Draft Minutes

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

Daniel Lurie
Mayor

Friday, December 12, 2025
10:00 am

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

Meeting will also be broadcast online and remote public comment will be available via WebEx event. To view the online presentation, join the meeting using the link https://tinyurl.com/4k9sutxv and password PropE. Members of the public may use email address CommissionStreamlining@sfgov.org to join the WebEx meeting if needed. To join by phone, dial 415-655-0001 and enter access code (webinar ID) 2663 945 4430 followed by ##. See page 3 for additional remote public comment instructions. It is possible that the Task Force may experience technical challenges that interfere with the ability of members of the public to participate in the meeting remotely. If that happens, the Task Force will attempt to correct the problem but may continue with the hearing as long as people attending in-person are able to observe and offer public comment.

Agenda

1. **Call to Order**
   Chair Harrington called the meeting to order at 10:08 a.m.

2. **Roll Call**

Chair Harrington	seat 4 - Board of Supervisors designee (public sector labor representative)
Vice Chair Bruss	seat 3 - City Attorney's designee
Sophie Hayward	seat 1 - City Administrator's designee
Natasha Mihal	seat 2 - Controller's designee
Sophia Kittler	seat 5 - Mayor's designee (expert in open and accountable government)

   Hannah Kohanzadeh, the clerk called role. With all five members present, a quorum was established.

3. **Announcements (Informational Item)**
   The clerk explained that the Task Force meeting has been moved from Room 263 to Room 408 due to technical issues. She also announced that the Task Force has completed its initial review of all bodies and is currently reviewing its preliminary decisions in preparation for drafting its final report. During this time, the Task Force may modify any of its previous decisions. The report is due to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor by February 1, 2026.

4. **Human Rights Commission (Action Item)**
Materials: Presentation; Attachment – Human Rights Commission Citations
Senior Project Analyst Chelsea Hall introduced the item and explained that the Task Force would clarify which functions belong to the Human Rights Commission (HRC) versus the department of the same name, identify outdated functions, and provide direction for drafting recommendations and legislation. Ms. Hall described each of HRC's functions and the associated staff proposals.

Public comment was received by 7 speakers:

- Hasib Emran, Vice Chair of the HRC, opposed converting the commission to an advisory body. He emphasized that civil rights enforcement requires an independent body with authority to hold government accountable.
- America Sanchez opposed converting the HRC to an advisory body, stating that efficiency is not a neutral justification and reductions in oversight harm marginalized communities.
- Leah Pimentel, Chair of the HRC, opposed making changes to the body and stressed that independent authority is essential for public trust.
- Asa James stated that the HRC strengthens and supports the community and should not lose power.
- Monika Brooks with Black Women Revolt Against Domestic Violence supported preserving the HRC as a governance commission and opposed moving it to the Administrative Code.
- Andrea with Black Women Revolt Against Domestic Violence opposed converting HRC to an advisory body, citing risks to civil rights enforcement and community trust.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:

  Slide #8 in your PowerPoint presentations states in item 2 for the Human Rights Commission's (HRC), current functions of "*ensuring the civil rights of all persons*" currently handled jointly by the Commission and the Department is proposed to be transferred to the sole jurisdiction of the Department. This is a core function of the Commission, and it should remain in the domain of the Commission. It's outrageous that this Streamlining Task Force is systematically dismantling core functions of Boards and Commissions, and transferring those functions to unchecked executive control of "*unitary executive*" department heads all appointed by Mayor Lurie.

  Worse, slide #12 that the requirement to submit a quarterly report to the Mayor and Board of Supervisor is being eliminated because this Task Force previously eliminated reporting requirements, and members of the public can "*refer to*" HRC meeting minutes to check the status of HRC's performance is pure nonsense.

Chair Harrington opened the Task Force's discussion by reminding attendees that today's decisions are recommendations, not final steps. He also confirmed with HRC Director Mawuli Tugbenyoh that the staff presentation accurately reflected current functions and acceptable changes to the commission.

Sophie Hayward requested that the Task Force include a recommendation authorizing the Board of Supervisors to rename the department to clarify the distinction between the commission and the department. She also noted that most functions should be handled by the department, not the commission.

DRAFT

In response, Chief Assistant City Attorney Jon Givner outlined options for renaming: either rename the department in the Charter or authorize the Board to do so by ordinance. Task Force members expressed openness to the latter option, agreeing that HRC department staff should have a say in the department's new name.

