



Commission Streamlining Task Force

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

MEMORANDUM

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

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

DATE: August 15, 2025

SUBJECT: Recommended Actions for Public Safety 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 10 public safety bodies at its September 3 meeting. After reviewing each body, **staff recommend keeping 7, eliminating 1, and allowing 2 to sunset within the next several years.**

These recommendations were informed by several evaluation criteria as well as additional contextual information about each body. Contextual information was provided by City departments, commissioners, and members of the public.

Criteria	Evaluation	If Yes
1 Required by state or federal law	Is this body explicitly required by state or federal law?	Keep
	Does this body fulfil some function that is required by state or federal law?	Keep, unless this function could be carried out elsewhere
2 Activity	Is this body inactive?	Consider eliminating
	Is this body borderline inactive?	Consider eliminating
3 Overlap with other bodies	Do other bodies cover a similar topic or policy area?	Consider combining or eliminating
4 Breadth	Is this body narrowly focused on a single funding source, neighborhood, age/ demographic group, or narrow topic?	Consider eliminating if interest could be adequately served by a body with a broader scope

2 | Recommended Actions for Public Safety Bodies

At its September 3 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 September 3 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.

The following recommendations are intended to support Task Force decision-making and action. All recommendations are preliminary and may be updated if new information is gathered about a body.

Comments pertaining to a specific body or bodies will be summarized for Task Force members in updated policy area staff recommendations if emailed to commission.streamlining@sfgov.org by 5pm the Thursday prior to the Task Force meeting.

Summary of Recommended Actions for Public Safety Bodies

Dept.	Name of Body	Code Citation	Recommendation
APD	Community Corrections Partnership	CA SB 678 (2009)	Keep
APD	Reentry Council	Administrative Code § 5.1-1	Allow to sunset in 2029
DAT	Real Estate Fraud Prosecution Trust Fund Committee	Administrative Code § 8.24-5, California Government Code § 27388	Keep
DAT	Sentencing Commission	Administrative Code § 5.250	Allow to sunset in 2026
DEM	Disaster Council	Administrative Code § 7.3-7.4-1	Keep
FIR	Fire Commission	Charter § 4.108	Keep
JUV	Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council	Cal. Welfare and Institutions Code § 749.22-749.27	Keep
JUV	Juvenile Probation Commission	Charter § 7.102	Keep
POL	Police Commission	Charter § 4.109	Keep
SDA	Sheriff's Department Oversight Board	Charter § 4.137	Eliminate

Recommended Actions for Public Safety Bodies

1. [Community Corrections Partnership](#) (Adult Probation)

Advises the City on the use of evidence-based practices in sentencing and probation for justice-involved adults using state funds. CCP must submit an annual report to the Administrative Office of the Courts and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation Services evaluating the effectiveness of the community corrections programs operated by the county ([CA SB 678 \(2009\)](#)).

Primary Department	APD	Meetings (CY24)	2
Current Type	Staff Working Group	Members (as of May 2025)	14 total seats 2 vacant seats (8%)
Established	2011	Appointing Officers	APD, BOS, DAT, PDR, SHF, SFPD, Superior Court judge, HSA, DPH, OEWD, SFUSD ¹
Sunset Date	None	Qualifications	None

Evaluation:

Criteria	Evaluation
1 Required by state or federal law	Yes, required to receive state funds
2 Activity	Active
3 Overlap with other bodies	Reentry Council Sentencing Commission
4 Breadth	Is the body's focus limited to one of the following? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Single funding source State funds <input type="checkbox"/> Single neighborhood <input type="checkbox"/> Age or demographic group <input type="checkbox"/> Narrow topic

Staff Recommendation: Keep

The Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) is legally required to exist as long as the County receives state Community Corrections Performance Incentive Funds.

¹ Chief of Adult Probation Department, Board of Supervisors or their designee, the District Attorney, the Public Defender, the Sheriff, the Chief of Police, head of social services at the Human Services Agency, head(s) of mental health services and alcohol and substance abuse programs at the Department of Public Health, head of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development, head of the San Francisco Unified School District

Recommended Changes: Staff recommend the following changes to partially align the Community Corrections Partnership to the Advisory Committee template:

Template component	Current State	Template	Recommended Change
Number of Members	14	15 maximum	None
Appointing authority	Adult Probation Department, Board of Supervisors	N/A	None
Appointment confirmations	None	None	None
Member removal	At will for the community-based organization positions	At will	None
Term length	None	4 years	Align to template by adopting term lengths for public members
Term limits	None	3 terms	Align to template by adopting term limits for public members
Qualifications	Chief of Adult Probation, Board of Supervisors or their designee, District Attorney, Public Defender, Sheriff, Chief of Police, head of social services at the Human Services Agency, head(s) of mental health services and alcohol and substance abuse programs at the Department of Public Health, head of the Office of Employment and Workforce Development, head of the San Francisco Unified School District, representative from a rehabilitative services community-based	N/A	None

	organization (CBO), and representative of victims' interests CBO		
Establishing authority	State	Administrative Code	Align to template by incorporating into the Administrative Code
Sunset date	None	3 years	None

City staff and members of the public make up the Community Corrections Partnership (CCP), so it is a hybrid of a Staff Working Group and an Advisory Committee. Since there is no Staff Working Group template, CCP conformance to the Advisory Committee template has been considered instead.

