

File No. 221264

Committee Item No. 3

Board Item No. 15

# COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

## AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Rules Committee

Date Dec. 12, 2022

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date January 10, 2023

### Cmte Board

- Motion
- Resolution
- Ordinance
- Legislative Digest
- Budget and Legislative Analyst Report
- Youth Commission Report
- Introduction Form
- Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report
- Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
- Grant Information Form
- Grant Budget
- Subcontract Budget
- Contract/Agreement
- Form 126 - Ethics Commission
- Award Letter
- Application
- xx   Form 700
- Information/Vacancies (Boards/Commissions)
- Public Correspondence

### OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

Completed by: Victor Young Date Dec 8, 2022

Completed by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

1 [Reappointment, Police Commission - Cindy Elias]

2

3 **Motion confirming the reappointment of Cindy Elias, term ending April 30, 2027, to the**  
4 **Police Commission.**

5

6 WHEREAS, On December 13, 2022, the Board of Supervisors approved  
7 Motion No. M22-198, declaring the intent to confirm the reappointment of Cindy Elias to the  
8 Police Commission; a copy of which can be found in Board of Supervisors File No. 221240;  
9 now, therefore, be it

10 MOVED, That That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco  
11 does hereby confirm the reappointment of Cindy Elias, succeeding herself, to seat 1 of the  
12 Police Commission for a four-year term beginning April 30, 2023, and ending April 30, 2027.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BOARD of SUPERVISORS




City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

Application for Boards, Commissions, Committees, & Task Forces

Name of Board/Commission/Committee/Task Force: \_\_\_\_\_

Seat # (Required - see Vacancy Notice for qualifications): \_\_\_\_\_

Full Name: \_\_\_\_\_



Zip Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Occupation: \_\_\_\_\_

Work Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Employer: \_\_\_\_\_

Business Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Business Email: \_\_\_\_\_ Home Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Pursuant to Charter, Section 4.101(a)(2), Boards and Commissions established by the Charter must consist of residents of the City and County of San Francisco who are 18 years of age or older (unless otherwise stated in the code authority). For certain appointments, the Board of Supervisors may waive the residency requirement.

Resident of San Francisco: Yes [ ] No [ ] If No, place of residence: \_\_\_\_\_
18 Years of Age or Older: Yes [ ] No [ ]

Pursuant to Mayoral Order, members of boards/commissions are required to be Covid-19 vaccinated and attend in-person meetings.

Covid-19 Vaccinated: Yes [ ] No [ ]

Pursuant to Charter, Section 4.101(a)(1), please state how your qualifications represent the communities of interest, neighborhoods, and the diversity in ethnicity, race, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, types of disabilities, and any other relevant demographic qualities of the City and County of San Francisco:

Large empty rectangular box for providing qualifications.

**Business and/or Professional Experience:**

**Civic Activities:**

Have you attended any meetings of the body to which you are applying? Yes  No

---

---

An appearance before the Rules Committee may be required at a scheduled public hearing, prior to the Board of Supervisors considering the recommended appointment. Applications should be received ten (10) days prior to the scheduled public hearing.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Applicant's Signature (required): *C Elias*  
*(Manually sign or type your complete name.  
NOTE: By typing your complete name, you are hereby consenting to use of electronic signature.)*

Please Note: Your application will be retained for one year. Once completed, this form, including all attachments, become public record.

---

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:**

Appointed to Seat #: \_\_\_\_\_ Term Expires: \_\_\_\_\_ Date Vacated: \_\_\_\_\_

# CINDY N. ELIAS

---

## Application for Boards, Commissions, Committees, & Task Forces

**Pursuant to Charter, Section 4.101(a)(1), please state how your qualifications represent the communities of interest, neighborhoods, and the diversity in ethnicity, race, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, types of disabilities, and any other relevant demographic qualities of the City and County of San Francisco:**

Both as a police commissioner and as a resident of Bayview-Hunters Point, I am familiar with the issues currently facing our police department and our community. The need for community safety, police accountability and best policing practices are needed now more than ever. As an attorney for the Labor Commissioner's Office, I am responsible for enforcing the Labor Code, including violations resulting from our various programs which include wage adjudication, retaliation, public works, field enforcement, judgment enforcement, licensing and registration, and administration. Through this work, I help shape policies and practices which protect workers' rights, particularly the most vulnerable from exploitation, while ensuring law-abiding businesses are not harmed by unfair competition.

