

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chair Ed Harrington and Members, Commission Streamlining Task Force
c/o Rachel Alonso, Project Director, Office of the City Administrator

FROM: David Pilpel

DATE: May 29, 2025

RE: More Thoughts on Commission Streamlining

Reflecting further, it also seems to me that a couple examples of how streamlining might work, including your upcoming decisions, might be helpful. To that end, I discuss below the fictitious San Francisco Fish and Game Commission and the real (former) Food Security Task Force.

Assuming some adopted goals or vision document, we now examine the Fish and Game Commission. It meets infrequently and has limited power over fish and wildlife in San Francisco. It does not add value to the City at this time (sorry about that). Its powers and duties can be reassigned to the Animal Control and Welfare Commission (animal welfare), Joint Zoo Committee (animals at the zoo), Public Utilities Commission (animals on watershed lands), and Recreation and Park Commission (animals in parks), plus the Department of Animal Care and Control (animal care and control) and the Department of Public Health (DPH environmental health / agricultural commissioner / weights and measures, as to any state regulatory matters). There should be an effective date for the transfer of functions and a plan developed to implement it. Fish and Game Commission records shall be transferred to the City Administrator until the other entities determine their needs for such records, at which time the records shall pass to one or more of those entities. Record retention policies and schedules shall be updated accordingly. City code references, the Conflict of Interest Code, budget and accounting systems, and other City processes shall be adjusted to reflect the transfer of functions.

Turning to the Food Security Task Force, which in fact existed for several years, I believe that a final report was produced and sent to the Board of Supervisors. I assume that records of that Task Force are still with DPH, the primary supporting department. I also assume that food security work may be continuing at DPH, with other departments and stakeholders, following the work and report of the Task Force. This may be a good example of a temporary advisory body that ended its work and sunseted.

I suggest the following possible actions regarding each body deemed in-scope for your work: Retain with no or only minor changes, retain with moderate or substantial changes, or eliminate and transfer functions as needed. Global changes (powers and duties of the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, etc.) and other recommendations beyond the scope of the Task Force are also components of your work. It may be useful to hear from Chair Harrington and others about some prior City reorganizations and transfers of functions as to how they were planned and executed (Muni from PUC to PTC, Wastewater Enterprise from DPW to PUC, Taxi Commission to MTA, for example).

Anyway, I was just thinking ahead to how the difficult discussions and decisions can be made in the upcoming months, hoping that entities and people will be less defensive about protecting the status quo and more interested in what makes sense for the City going forward. Thanks again for reading this.

Sincerely,

/s/

David Pilpel

Disclaimer: Any opinions I share are my own and do not reflect the views of other Sunshine Ordinance Task Force (SOTF) members or the SOTF as a whole, nor do they indicate any preference regarding complaints, petitions, or policy matters at the SOTF, which I consider on a case-by-case basis.