Six elements either already align with or are not applicable to the Advisory Committee template: number of members, appointing authority, appointment confirmations, member removal, qualifications, and sunset date.

Three elements should be aligned with the Advisory Committee template: term length and term limits for public members, to ensure a rotating and broad representation of community interests, and establishing authority, since the CCP is currently not included in local code. While the Task Force may decide to remove most Staff Working Groups from code, CCP should be added for visibility and because it is legally required to exist.

2. [Reentry Council](#) (Adult Probation)

Coordinates local efforts to support adults exiting San Francisco County Jail, San Francisco juvenile justice system out-of-home placements, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation facilities, and the United States Federal Bureau of Prison facilities ([Administrative Code § 5.1-1](#)).

Primary Department	APD	Meetings (CY24)	12
Current Type	Staff Working Group	Members (as of May 2025)	25 total members 1 vacant seat (4%)
Established	2008	Appointing Officers	Mayor, Board of Supervisor, APD, PDR, DAT, SHF, SFPD, OEWD, HSA, DCYF, DPH, HSH, pretrial services ²
Sunset Date	6/1/2029	Qualifications	7 formerly incarcerated individuals (3 appointed by Mayor, 4 appointed by the Board)

Evaluation:

Criteria	Evaluation
1 Required by state or federal law	No
2 Activity	Active
3 Overlap with other bodies	Community Corrections Partnership Sentencing Commission
4 Breadth	Is the body's focus limited to one of the following? <input type="checkbox"/> Single funding source <input type="checkbox"/> Single neighborhood <input type="checkbox"/> Age or demographic group <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Narrow topic Reentry

Staff Recommendation: Allow to sunset in 2029

The Reentry Council meets regularly, has all but one seat filled, and is set to sunset in June 2029, within three years of the potential enactment of an ordinance based on Commission Streamlining Task Force recommendations. The Task Force should explicitly recommend that the Reentry Council sunset on that date and not be re-authorized³; the fact that many members are department heads

² Adult Probation Department; Public Defender's Office; District Attorney's Office; Sheriff's Department; San Francisco Police Department; Office of Economic and Workforce Development; Human Services Agency; Department of Children, Youth and their Families; Department of Public Health; Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing

³ This can be achieved by including language in the Task Force's ordinance deleting the Reentry Council from the code effective June 2029.

means that this group can continue to collaborate and meet with community members without needing this body explicitly established in the Administrative Code.

Consolidation of the Reentry Council and Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) was investigated. While the two bodies hold similar focuses on reentry, recidivism, and best practices for probation, Reentry Council includes a focus on juveniles while CCP currently does not.

Recommended Changes: Staff recommend the following changes to partially align the Reentry Council to the Advisory Committee template:

Template component	Current State	Template	Recommended Change
Number of Members	24	15 maximum	Align to template; remove 9 seats
Appointing authority	Mayor; Public Defender's Office; District Attorney's Office; Sheriff's Department; Adult Probation Department; Police Department; Office of Economic and Workforce Development; Human Services Agency; Department of Children, Youth and their Families; Department of Public Health; Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing; Superior Court; Department of Child Support Services; CA Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation Division of Adult Parole Operations; U.S. Probation and Pretrial Services System	N/A	None
Appointment confirmations	None	None	None
Member removal	At will	At will	None
Term length	2 years	4 years	None
Term limits	None	3 terms	None
Qualifications	Seven formerly incarcerated members	If no qualifications specified, appointing officer should provide written statement	None

	(three Mayoral ⁶ and four Board of Supervisors ⁷ appointees)	specifying why the appointee is qualified	
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	None
Sunset date	June 2, 2029	3 years	None

City staff and members of the public make up the Reentry Council, so it is a hybrid of a Staff Working Group and an Advisory Committee. Since there is no Staff Working Group template, staff assessed whether conformance to the Advisory Committee template is appropriate.

Six elements either already align with or are not applicable to the Advisory Committee template: appointing authority, confirmations, member removal, qualifications, establishing authority, and sunset date.

The Task Force should align one element to the Advisory Commission template: number of members. The body should be reduced from 24 seats to 15 seats. Ten public seats could remain, and the City's membership could be reduced from 15 to the five co-chair departments (Adult Probation, Public Defender's Office, District Attorney's Office, Sheriff, and the Mayor's designee). The other named departments could be required to provide information and input as needed without having an official seat on the body (Police; Office of Economic and Workforce Development; Human Services Agency; Children, Youth and their Families; Public Health; and Homelessness and Supportive Housing).

The Task Force should permit exceptions for two elements: term lengths and term limits, given the imminent sunset date.

⁶ Mayoral appointees must include an appointee between 18 to 35 years old who was incarcerated before the age of 24 years old, and an appointee with expertise in providing services to individuals exiting the criminal justice system

⁷ BOS appointees must include an appointee with expertise in providing services to individuals exiting the criminal justice system, an appointee released from custody within the last three years, an appointee with multiple terms of incarceration, and an appointee who self-identifies as a survivor of violent crime.