Having dedicated my life to public service and helping people that have been marginalized and ostracized by society, I am in a better position to understand and relate to different communities. My desire to help others who are unable to help themselves and to speak up for those who unable has been a guiding force in my life. Being born and raised in a small, farm working community has taught me how people are viewed or judged not only by the color of their skin but also by the amount of money one has. Where I grew up, words like diversity and inclusion were not words, much less ideals, people lived by or tried to emulate. If you were different, you stood out. This experience has taught me to be more compassionate and understanding of others.

# CINDY N. ELIAS

---

## **Business and/or professional experience:**

In my current role as Special Counsel to the Labor Commissioner, I create policies that ensure workers' voices are amplified and exploitative employers are held accountable. I also hope to strengthen and expand our enforcement and litigation efforts to make the Labor Commissioner's Office a robust enforcement agency. Prior to becoming Special Counsel, I served as a Bureau of Field Enforcement attorney for the Labor Commissioner's Office, where I enforced California's labor laws and prosecuted employers' who have disregarded the rights of their employees. Since joining the Labor Commissioner's Office in 2018, I have recovered nearly \$8 million dollars in unpaid wages and penalties. I was also responsible for working with law enforcement and District Attorney's offices in combating wage theft and insurance fraud. As such, I have conducted wage theft trainings for various District Attorneys and law enforcement agencies all throughout California. I also worked with a team of California District Attorneys and California Department of Justice Attorneys on human trafficking cases and assisting in the certification process for these victims.

Additionally, as a Bureau of Field Enforcement attorney for the Labor Commissioner's Office, I am familiar with the Administrative Procedures Act which establishes procedures and standards for state and local agencies. Being familiar with the process is extremely beneficial as a police commissioner because this is similar to what is used in the police officers misconduct hearings.

As a Police Commissioner, I have established policies and procedures for the San Francisco Police Department ("SFPD"), including revising the Police Department's general orders ("DGO") which instruct police officers on how to conduct effective law enforcement. I have assisted in executing and implementing the 272 policy recommendations from the United States Department of Justice ("DOJ") Community Oriented Policing Services ("COPS") aimed at improving the SFPD policies and procedures to increase public trust in law enforcement, requiring officers be professional and accountable for their actions. I have continually worked in collaboration with the California DOJ, the Hillard Heintze consulting firm, the community, and the Police Department to establish best practices aimed at bringing the SFPD into compliance with best police enforcement practices and 21<sup>st</sup> century policing.

I have conducted and adjudicated numerous police officer disciplinary hearings involving police misconduct charges filed by the Chief of Police or the Department of Police Accountability, including imposing discipline as warranted. I have drafted and implemented appellate procedures for police misconduct hearing appeals as well as the rules of conduct for these administrative hearings.

I have also attended community engagements and activities to develop positive and trusting relationships with the community and other government agencies. I participate and set the agenda for weekly commission meetings wherein the public discusses community concerns and policing issues related to SFPD.

# CINDY N. ELIAS

---

## **Civic Activities:**

While having the honor of serving as a Police Commissioner, I have been able to reach out to and connect with my community on a greater level. After becoming a Police Commissioner, I began visiting the district stations at roll call to speak with the uniformed police officers patrolling the various districts. It was through these visits and interactions with the beat officers that I learned of the direct issues facing these officers as they interact with the community on a daily basis.

As a Police Commissioner, I have worked close with the Chief of Police and the Department of Police Accountability (“DPA”). During my tenure, I have worked on revising, editing, and drafting nearly twenty-five DGOs. These have included issues surrounding use of force, bias, discrimination, search and seizure, and the logistical process of how DGOs are created, amended, and implemented. This included establishing a system which allows both the public and police officers to provide feedback on the policies the police commission is working on or set to adopt. Additionally, I have met with various members of the department regarding policy and morale. The purpose of which is to ensure that the policies the police department and the police commission are making – will actually work when implemented. These discussions and candid conversations have helped me when making or revising department policies.

**STATEMENT OF ECONOMIC INTERESTS**  
**COVER PAGE**  
*A Public Document*

1445539

Please type or print in ink.