The Task Force reviewed functions one by one, confirming which remain with the department (Charter) and which move to the commission (Administrative Code). They agreed to remove obsolete functions such as affirmative action plan oversight (due to Proposition 209) and contract enforcement (now handled by the Contracts Monitoring Division). Specifically, the Task Force arrived at the following recommendations for each HRC function:

- Investigate complaints of unlawful discrimination – Remain in Charter as a department function.
- Ensure civil rights of all persons – Remain in Charter as a department function; add to Administrative Code as a commission function.
- Create operational rules/draft legislation – Department retains primary responsibility; Administrative Code will authorize the commission to make legislative recommendations.
- Hold hearings, issue subpoenas, take testimony, administer oaths, issue orders – Remain in Charter as department functions; Administrative Code will allow the commission to hold hearings and take testimony; subpoena authority stays with the department.
- Affirmative action plans – Remove from Charter; do not add to Administrative Code.
- Promote understanding and cooperation – Remain in Charter as a department function; add to Administrative Code as a commission function.
- Study, investigate, mediate, and recommend solutions to community-wide problems – Move to Administrative Code as a commission function.
- Contract enforcement – Remove from Charter; do not add to Administrative Code.
- Adopt the staff recommendations on slide 11 to delete certain obsolete functions from code.

Vice Chair Bruss moved to adopt staff recommendations as modified during discussion and described above. Ms. Kittler seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

The Task Force directed the City Attorney's Office to ensure the ordinance clearly distinguishes between commission and department responsibilities and to include language authorizing the Board of Supervisors to rename the department.

5. Deferred Decisions on Specific Bodies (Action Item)

Materials: Presentation

Senior Project Analyst Chelsea Hall introduced the item and explained that the Task Force would revisit outstanding decisions for the following four bodies:

1. Fine Arts Museum Board of Trustees (FAM) – number of seats
2. Refuse Rate Board (RRB) – term length/limit and holdover provision for public seat
3. Committee on Information Technology (COIT) – necessity of two public seats
4. Retiree Health Care Trust Fund Board (RHCTFB) – establishing authority

Public comment was received by 2 speakers:

- Alison Romano, CEO and CIO of the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System and RHCTFB Administrator, spoke about RHCTFB. She emphasized that the Retiree Health Care Trust Fund Board and the Retirement Board have distinct responsibilities, fiduciary duties, and

service populations. She noted differences in investment objectives, liquidity profiles, and roles, and warned that combining the boards would add complexity and make it harder to fulfill fiduciary duties.

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

  Slide 16 on the Retiree Health Care Trust Fund Board (RHCTFB) wrongly states — as misinformation — that during your 11/5/2025 meeting the Task Force voted to move the RHCTFB to the Administrative Code. That's misinformation; the 12/9/2025 version of your "*Decision Log*" clearly states the "*establishing authority*" was still TBD, with your Administrative Staff to report back on implications of moving the RHCTFB to the Admin Code. The RHCTFB has elected members, as does the Health Services Board, and the City Employees' Retirement System (SFERS).

  All three bodies should remain in the Charter, each remaining separate Boards and Commissions, because their underlying funding sources are all unique, with different liquidities, beneficiaries, and fiduciary responsibilities. To the extent this Task Force modifies the City Charter to allow a merger of the SFERS and RHCTFB, it should also require a majority vote of the retired beneficiaries of the RHCTF system, held in **TRUST**!

Fine Arts Museum Board of Trustees (FAM)

Vice Chair Bruss supported staff's recommendation to reduce the maximum number of seats. Chair Harrington clarified with Chief Assistant City Attorney Jon Givner that the Charter currently sets quorum for FAM at one-third of members in office and allows action by a majority of members present. The Task Force had previously voted to remove these provisions. Members agreed to clarify that FAM should act by a majority of appointed members in office.

Vice Chair Bruss moved to adopt staff's recommendation that the FAM Board consist of no more than 20 members and clarify that the body will act by a majority vote of appointed members in office. Ms. Kittler seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Refuse Rate Board (RRB)

Vice Chair Bruss stated that it makes sense to add a three-term limit for public members and an exception to the holdover provision to prevent gaps in service. She explained that the holdover exception is important given the timing of rate cycles.