3. Real Estate Fraud Prosecution Trust Fund Committee (District Attorney)

Aims to distribute dedicated funds for the investigation and prosecution of real estate fraud within San Francisco to eligible law enforcement agencies. ([Administrative Code § 8.24-5](#), [California Government Code § 27388](#))

Primary Department	DAT	Meetings (CY24)	0
Current Type	Staff Working Group	Members (as of May 2025)	3 total seats
Established	1997	Appointing Officers	District Attorney, City Attorney, City Administrator
Sunset Date	None	Qualifications	None

Evaluation:

Criteria	Evaluation
1 Required by state or federal law	Yes
2 Activity	Active (Periodic)
3 Overlap with other bodies	None
4 Breadth	<p>Is the body's focus limited to one of the following?</p> <div> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Single funding source <div>Real Estate Fraud Prosecution Trust Fund</div> </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Single neighborhood <div></div> </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Age or demographic group <div></div> </div> <div> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Narrow topic <div>Real estate fraud prosecution</div> </div>

Staff Recommendation: Keep

This body is legally required so should be retained despite not having met since March 2009. Neither state nor local law require that the committee meet on a scheduled basis. The Committee was established to award funds for the purpose of deterring real estate fraud using the procedures and criteria required by Section 27388 of the California Government Code. The allocation of the fund has been established and remains at 10% for the Assessor/Recorder, 54% for the District Attorney, and 36% for the Police Department. There are no pending items requiring the Committee to meet.

Recommended Changes: Staff do not recommend any changes to align the Real Estate Fraud Prosecution Trust Fund Committee to a template.

Template component	Current State	Template	Recommended Change
Number of Members	3	N/A	None
Appointing authority	District Attorney, City Attorney, City Administrator	N/A	None
Appointment confirmations	None	N/A	None
Member removal	None	N/A	None
Term length	None	N/A	None
Term limits	None	N/A	None
Qualifications	Must be the District Attorney, City Administrator, City Attorney, or designees.	N/A	None
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	TBD	None
Sunset date	None	N/A	None

The Real Estate Fraud Prosecution Trust Fund Committee is a Staff Working Group, which does not have a template. No other changes are needed to the body's components.

The Commission Streamlining Task Force may consider removing Staff Working Groups from code completely in a future meeting. However, because the Committee is legally required, the body should remain in code regardless of any future decisions the Task Force makes.

The District Attorney and City Attorney's Offices requested that the Task Force propose amending the Administrative Code to expressly state that the body only needs to meet if the District Attorney calls a meeting to reevaluate the funding allocations.

4. Sentencing Commission (District Attorney)

Encourages the development of criminal sentencing strategies that reduce recidivism, prioritize public safety and victim protection, emphasize fairness, employ evidence-based best practices, and efficiently utilize San Francisco's criminal justice resources ([Administrative Code § 5.250](#)).

Primary Department	DAT	Meetings (CY24)	4
Current Type	Staff Working Group	Members (as of May 2025)	13 total members 1 vacant seat (8%)
Established	2012	Appointing Officers	Split Appointments between DAT, PDR, APD, JPD, SHF, POL, DPH, CRT, MYR, BOS, Reentry Council, Family Violence Council ⁹
Sunset Date	6/30/2026	Qualifications	Either the head of the City departments or their designee shall serve. The 4 public members have specific seat-level qualifications for experience or expertise in working with victims or ex-offenders, sentencing, or data analysis.

Evaluation:

Criteria	Evaluation
1 Required by state or federal law	No
2 Activity	Active
3 Overlap with other bodies	Reentry Council Community Corrections Partnership
4 Breadth	Is the body's focus limited to one of the following? <input type="checkbox"/> Single funding source <input type="checkbox"/> Single neighborhood <input type="checkbox"/> Age or demographic group <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Narrow topic Sentencing

Staff Recommendation: Allow to sunset in 2026

⁹ District Attorney, Public Defender, Adult Probation, Sheriff, Police, Juvenile Probation, Public Health, Superior Court, Mayor, and Board of Supervisors

The Sentencing Commission meets regularly and provides an active forum for coordination across the many public safety agencies, nonprofits, and experts. It has all but one seat filled. The Commission focuses on developing recommendations around sentencing reform by facilitating expert conversations between City departments and nonprofit representatives. They submit recommendations to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor via written reports.

There is some overlap in focus, activities, and members with the Reentry Council. The Sentencing Commission's activities include some work around reentry, the establishing code explicitly tasks them with coordinating with the Reentry Council and Community Corrections Partnership, and a Reentry Council representative sits on the Sentencing Commission. However, Staff do not recommend combining them because the Sentencing Commission and Reentry Council are focused on different components of the justice system. Those components have different purposes: sentencing focuses on determining appropriate consequences for a crime, while reentry focuses on re-integrating a person back into their community. The choice of which departments chair the bodies also reflects these different purposes: the District Attorney or designee chairs the Sentencing Commission while five public safety department heads or designees co-chair the Reentry Council.

