸⁶	
	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	

¹⁸⁵ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁸⁶ Sunshine Ordinance Task Force

Staff Discussion:

The evaluation criteria do not provide any reason to eliminate the Ethics Commission. Created by voters in 1993, the Ethics Commission oversees a department of the same name which has a budget of \$6.5 million and over 25 employees (FTEs) for FY26. Through its staff, the Commission is responsible for the independent and impartial administration and enforcement of laws related to campaign finance, public financing of candidates, governmental ethics, conflicts of interests, and registration and reporting by lobbyists, campaign consultants, permit consultants, and major developers. Prior to the creation of the Ethics Commission in 1993, these functions were handled by separate entities including the District Attorney, City Attorney, Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and City Registrar.

In the last year, the Commission reviewed and approved several large penalties for violations of campaign finance, lobbying, and filing laws, as well as new regulations on campaign disclaimers and consultant filings.

The Commission also placed a measure on the March 2024 ballot (Proposition D), which amended several provisions of the Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code.¹⁸⁷ This power is unique among the City's appointed boards and commissions. Only the Ethics Commission and MTA Board of Directors have the authority to place measures on the ballot, and only the Ethics Commission has ever exercised this authority.¹⁸⁸ While voters routinely approve Ethics measures by wide margins, measures drafted by the Ethics Commission may receive less public input and scrutiny than measures drafted by the Board of Supervisors. Each Board measure must undergo a rigorous public process spanning several months with extensive public input, including a 30-day hold, usually several committee hearings, and consideration by the full Board of Supervisors. The Task Force should strongly consider whether it is appropriate and desirable for a policy body other than the Board of Supervisors to have the power to place a measure before voters. If the Task Force eliminates the Ethics Commission's ability to directly place measures before voters, it could instead allow the Ethics Commission, by four-fifths vote, to introduce potential ballot measures to the Board of Supervisors for consideration. The Task Force could require any potential ballot measure to receive a Board hearing within a certain timeframe (e.g., sixty days), but the Board of Supervisors should retain the authority to amend language and decide whether or not to place the measure before voters.

The Ethics Commission also adjudicates matters concerning alleged violations of the City's public records and meeting laws, which are codified in the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Most Sunshine Ordinance matters heard by the Ethics Commission are referred by the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF). However, the Ethics Commission does not have the capacity or legal jurisdiction to hear all Sunshine Ordinance complaints and should not be combined with SOTF.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁷ By a four-fifths vote, the Commission may place on the ballot at the next succeeding general election any City ordinance that the Board of Supervisors is empowered to pass relating to conflicts of interest, campaign finance, lobbying, campaign consultants, or governmental ethics.

¹⁸⁸ The Ethics Commission has placed five measures on the ballot in its history. Source: San Francisco Ballot Propositions Database https://data.sfgov.org/City-Management-and-Ethics/San-Francisco-Ballot-Propositions-Database-Histori/88s2-6ua9/about_data

¹⁸⁹ The Ethics Commission does not have jurisdiction over violations by lower-level City employees or over unintentional/non-willful violations.

Possible Application of Governance Commission Template:

Template component	Current State	Governance Commission Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	5	5-7	Yes	
Appointing authority	Mayor, Board of Supervisors, City Attorney, District Attorney, and Assessor-Recorder (1 seat each)	Mayor	No	No change
Appointment confirmations	None	None ¹⁹⁰	Yes	
Member removal	For-cause or via recall election	At will	No	Align to template; change to at-will removal; eliminate members removal by recall election
Term length	6 years	4 years	No	No change
Term limits	No person may serve more than one six-year term, until six years after the expiration of the term.	3 terms	No	No change
Qualifications	3 seat-specific requirements ¹⁹¹	None required ¹⁹²	Yes	
Establishing authority	Charter	TBD	No	No change
Sunset date	None	None	Yes	
Hiring and Firing Authority	Sole authority to appoint and remove the Executive Director	Consultative responsibilities only	No	No change
Contract approval authority	None	Retain status quo	Yes	
Budget approval authority	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Employee discipline authority	Holds hearings when elective and certain appointed officers are suspended for official misconduct.	No role ¹⁹³	No	No change

¹⁹⁰ Appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)

¹⁹¹ Mayoral appointee: background in public information and public meetings. City Attorney appointee: background in law as it relates to government ethics.