As such, Vice Chair Bruss moved to adopt a three-term limit for public members and allow holdover appointments. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Committee on Information Technology (COIT)

Vice Chair Bruss expressed support for staff's recommendation to remove two public seats but noted mixed opinions. Sophie Hayward opposed removing the seats, stating that the public members are non-voting and not the source of any issues. However, Ms. Kittler supported removing the seats, citing appointment delays and possible low attendance. Chair Harrington stated he was agnostic and pointed out that COIT originally had no public members.

Ms. Kittler moved to eliminate the two public seats, but the proposal died for lack of a second.

Ms. Hayward then moved to keep COIT as-is with two public members. Ms. Mihal seconded the motion, and it passed 4-1 with Ms. Kittler opposed.

Retiree Health Care Trust Fund Board (RHCTFB)
Chair Harrington noted that the Charter protects RHCTFB's rate-setting process from being altered during the budget process, which supports keeping the body in the Charter. He expressed interest in preserving flexibility for a future merger with the Retirement Board.

Ms. Kittler agreed and supported Option 2A, which allows a merger by majority vote of both bodies rather than by ordinance. She moved to adopt Option 2A. Chair Harrington seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

6. Reviewing and Revising Preliminary Decisions (Action Item)
Materials: Presentation; Attachment A – Member Compensation and Benefits; Attachment B – Public Body Naming Conventions
Senior Project Analyst Chelsea Hall explained that the Task Force would consider whether to modify any previous decisions based on evaluation criteria, overall decision-making trends, or subsequent discussion. Although any public body could be addressed during this time, the broader discussion topics included:

1. Member qualifications for governance bodies
2. Compensation and benefits provisions
3. Contract approval authority for governance bodies
4. Confirming appointment authority decisions and exceptions
5. Applying naming conventions from prior discussions

Ms. Hall presented the status quo, staff recommendations, and policy options for each topic. During the presentation, Chair Harrington clarified with staff and Chief Assistant City Attorney Jon Givner that commission approval of contracts subject to Chapter 21/21G of the Administrative Code is not legally binding. In addition, Sophia Kittler confirmed with Mr. Givner that member compensation for various public bodies is a policy decision that is established in several places in code and elsewhere.

Public comment was received by 10 speakers:

- Austin Hunter, Commission on the Environment member, urged the Task Force to reconsider its decision to convert the Commission on the Environment (COE) to an advisory body. He emphasized the COE's role in accountability and oversight, citing its work on climate action plans and joint meetings with other commissions.
- Lyla Holzman, San Francisco resident and climate advocate, opposed converting the COE to advisory status, as the body currently exercises governance authority and should retain it.
- Elmy Burmejo, COE member, highlighted the body's community engagement and global partnerships, arguing that advisory status would diminish its impact.
- Peter Belden with the Sierra Club stressed that COE provides critical oversight, comparing its role to an "accountability partner" that ensures climate goals are met. In his personal capacity, he also referenced a letter supporting the Bicycle Advisory Committee.
- Griffin Lee with Connected SF commented on governance body qualifications, recommending that all commissioners be San Francisco residents and that all seven Municipal Transportation Agency Board members be regular Muni riders. He also suggested prohibiting board members from having affiliations with City-funded special interest groups.

- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:
  This Task Force SHOULDN'T change membership qualifications for the SFMTA Board of Directors, or Elections, Police, and Public Utilities commissions. You already changed qualifications for 20 other bodies, causing avoidable damage to San Francisco's democratic oversight of our boards and commissions. Changing membership qualifications of these four bodies will add to the growing opposition of San Franciscans to charter change amendments you put on the November 2026 ballot. Stop breaking things that don't need fixing!

  DON'T further revise contract approval authorities; keep the status quo as is. And you MUST not prohibit or restrict the Board of Supervisors from making contract approval exceptions as they see fit. The Board of Supervisors is our "Legislative Branch." "*Prop. E*" didn't empower you to change our elected Board of Supervisors' authorities!