The Sentencing Commission is set to sunset in less than a year, at the end of June 2026. The Task Force should explicitly recommend that the Sentencing Commission sunset on that date and not be re-authorized¹⁰; the narrow focus and the fact that the majority of members are department heads means that this group can continue to collaborate and meet with both nonprofits and community members without needing this body explicitly established in the Administrative Code.

¹⁰ This can be achieved by including language in the Task Force's ordinance deleting the Sentencing Commission from the code effective June 2026.

Recommended Changes: Staff recommend the following changes to partially align the Sentencing Commission to the Advisory Committee template:

Template component	Current State	Template	Recommended Change
Number of Members	13	15 maximum	None
Appointing authority	Split appointments between DAT, PDR, APD, SHF, POL, JPD, DPH, CRT, MYR, BOS, Reentry Council, and Family Violence Council	N/A	None
Appointment confirmations	None	None	None
Member removal	At will	At will	None
Term length	None	4 years	None
Term limits	None	3 terms	None
Qualifications	<p>Either the head of the City departments or their designee can sit on this body.</p> <p>The 4 public members have specific seat-level qualifications:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) a member of a nonprofit organization that works with victims 2) a member of a nonprofit organization that works with ex-offenders 3) a sentencing expert 4) an academic researcher with expertise in data analysis 	N/A	None
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	None
Sunset date	June 30, 2026	3 years	None

Both City staff and members of the public make up the Sentencing Commission, so it is a hybrid of a Staff Working Group and an Advisory Committee. Since there is no Staff Working Group template, staff assessed whether conformance to the Advisory Committee template is appropriate.

Six elements either already align with or are not applicable to the Advisory Committee template: the number of members, appointing authority, appointment confirmations, member removal, qualifications, and establishing authority.

The Task Force should permit exceptions for three elements: term length, term limit, and sunset date, given the imminent sunset date in 2026. If this body is reauthorized by the Board of Supervisors (BOS), BOS should incorporate the standard term lengths and term limits for the public seats.

5. **Disaster Council** (Emergency Management)

Develops and approves plans for disaster response requiring the mobilization of public and private resources and advises the Board of Supervisors on regulations needed to implement these plans ([Administrative Code § 7.3-7.4-1](#)).

Primary Department	DEM	Meetings (CY24)	1
Current Type	Staff Working Group	Members (as of May 2025)	13 total seats 0 vacant seats (0%)
Established	1972	Appointing Officers	Mayor, President of the Board of Supervisors
Sunset Date	None	Qualifications	None, but includes representatives of external groups with official emergency roles (i.e. PG&E and the Red Cross)

Evaluation:

Criteria	Evaluation
1 Required by state or federal law	No, but expressly permitted under state law
2 Activity	Borderline inactive – fewer than 4 meetings in CY24
3 Overlap with other bodies	None
4 Breadth	Is the body's focus limited to one of the following? <input type="checkbox"/> Single funding source <input type="checkbox"/> Single neighborhood <input type="checkbox"/> Age or demographic group <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Narrow topic Disaster preparedness

Staff Recommendation: Keep

The Disaster Council keeps San Francisco safe and prepared for crises. The Council meets only as frequently as necessary to revise plans.

Recommended Changes: Staff do not recommend any changes to align the Disaster Council to a template.

Template component	Current State	Template	Recommended Change
Number of Members	13	15 maximum	None
Appointing authority	Mayor and President of the Board of Supervisors	N/A	None
Appointment confirmations	None	None	None
Member removal	At will	At will	None
Term length	Not specified	4 years	None
Term limits	None	3 terms	None
Qualifications ¹¹	Includes officers in charge of San Francisco's emergency services and representatives of external organizations which have an official emergency responsibility	N/A	TBD
Establishing authority	Administrative Code	Administrative Code	TBD
Sunset date	None	3 years	None

City staff and members of the public make up the Disaster Council, so it is a hybrid of a Staff Working Group and an Advisory Committee. Since there is no Staff Working Group template, staff assessed whether conformance to the Advisory Committee template is appropriate.

Four elements either already align with or are not applicable to the Advisory Committee template: number of members, appointing authority, appointment confirmations, and member removal.

The Task Force should permit exceptions for three elements: term length and term limits, given the purpose of this body is more about coordination than public input, and sunset date, given the ongoing nature of disaster preparedness.

¹¹ Per section 7.3 of the Administrative Code, the seats are as follows: (a) The Mayor, who shall be the chair; (b) The Vice-Chair, who shall be appointed by the Mayor, and who, in the absence of or at the direction of the Mayor, shall act on his or her behalf on matters within the purview of this Chapter; (c) Such officers in charge of emergency services as are provided for in the current emergency plan of this City and County; (d) Such other representatives of civic, business, labor, veterans, professional, or other organizations having an official emergency responsibility, as may be appointed by the Mayor; (e) Three members of the Board of Supervisors, to be appointed by the President of the Board; (f) Controller; (g) The Director of Emergency Services who shall be the Executive Secretary.