NAME OF FILER	(LAST)	(FIRST)	(MIDDLE)
Elias, Cindy			

**1. Office, Agency, or Court**

Agency Name (Do not use acronyms)

City and County of San Francisco

Division, Board, Department, District, if applicable

Your Position

Police Commission

Commissioner

▶ If filing for multiple positions, list below or on an attachment. (Do not use acronyms)

Agency: \_\_\_\_\_ Position: \_\_\_\_\_

**2. Jurisdiction of Office (Check at least one box)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> State              | <input type="checkbox"/> Judge, Retired Judge, Pro Tem Judge, or Court Commissioner<br>(Statewide Jurisdiction) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Multi-County _____ | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> County of <u>San Francisco</u>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> City of _____      | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____  |

**3. Type of Statement (Check at least one box)**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Annual:</b> The period covered is January 1, 2021 through December 31, 2021.  | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Leaving Office:</b> Date Left ____/____/____<br>(Check one circle)     |
| -or-   | <input type="checkbox"/> The period covered is January 1, 2021 through the date of leaving office. |
| The period covered is ____/____/____, through December 31, 2021.   | <input type="checkbox"/> The period covered is ____/____/____, through the date of leaving office. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Assuming Office:</b> Date assumed ____/____/____   |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Candidate:</b> Date of Election _____ and office sought, if different than Part 1: _____ |  |

**4. Schedule Summary (must complete) ▶ Total number of pages including this cover page: 1****Schedules attached**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Schedule A-1 - Investments</b> – schedule attached | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Schedule C - Income, Loans, &amp; Business Positions</b> – schedule attached |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Schedule A-2 - Investments</b> – schedule attached | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Schedule D - Income – Gifts</b> – schedule attached                          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Schedule B - Real Property</b> – schedule attached | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Schedule E - Income – Gifts – Travel Payments</b> – schedule attached        |

-or-

- 
- None - No reportable interests on any schedule**

**5. Verification**

MAILING ADDRESS	STREET	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
<i>(Business or Agency Address Recommended - Public Document)</i>				
1245 3rd Street		San Francisco	CA	94158
DAYTIME TELEPHONE NUMBER	E-MAIL ADDRESS			
( 415 ) 837-7070	cindy.elias@sfgov.org			

I have used all reasonable diligence in preparing this statement. I have reviewed this statement and to the best of my knowledge the information contained herein and in any attached schedules is true and complete. I acknowledge this is a public document.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date Signed 03/30/2022  
(month, day, year)Signature Cindy Elias  
(File the originally signed paper statement with your filing official.)



BOARD of SUPERVISORS




City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

Application for Boards, Commissions, Committees, & Task Forces

Name of Board/Commission/Committee/Task Force: San Francisco Police Commission

Seat # (Required - see Vacancy Notice for qualifications): 2

Full Name: Terence R. Tracy



Zip Code: 94127

Occupation: Retired

Work Phone: Employer:

Business Address: Zip Code:

Business Email: Home Email: tracy@phc.net

Pursuant to Charter, Section 4.101(a)(2), Boards and Commissions established by the Charter must consist of residents of the City and County of San Francisco who are 18 years of age or older (unless otherwise stated in the code authority). For certain appointments, the Board of Supervisors may waive the residency requirement.

Resident of San Francisco: Yes [X] No [ ] If No, place of residence:
18 Years of Age or Older: Yes [X] No [ ]

Pursuant to Mayoral Order, members of boards/commissions are required to be Covid-19 vaccinated and attend in-person meetings.

Covid-19 Vaccinated: Yes [X] No [ ]

Pursuant to Charter, Section 4.101(a)(1), please state how your qualifications represent the communities of interest, neighborhoods, and the diversity in ethnicity, race, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, types of disabilities, and any other relevant demographic qualities of the City and County of San Francisco:

My experience and training have developed in me the ability to represent all communities and all interests. Having had the opportunity to work in positions requiring contact and coordination with people from all walks of life, I have learned that everyone needs an advocate, regardless of their station in life. It is important to see people not as members of particular groups, but instead as members of the community as a whole. By doing so, it is possible to avoid the factionalization of disparate groups and to ensure that all members of the community are seen and treated as equal.

**Business and/or Professional Experience:**

I am a veteran, having served in the United States Air Force from 1981 through 1985. This experience provided me with the opportunity to travel around the world and to experience many different cultures. This experience also instilled in me that there is no greater country than the United States.

I served for 27 years in law enforcement, including 24 years with the California Highway Patrol. Throughout my law enforcement career, I had the opportunity to work with many different individuals and organizations. I worked with federal, state and local government officials. My law enforcement responsibilities often required that I interact with all segments of society, from those who violated the law to those who simply needed some type of assistance. I learned early on that we are all part of the global community and that we all have our faults, our strengths and our weaknesses.

I worked for ten years in corporate security for a large, multi-national, U.S.-based bank. I currently serve as a union representative for retired CHP officers.



**Civic Activities:**

I volunteered to coach my daughters' school athletic teams.