Assessor appointee: background in campaign finance. District Attorney and Board of Supervisors appointees shall be broadly representative of the general public.

¹⁹² 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.

¹⁹³ Exceptions if this is currently required by law

The Ethics Commission differs from the governance commission template in several areas, including appointing authority, term lengths, term limits, and hiring, firing, and employee discipline authority. The Task Force should deviate from the template in these areas to preserve the Commission's independence from political influence and uphold its critical role as an impartial enforcer of the City's ethics and transparency laws. Political insulation is essential to maintaining public trust in the Commission's oversight of elected officials and City departments. Split appointments protect the Commission from undue influence by any one elected official/appointing authority. A six-year term is appropriate because it allows commissioners sufficient time to develop expertise and fully understand the complex issues before the body, while current term limits allow rotation of members over time. Hiring/firing the Executive Director insulates this position and the department from political considerations. Finally, the Ethics Commission is the appropriate body to hold hearings when elective and other officers are suspended for official misconduct and should retain this authority.

Changing member removal from for-cause to at-will may be appropriate given the Ethics Commission's broadly distributed appointing structure, which protects against undue influence by any one elected official. The Task Force should also eliminate the provision allowing Ethics Commissioners to be removed by recall election, which would further protect members from political pressure.

The Task Force should keep the Ethics Commission in the Charter, recognizing its unique purpose as a safeguard of integrity and accountability in City government.

23. Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (Board of Supervisors)

Criteria-based outcome: Keep
Notes: Criteria provide no reason to eliminate

Primary Department	BOS	Established	1993
Current Type	Regulatory	Meetings (CY24)	22
Policy Area	General City Administration	Members (as of May 2025)	11 total seats 1 vacancy (9%)
Annual Cost	\$300k ¹⁹⁴		

Hears violations of the Sunshine Ordinance. Advises the Board of Supervisors and provides information to City departments on appropriate ways in which to implement the Sunshine Ordinance to ensure that deliberations of commissions and other agencies of the City and County are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review ([Administrative Code § 67.3](#)).

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 fulfill some function required by state or federal law?	No	
	1C. Could either another body or City staff fulfill 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 ¹⁹⁵	
	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 ¹⁹⁷	
	5B. Could those interests be adequately represented by some other body or City department?	Yes ¹⁹⁸	Consider combining or eliminating

¹⁹⁴ Per the Budget and Legislative Analyst's [Financial Analysis report](#) issued September 1, 2025

¹⁹⁵ Ethics Commission

¹⁹⁷ Sunshine Ordinance

¹⁹⁸ Ethics Commission

Staff Discussion:

The Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF) oversees the City's implementation of the Sunshine Ordinance, which ensures open meeting and improved access to public records. The SOTF develops goals for practical and timely enforcement of the ordinance, proposes amendments, raises implementation concerns to the Board of Supervisors, and may refer potential violations of the Sunshine Ordinance or Brown Act to the Ethics Commission. SOTF may also issue public reports evaluating departmental compliance with open government laws. In 2024, SOTF received 62 new complaints, resolved 73, and reduced its backlog of outstanding cases from 94 to 21.¹⁹⁹

SOTF has five committees: Complaint; Compliance and Amendments; Education, Outreach, and Training; Rules; and ad hoc committees. The full body meets monthly, while its committees meet at varying frequencies. The Complaint and Compliance and Amendments Committees typically address delayed or incomplete public records responses, transparency issues, proposed ordinance amendments, and related matters. These committees frequently meet for four or five hours. The Education, Outreach and Training Committee has met three times and canceled four times since January 2025, while the Rules Committee has not met since October 2022, and the Ad Hoc Committee has not convened since December 2019.