The Task Force may consider removing Staff Working Groups from code completely in a future meeting, which could apply to the Disaster Council. The Department of Emergency Management (DEM) described public comment as minimal, so removing the body from code would have little impact on the public.

Qualifications have been listed as still to be determined because DEM has proposed updating the nearly thirty-year-old code section. DEM should work with the City Attorney's Office over the next three months on desired changes for inclusion in the Task Force's proposed ordinance.

6. [Fire Commission](#) (Fire Department)

Prescribes and enforces rules and regulations to provide for the efficiency of the Fire Department. The Department's mission includes protecting the lives and property of the people of San Francisco from fires, natural disasters, and hazardous materials incidents; saving lives by providing emergency medical services; and preventing fires through prevention and education programs. Reviews Fire Department personnel matters ([Charter § 4.108](#)).

Primary Department	FIR	Meetings (CY24)	21
Current Type	Governance	Members (as of May 2025)	5 seats, all filled
Established	1866	Appointing Officers	Mayor's Office
Sunset Date	None	Qualifications	None listed

Evaluation:

Criteria	Evaluation
1 Required by state or federal law	No
2 Activity	Active
3 Overlap with other bodies	None
4 Breadth	Is the body's focus limited to one of the following? <input type="checkbox"/> Single funding source <input type="checkbox"/> Single neighborhood <input type="checkbox"/> Age or demographic group <input type="checkbox"/> Narrow topic

Staff Recommendation: Keep

The Fire Commission is a mechanism of oversight and accountability for San Francisco's Fire Department, which has a budget of over \$550 million and employs over 1,850 FTEs for FY26. The Fire Commission meets regularly and oversees a large department providing public protection services. The evaluation criteria do not provide any reason to eliminate the Fire Commission. Combining it with another of the City's public bodies is also not practical because there is no other body with overlapping functions.

Recommended Changes: Staff recommend the following changes to align the Fire Commission to the Governance Commission template:

Template component	Current State	Template	Recommended Change
Number of Members	5	5-7	None
Appointing authority	Mayor	Mayor	None
Appointment confirmations	None; appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)	None; appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)	None
Member removal	At will	At will	None
Term length	4 years	4 years	None
Term limits	None	3 terms	Align to template; limit of 3 terms.
Qualifications	None; the Notice of Appointment shall include the appointee's qualifications to serve and a statement of how the appointment represents the City's communities of interest, neighborhoods and diverse populations (per Charter § 3.100.18)	If no qualifications specified, appointing officer should provide written statement specifying why the appointee is qualified	None
Establishing authority	Charter	TBD	TBD
Sunset date	None	None	None
Hiring and Firing Authority	The Mayor shall appoint based on a short list of three qualified candidates from the commission.	Consultative responsibilities only	Align to template; Consultative responsibilities only
Policy-making authority	Prescribe and enforce any reasonable rules and regulations that	TBD	TBD

	it deems necessary to provide for the efficiency of the Department.		
Contract approval authority	3-6 contracts approved per year	TBD	TBD
Budget approval authority	Yes	Yes	None
Employee discipline authority	Yes, the Fire Commission holds hearings to decide matters involving discipline or termination of uniformed employees of the Fire Department.	No role except where allowable by law	Place authority to impose all disciplinary action with the Fire Chief. The Commission should serve as the appellate body to satisfy the state's appeal requirement.

Seven elements of the Fire Commission already align to the Governance Commission template: number of members, appointing authority, appointment confirmations, member removal, term length, qualifications, and sunset date.

The Task Force should align two elements to the Governance Commission template: the addition of term limits and removal of hiring and firing authority.

The Task Force will discuss in a future meeting whether governance commissions should be authorized in the charter or the administrative code, as well as policy-making and contract approval authority.

The Task Force should recommend a change to the employee discipline process to create citywide consistency. The current process wherein the Fire Commission renders disciplinary decisions for anything more than ten days is inconsistent with other commissions' employee discipline powers and is not required by state law. Furthermore, commissions are not supposed to interfere in the day-to-day operations of a department.

7. Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (Juvenile Probation)

As mandated by state law to receive state funds, develops and implements a continuum of county-based responses to juvenile crime and submits the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act Plan to the state ([Cal. Welfare and Institutions Code §§ 749.22-749.27](#)).

Primary Department	JPD	Meetings (CY24)	6
Current Type	Staff Working Group	Members (as of May 2025)	20 current members ¹² 0 vacant seats (0%)
Established	1999	Appointing Officers	Chief Probation Officer of Juvenile Probation Department
Sunset Date	None	Qualifications	Specialized seat requirements for non-City members include 1 community-based-organization (CBO) drug and alcohol program, 1 at-large community representative, and additional CBO service providers

Evaluation:

Criteria	Evaluation
1 Required by state or federal law	Yes
2 Activity	Active
3 Overlap with other bodies	No
4 Breadth	Is the body's focus limited to one of the following? <input type="checkbox"/> Single funding source <input type="checkbox"/> Single neighborhood <input type="checkbox"/> Age or demographic group <input type="checkbox"/> Narrow topic

Staff Recommendation: Keep

The Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) is legally required to exist as long as the County receives state funds from the Juvenile Crime Enforcement and Accountability Challenge Grant Program. JJCC meets once per year by design to complete the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act Plan. Staff investigated consolidating the JJCC with the Juvenile Probation Commission but found the bodies to be different enough not to warrant combination. The JJCC acts as a Staff Working Group

¹² State law requires a minimum of 11 members

bringing together various departments to contribute to a definitive product whereas the Juvenile Probation Commission acts as an oversight body for the Juvenile Probation Department and holds space for public engagement with the department.