  Deputy City Attorney Jon Givner gave you illegal Sunshine Ordinance approval to discuss the "Re-entry Council," which wasn't "*noticed*" on today's agenda!
- Christopher Pederson with the San Francisco League of Conservation Voters supported keeping the COE as a decision-making body with full authority over environmental policy and funding.
- Michael Cox, League of Conservation Voters member, opposed changing COE's status, citing its importance in coordinating climate action across departments.
- Christina Pappas, Mission resident, strongly opposed converting COE to advisory status and adding a sunset date, noting the climate crisis will not end in three years.
- John, a call-in commenter, was unintelligible due to audio feedback issues. They were invited to submit written public comment to commissionstreamlining@sfgov.org.

Following public comment, the Task Force briefly revisited its decisions for the Commission on the Environment. Sophia Kittler confirmed with staff that the Task Force had previously added a sunset date to COE. Vice Chair Bruss noted that advisory status does not diminish the importance of the work and expressed reluctance to revisit the decision. Chair Harrington added that sunset dates ensure periodic evaluation and do not automatically eliminate a body. Though Natasha Mihal stated that she would be open to removing the sunset date, the Task Force ultimately declined to change its prior decisions on the COE.

Member Qualifications for Governance Bodies

The Task Force addressed four bodies where seat-specific qualifications had not been resolved: Elections Commission, Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors (MTA Board), Police Commission, and Public Utilities Commission (PUC).

Vice Chair Bruss moved to make qualifications desirable at the body level for Elections and PUC, remove the single seat qualification for Police Commission, and make no changes for the MTA Board. Ms. Kittler seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Contract Approval Authority

Vice Chair Bruss recommended maintaining the legal status quo. She explained that the Board of Supervisors should retain flexibility to prescribe rules by ordinance, as it does under Chapters 6 and 21G of the Administrative Code. Sophie Hayward agreed and noted that training would be needed for commissions after implementation.

Chair Harrington expressed concern that commissions could make policy decisions on contract review that department heads might ignore, given the Task Force's general removal of commissions' hiring/firing authority over leadership. Chair Harrington and Vice Chair Bruss (respectively) suggested urging the Board of Supervisors to consider making commission decisions binding when authority is delegated, and clarifying the legal status quo for contracting in the Task Force's final report.

After some deliberation, Task Force members agreed to include this information in its report but not in the draft legislation. No formal vote was required.

Compensation and Benefits
Chair Harrington stated that decisions on compensation and benefits should remain with the Mayor and Board of Supervisors and should not be addressed in the Charter. He generally supported health benefits for commissioners but emphasized that the Task Force should not mandate them. Ms. Kittler agreed and noted the need for standardization outside the Charter.

The Task Force confirmed that compensation and benefits decisions would stay with the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Givner noted that ordinances specifying "no compensation" for advisory bodies would be cleaned up for consistency and be silent on compensation.

No formal vote was required; the Task Force reaffirmed prior direction.

Appointing Authorities
Vice Chair Bruss confirmed that no changes were needed to prior decisions on appointing authorities. The other Task Force members agreed.

Naming Conventions
The Task Force reviewed the staff recommendations for applying naming conventions to public bodies and agreed to accept the proposed new names without changes.

7. Future Agenda Topics (Discussion Item)
Project Director Rachel Alonso informed the Task Force that the next meeting is scheduled for December 18 at 4:00 p.m. at the Southeast Community Center. She explained technical challenges at the facility, including limited microphones, reliance on standard Wi-Fi for hybrid participation, and lack of multiple screens. She stated that the meeting could proceed in person if hybrid capability fails, but that Room 263 at City Hall is reserved as a backup option if the Task Force chooses to change the meeting location.

Chair Harrington supported meeting at the Southeast Community Center and offered to assist with resolving technical issues.

Public comment was received by 18 speakers:

- Jay Kim with Dignifi supported retaining the Reentry Council without a sunset date. He emphasized its role in advocating for justice-impacted individuals and providing lived experience to inform policy.
- Victoria Westbrook, Reentry Director for the Adult Probation Department and former Reentry Councilmember, described the importance of having formerly incarcerated individuals at the

decision-making table and warned that eliminating or weakening the Council would remove critical voices.