Although the Sunshine Ordinance does not require the SOTF to hear all submitted complaints, the body currently does so, often resulting in multiple levels of review for a single issue.²⁰⁰ Staff considered whether Sunshine Ordinance compliance responsibilities could be combined with other entities focused on government accountability and transparency and found that it would be overly burdensome to combine SOTF into other bodies. While noting that SOTF's oversight functions align with the Ethics Commission's existing mandate²⁰¹ and that the Ethics Commission already hears some Sunshine Ordinance violations, merging SOTF into the Ethics Commission is inadvisable. Assigning the Ethics Commission sole oversight over Sunshine Ordinance compliance could pull the Commission away from other high-level priorities due to the volume of complaints submitted. The Ethics Commission also does not currently have jurisdiction over violations by lower-level City employees or over unintentional/non-willful violations. SOTF plays a well-known role in ensuring Sunshine Ordinance compliance that San Franciscans trust and rely on.

¹⁹⁹ Sunshine Ordinance Task Force [2024 Annual Report](#), p. 3

²⁰⁰ Individuals may file a lawsuit against the City rather than going through the SOTF.

²⁰¹ To provide impartial and independent administration and enforcement of City integrity, accountability, and transparency laws.

Possible Application of Advisory Committee Template:

Template component	Current State	Advisory Committee Template	Currently Aligned?	Proposal
Number of Members	11 voting members, 2 non-voting members	15 maximum	Yes	
Appointing authority	Board of Supervisors	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	
Term limits	None	Case-by-case ²⁰²	No	Add term limits
Qualifications	Mandatory body-level ²⁰³	None required ²⁰⁴	Yes	Remove qualifications
Establishing authority	Administrative Code ²⁰⁵	Administrative Code	Yes	
Sunset date	None	3 years	No	Align to template; add a 3-year sunset date

The evaluation criteria suggest potentially eliminating the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force or combining it with the Ethics Commission. If the Task Force chooses to keep SOTF, it may consider aligning two components with the advisory committee template: term limits and a sunset date. If two-year terms are retained, a four-term limit should be added; if the Task Force recommends a three-year term instead, the term

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 Three members must be nominated by the local chapter of the Society of Professional Journalists of which one must be an attorney, one must be a local journalist, and one must be a journalist from a racial/ethnic-minority-owned news organization or focus on issues impacting minority racial or ethnic communities or works at a publication whose target audience is a minority racial or ethnic community. One member must be from the League of Women Voters. Four members must be members of the public who have demonstrated interest or experience in the issues of citizen access and participation in local government, and an additional member who is physically handicapped. Two members must have experience in consumer advocacy. The Mayor or their designee and the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors or their designee serve as non-voting members. The City Attorney or an attorney from that office serve as the body's legal advisor.

²⁰⁴ 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.

²⁰⁵ Voter-approved, so changes require going back to the voters

limit should be four terms. The Task Force may also add a sunset date to allow the Board of Supervisors to confirm the purpose, necessity, and significance of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force on a regular basis.

Although not specifically addressed in the advisory committee template, the Task Force should consider eliminating SOTF's mandatory qualification and nomination requirements. While the requirements were well-intentioned and designed to ensure subject matter expertise and representation from journalism, advocacy, and civic organizations, they are overly narrow and exclude individuals who could effectively serve on the Task Force. The specificity of the nomination and professional background criteria narrows the field of eligible applicants, slows the appointment process, and limits flexibility for appointing authorities. Simplifying or removing these rigid qualification requirements would broaden participation while still ensuring that members bring meaningful perspectives on open government. Removing the mandatory qualifications would also mirror the approach used for the Board of Appeals, which has benefited from a broad range of expertise.