Recommended Changes: Staff recommend the following changes to align the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council to the Advisory Committee template:

Template component	Current State	Template	Recommended Change
Number of Members	20	15 maximum	Align to template; remove 5 seats
Appointing authority	Chief Probation Officer of Juvenile Probation Department	N/A	None
Appointment confirmations	None	None	None
Member removal	At will	At will	None
Term length	None	4 years	Align to template for public members by adding term lengths
Term limits	None	3 terms	Align to template for public members by adding term limits
Qualifications	A community-based drug and alcohol program, a nonprofit community-based organizations providing services to minors	N/A	None
Establishing authority	State Welfare and Institutions Code	Administrative Code	Align to template by incorporating into the Administrative Code
Sunset date	None	3 years	None

Given it is composed of both City staff and members of the public, the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) is a hybrid of a Staff Working Group and an Advisory Committee. Since there is no Staff Working Group template, staff assessed whether conformance to the Advisory Committee template is appropriate.

Four elements either already align with or are not applicable to the Advisory Committee template: appointing authority, appointment confirmations, member removal, and qualifications.

The Task Force should align four elements to the Advisory Committee template. Term lengths and term limits should be added to ensure a rotating and broad representation of community interests. The establishing authority should be the Administrative Code; while the Task Force may decide to remove most Staff Working Groups from code, JJCC should be added for visibility and because it is legally required to exist. Finally, membership should be reduced by five seats. The JJCC goes beyond the state's membership requirements with nearly double the required individuals in the body

The Task Force should permit an exception for sunset date because the body is legally required.

8. Juvenile Probation Commission (Juvenile Probation)

Oversees the Juvenile Probation Department, including review of current policies and procedures to ensure that the Department promotes the safety and welfare of juveniles entering the juvenile justice system and follows state and court mandates for protection of juveniles in the justice system. The Commission also serves as a resource for positive change in the lives of youth and their families, accountability to victims, and the protection of the public ([Charter § 7.102](#)).

Primary Department	JPD	Meetings (CY24)	11
Current Type	Governance	Members (as of May 2025)	7 seats 1 seat vacant (14%)
Established	1989	Appointing Officers	Mayor
Sunset Date	None	Qualifications	2 members shall be appointed from lists of eligibles submitted to the Mayor by the Superior Court

Evaluation:

Criteria	Evaluation
1 Required by state or federal law	No
2 Activity	Active
3 Overlap with other bodies	Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council
4 Breadth	Is the body's focus limited to one of the following? <input type="checkbox"/> Single funding source <input type="checkbox"/> Single neighborhood <input type="checkbox"/> Age or demographic group <input type="checkbox"/> Narrow topic

Staff Recommendation: Keep

The Juvenile Probation Commission should be maintained since it assists the Juvenile Probation Department with transparency and accountability efforts, meets regularly, and acts as a positive forum for public engagement. However, the Task Force may want to modify the body from a governance commission to an advisory committee given the department's size and responsibilities.

Possible Changes: The Task Force may consider aligning the Juvenile Probation Commission to either the Governance Commission or Advisory Committee template:

Template component	Current State	Governance Template	Advisory Template
Number of Members	7	5-7	15 maximum
Appointing authority	Mayor	Mayor	None
Appointment confirmations	None; appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)	None; appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)	None
Member removal	With cause (per Charter § 15.105)	At will	At will
Term length	4 years	4 years	4 years
Term limits	None	3 terms	3 terms
Qualifications	2 of the 7 members appointed should be from lists of eligible members submitted to the Mayor by the Superior Court	If no qualifications specified, appointing officer should provide written statement specifying why the appointee is qualified	Remove Superior Court requirement
Establishing authority	Charter	TBD	Administrative Code
Sunset date	None	None	3 years from launch
Hiring and Firing Authority	The Mayor shall appoint based on a short list of three qualified candidates from the commission (per Charter § 3.100.18).	Consultative responsibilities only	No
Policy-making authority	Reviews relevant policy topics	TBD	No
Contract approval authority	Yes, approves approx. 8-10 contracts or grants per quarter	TBD	No
Budget approval authority	Yes	Yes	No

Employee discipline authority	No	No role except where allowable by law	No
-------------------------------	----	---------------------------------------	----

The Juvenile Probation Commission (JPC) serves as a bridge between community stakeholders and the Juvenile Probation Department, as well as the Mayor's Office. This body contributes to transparency, accountability, and youth-centered justice reform in San Francisco. The establishment of the JPC was central to a larger effort to reform the City's dysfunctional and ineffective youth justice system, which also included shifting the Juvenile Probation Department from the authority of the SF Superior Court to the mayor as an independent city department with clear lines of administrative authority and oversight. The body's original purpose was to ensure that the department's policies and practices aligned with the best interests of justice-involved youth, their families, and the broader community and has evolved to include more active engagement in equity-driven reforms, strategic planning, and youth-centered policy development.