- Alec Harbick, Legislative Affairs Manager for the Adult Probation Department, urged the Task Force to keep the Reentry Council as an active body in the Administrative Code, explaining its history and role in coordinating agencies and community providers.
- Lorenzo Juan Castaneda, Reentry Council member and advocate, supported upholding and strengthening the Council.
- Sedrick Akbar emphasized the Council's unique structure, combining departmental representatives and people with lived experience, and argued that data alone cannot replace on-the-ground expertise.
- A Mr. Martinez supported the Reentry Council.
- Jose Castillo, a formerly incarcerated person, supported the Reentry Council.
- Louie Gomez, a formerly incarcerated person, supported the Reentry Council and cited its impacted on him personally.
- Tony Pumbres supported the Reentry Council.
- Mike Craig supported the Reentry Council.
- Michael Torres supported the Reentry Council.
- John Doroza supported the Reentry Council.
- Ricardo Cruz, a formerly incarcerated person, supported the Reentry Council.
- A formerly incarcerated person supported the Reentry Council.
- Brian Pruitt, a formerly incarcerated person, supported the Reentry Council.
- Benjamin Libby, a formerly incarcerated person, supported the Reentry Council.
- Gabriel Garcia supported the Reentry Council.
- Patrick Monette-Shaw provided comment and submitted the following written summary:

  Chelsea Hall on your Support Staff just indicated the December 18 Streamlining Task Force meeting at the Southeast Community Center appears to have major problems with the audiovisual equipment capabilities, and may not be able to support remote "*hybrid*" meeting participation for San Franciscans to join that meeting remotely via WebEx. Ever since 2020 when the COVID-19 pandemic arrived worldwide, the City has used hybrid remote public meetings to accommodate people with disabilities who can't attend public meetings at City Hall, and others.

  Because the preliminary agenda for December 18 is scheduled to present additional deferred decisions and so-called "*consistency checks*," and present the first draft of your proposed "***Final Report***," unless the Southeast Center can guarantee uninterrupted WebEx services to hold this meeting remotely, you should rapidly reschedule the 12/18/2025 meeting location to City Hall, and stop your unnecessary obsession with holding an off-site community-based meeting, which isn't necessary.

Chair Harrington and other Task Force members opened the discussion by stating that the Reentry Council clearly provides expertise that only certain community members can offer and supported bringing the item back for a future meeting.

After some discussion of the sequence of agenda items, members expressed readiness to act immediately rather than delay. Chair Harrington closed Item 7 and reopened Item 6 to consider the Reentry Council.

DRAFT

Action on Reentry Council (Reopened from Item 6)
Chair Harrington noted that the Council is currently set to sunset in June 2029 and suggested leaving that date unchanged. Members agreed that the body should remain in the Administrative Code and generally align with the advisory template, with the only modification being the addition of term limits for public members.

Vice Chair Bruss motioned to reverse the Task Force's prior decision and restore the Reentry Council to the Administrative Code in its current form, while adding a six-term limit for public members, retaining two-year terms, and keeping the existing 2029 sunset date. Ms. Kittler seconded the motion.

Public comment was reopened for individuals who had not previously spoken on Item 6:

- One speaker praised the Task Force for reversing its prior decision, and one caller reiterated support for the Council but objected to reopening the item during the meeting.

The Task Force voted unanimously in favor of the prior motion.

8. General Public Comment

During this agenda item, members of the public may comment generally for up to three minutes on matters within the Task Force's purview but not on the day's agenda. The Brown Act prohibits the Task Force from taking action or discussing any item not appearing on the agenda, including those items raised at public comment.

Public comment was received by one speaker:

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

  The "*unitary executive*" theory claims the Mayor may fire nearly anyone who leads a San Francisco City Department, Board, or Commission. San Franciscans reject that theory.

  Your decisions to date show collusion implementing SPUR's agenda to hand exclusive, greatly expanded "*unitary executive*" powers to a "*strong mayor*."

  Your "*Decision Log*" reports your adopted recommendations radically change San Francisco's boards and commissions, including:

  - 21 will be moved from the Charter to the Administrative Code;
  - 21 will lose authority to hire-and-fire department heads, reduced to ***optional*** "*consultative roles*";
  - 20 are recommended for changing removal of commission members from ***for-cause*** **only** to ***at-will*** removal; and
  - 20 have membership qualifications changed to only "*desirable*."

  It's almost certain San Franciso's voters won't endorse the nakedly partisan recommendations you have approved so far. The momentum of citizen opposition — 1,037 people opposing decisions you've made so far — suggests they will probably reject your charter change ballot measure.

9. Adjournment

Chair Harrington adjourned the meeting at 1:27 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Chelsea Hall, Senior Project Analyst.

DRAFT