9. **Police Commission** (Police Department)

Oversees and sets policy for the Police Department and the Department of Police Accountability (DPA). Adjudicates discipline cases involving sworn members of the Police Department. ([Charter § 4.109](#))

Primary Department	Police	Meetings (CY24)	26
Current Type	Governance	Members (as of May 2025)	7 total seats 0 vacant seats
Established	1878	Appointing Officers	Mayor and Board of Supervisors
Sunset Date	None	Qualifications	At least one of the Mayoral appointees must be a retired judge or an attorney with trial experience

Evaluation:

Criteria		Evaluation
1	Required by state or federal law	No
2	Activity	Active
3	Overlap with other bodies	No
4	Breadth	Is the body's focus limited to one of the following? No <input type="checkbox"/> Single funding source <input type="checkbox"/> Single neighborhood <input type="checkbox"/> Age or demographic group <input type="checkbox"/> Narrow topic

Staff Recommendation: Keep

The evaluation criteria do not provide any reason to eliminate the Police Commission, as oversight of law enforcement is of paramount importance. Merging the Police Commission with another one of the City's public bodies is not practical because there is no other body with overlapping functions.

Recommended Changes: Staff recommend the following changes to partially align the Police Commission to the Governance Commission template:

Template component	Current State	Template	Recommended Change
Number of Members	7	5-7 members	None
Appointing authority	Mayor (4 seats), BOS (3 seats)	Mayoral appointments	Mayoral appointments
Appointment confirmations	<u>Mayoral appointees:</u> BOS confirmation required within 60 days (after a public hearing); if BOS takes no action within that time, the nominee is automatically deemed confirmed.	None; appointments are effective immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of the Board of Supervisors within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)	<u>Mayoral appointees:</u> align to template by taking effect immediately unless rejected by 2/3 of BOS within 30 days (per Charter § 3.100.18)
	<u>BOS appointees:</u> Nominees from the Rules Committee must be confirmed by the full BOS		N/A, if split appointments are removed. Otherwise, no change; retain current process. The Task Force should consider standardizing or clarifying BOS appointment processes in a future meeting.
Member removal	<u>Mayoral appointees:</u> BOS consent required	At will	<u>Mayoral appointees:</u> Align to template; remove BOS consent
	<u>BOS appointees:</u> BOS may remove.		<u>BOS appointees:</u> None
Term length	4 years	4 years	None; retain 4 years.
Term limits	None	3 terms	Align to template
Qualifications	At least one of the Mayoral appointees must be a retired judge or an attorney with trial experience.	N/A	None
Establishing authority	Charter	TBD	Charter
Sunset date	None	None	None
Hiring and Firing Authority	<u>Police Chief hiring:</u> the Mayor shall appoint based on a short list of three	Consultative responsibilities only	<u>Police Chief hiring:</u> align to template by removing the commission's authority to create a short-list for hiring and

	<p>qualified candidates from the commission.</p> <p>Police Chief firing: The Mayor may recommend removal to the commission, which shall take action within 30 days</p> <p><u>Department of Police Accountability (DPA) hiring:</u> The Mayor shall appoint a nominee of the Police Commission as the Director of DPA, subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.¹³</p>		<p>having to take action to fire the department head</p> <p><u>Department of Police Accountability (DPA) hiring:</u> align to template by removing the commission's authority to nominate a candidate for hiring and having to take action to fire the department head</p>
Policy-making authority	Yes ¹⁴	TBD	TBD
Contract approval authority	8-10 grants to SFPD approved per year for various law enforcement tools	TBD	TBD
Budget approval authority	Yes	Yes	None
Employee discipline authority	The Chief of Police may only impose discipline of 10 days or fewer; more serious actions must be referred by the Chief to the Police Commission. ¹⁵ All California peace officers are entitled to an administrative appeal; in San Francisco, because the Police	No role except where allowable by law	Place authority to impose all disciplinary action with the Chief of Police. The Commission should serve as the appellate body to satisfy the state's appeal requirement. This would eliminate the need for an outside ALJ, thereby speeding up accountability and resulting in a more

¹³ Charter § 4.136

¹⁴ The Police Commission approves department policies. Recent examples include body-worn cameras, pretextual stops, community policing, discipline process, serious incident review board, boundary analysis, and crowd control

¹⁵ Charter § A8.343

	Commission is rendering the disciplinary decision, appeals are referred to an external Administrative Law Judge (ALJ).		efficient allocation of resources.
--	--	--	------------------------------------

Five elements either already align with or are not applicable to the Governance Commission template: number of members, term lengths, qualifications, sunset date, and budget approval authority.

The Police Commission should align with the governance body template regarding five items: appointing authority, confirmation and removal of Mayoral appointees, term limits for all appointees, and hiring/firing authority.

The Task Force will discuss in a future meeting whether governance commissions should be authorized in the charter or the administrative code, as well as their policy-making and contract approval authority.

The Task Force should recommend a change to the employee discipline process to create citywide consistency. The current process wherein the Police Commission renders disciplinary decisions for anything more than ten days is inconsistent with other commissions' employee discipline powers and is not required by state law. Furthermore, commissions are not supposed to interfere in the day-to-day operations of a department.

10. Sheriff's Department Oversight Board (Office of Sheriff's Inspector General)

Appoints, evaluates the work of, and removes the Inspector General from the Sheriff's Department Office of Inspector General (SDOIG). Reviews and recommends best practices for custodial and patrol operations, incorporates community feedback on Sheriff Department activities and jail conditions, and reports findings to the Sheriff. Summarizes and submits this information to the Board of Supervisors on a quarterly and annual basis ([Charter § 4.137](#)).

Primary Department	SDA	Meetings (CY24)	12
Current Type	Regulatory	Members (as of May 2025)	7 total seats 2 vacant seats (29%)
Established	2020	Appointing Officers	Mayor and Board of Supervisors
Sunset Date	None	Qualifications	One of the BOS seats must be held by a person with experience in labor representation

Evaluation:

Criteria	Evaluation
1 Required by state or federal law	No
2 Activity	Borderline inactive – greater than 25% vacancy rate
3 Overlap with other bodies	None
4 Breadth	Is the body's focus limited to one of the following? <input type="checkbox"/> Single funding source <input type="checkbox"/> Single neighborhood <input type="checkbox"/> Age or demographic group <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Narrow topic Sheriff's Department oversight

Staff Recommendation: Eliminate

Since being approved by voters 4.5+ years ago (in November 2020), the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board (SDOB) and Sheriff's Department Office of Inspector General (SDOIG) have struggled to get off the ground. SDOB staff acknowledge that operational challenges such as delayed hiring, lack of funding, successive budget cuts, staffing shortages, and hiring restrictions have significantly impacted SDOIG's ability to establish itself as a fully functional and independent department.

SDOIG has been insufficiently funded, so investigations of Sheriff misconduct have continued to be handled by staff at the Department of Police Accountability (DPA). The SDOB began meeting in summer 2022. The inaugural Inspector General was appointed 1.5 years later and served for thirteen months, with the post remaining vacant for seven months and counting.

The powers of the SDOIG and SDOB will always be limited by California law which prohibits oversight bodies for county Sheriff agencies. The SDOB oversees the SDOIG, not the actual Sheriff's Department. The SDOIG's power is limited to investigating allegations of Sheriff Department misconduct and reporting findings to the Sheriff, who decides what to do with discipline.

The duties completed by the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board Office of Inspector General (SDOIG) could be adopted by the Department of Police Accountability, centralizing the oversight of public safety departments in San Francisco without the need for the SDOB. It is less efficient to have law enforcement investigators work in two different departments (DPA and SDOIG). The Task Force could recommend renaming DPA to the Department of Law Enforcement Accountability (DLEA) to reflect the expanded scope. This is outside of the Task Force's purview, however.

According to SDOB, public engagement varies; some meetings have just a few speakers, while others – especially after high-profile incidents like in-custody deaths – draw significant community turnout. The following outcomes or impacts were reported for the previous year:

- Establishing key infrastructure: a website, online complaint filing system, a complainant portal to track investigations, case management system, digital workflows, newsletters, and a social media presence.
- Conducting jail inspections, gathered public feedback, and developing multiple policy recommendations. A rotation of three SDOB members at a time also make site visits with the SDOIG and meet with Sheriff's staff to provide feedback and discuss and resolve any pressing issues.
- SDOB contributed to increasing public awareness and trust in the oversight process.
- Despite a lack of any investigative staff, OSIG functioned by partnering with the DPA for investigative and operational support. This partnership is through a limited agreement between the Sheriff's Office and DPA. Only SDOB and OSIG have subpoena power.

Recommended Changes: Staff do not recommend changes to the Sheriff Department Oversight Board. Should the Task Force choose to keep the body, it may elect to propose changes to the following elements. Note that there is no Regulatory Body template to adhere to.

Template component	Current State	Template	Recommended Change
Number of Members	7	N/A	N/A
Appointing authority	Mayor (3 seats), Board of Supervisors (4 seats)	N/A	N/A
Appointment confirmations	None	N/A	N/A
Member removal	For cause	N/A	N/A
Term length	4 years	N/A	N/A
Term limits	3 successive terms	N/A	N/A
Qualifications	One of the BOS seats must be held by a person with experience in labor representation	N/A	N/A
Establishing authority	Charter	N/A	N/A
Sunset date	None	N/A	N/A
Hiring and Firing Authority	Appoints and may remove the Sheriff's Inspector General	N/A	N/A
Policy-making authority	Compiles, evaluates, and recommends law enforcement custodial and patrol best practices. Reviews and provides feedback on OSIG policies	N/A	N/A
Contract approval authority	No	N/A	N/A
Budget approval authority	Yes	N/A	N/A
Employee discipline authority	None	N/A	N/A