I served on the Board of Directors of two different homeowners' associations.

I participate in various charity organizations, including annual holiday clothing drives.

Have you attended any meetings of the body to which you are applying? Yes  No

An appearance before the Rules Committee may be required at a scheduled public hearing, prior to the Board of Supervisors considering the recommended appointment. Applications should be received ten (10) days prior to the scheduled public hearing.

Date: March 12, 2022 Applicant's Signature (required): Terence R. Tracy

*(Manually sign or type your complete name.)*

*NOTE: By typing your complete name, you are hereby consenting to use of electronic signature.)*

Please Note: Your application will be retained for one year. Once completed, this form, including all attachments, become public record.

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:**

Appointed to Seat #: \_\_\_\_\_ Term Expires: \_\_\_\_\_ Date Vacated: \_\_\_\_\_

## Quick Start Guide

Detailed instructions begin on page 3.

### WHEN IS THE ANNUAL STATEMENT DUE?

- March 1 – Elected State Officers, Judges and Court Commissioners, State Board and Commission members listed in Government Code Section 87200
- April 1 – Most other filer

### WHERE DO I FILE?

Most people file the Form 700 with their agency. If you're not sure where to file your Form 700, contact your filing officer or the person who asked you to complete

### ITEMS TO NOTE!

- The Form 700 is a public document.
- Only filers serving in active military duty may receive an extension on the filing deadline
- You must also report interests held by your spouse or registered domestic partner.
- Your agency's conflict of interest code will help you to complete the Form 700. You are encouraged to get your conflict of interest code from the person who asked you to complete the Form 700

### NOTHING TO REPORT?

Mark the "No reportable interests" box on Part 4 of the Cover Page, and submit only the signed Cover Page. Please review each schedule carefully!

Schedule	Common Reportable Interests	Common Non-Reportable Interests
A-1: Investments	Stocks, including those held in an IRA or 401K. Each stock must be listed.	Insurance policies, government bonds, diversified mutual funds, funds similar to diversified mutual funds.
A-2: Business Entities/Trusts	Business entities, sole proprietorships, partnerships, LLCs, corporations and trusts. (e.g., Form 1099 filers)	Savings and checking accounts, and annuities.
B: Real Property	Rental property in filer's jurisdiction, or within two miles of the boundaries of the jurisdiction.	A residence used exclusively as a personal residence (such as a home or vacation property).
C: Income	Non-governmental salaries. Note that filers are required to report only half of their spouse's or partner's salary.	Governmental salary (from school district, for example).
D: Gifts	Gifts from businesses, vendors, or other contractors (meals, tickets, etc.).	Gifts from family members.
E: Travel Payments	Travel payments from third parties (not your employer).	Travel paid by your government agency.

**Note:** Like reportable interests, non-reportable interests may also create conflicts of interest and could be grounds for disqualification from certain decisions

### QUESTIONS?

- [advice@fppc.ca.gov](mailto:advice@fppc.ca.gov)
- (866) 275-3772 Mon-Thursday, 9-11:30 a.m.

### E-FILING ISSUES?

- If using your agency's system, please contact technical support at your agency.
- If using FPPC's e-filing system, write to [form700@fppc.ca.gov](mailto:form700@fppc.ca.gov).

## What's New

### Gift Limit Increase

The gift limit increased to **\$520** for calendar years **2021** and **2022**. The gift limit in 2020 was **\$500**.

### Who must file:

- Elected and appointed officials and candidates listed in Government Code Section 87200
- Employees, appointed officials, and consultants filing pursuant to a conflict of interest code ("code filers") **Obtain your disclosure categories, which describe the interests you must report, from your agency;** they are not part of the Form 700
- Candidates running for local elective offices that are designated in a conflict of interest code (e.g., county sheriffs, city clerks, school board trustees, and water board members)

#### Exception:

- Candidates for a county central committee are not required to file the Form 700
- Employees in newly created positions of existing agencies

For more information, see Reference Pamphlet, page 3, at [www.fppc.ca.gov](http://www.fppc.ca.gov).

### Where to file:

#### 87200 Filers

State office	⇒	Your agency
Judicial office	⇒	The clerk of your court
Retired Judges	⇒	Directly with FPPC
County office	⇒	Your county filing office
City office	⇒	Your city clerk
Multi-County office	⇒	Your agency

#### Code Filers — State and Local Officials, Employees, and Consultants Designated in a Conflict of Interest

**Code:** File with your agency, board, or commission unless otherwise specified in your agency's code (e.g., Legislative staff files directly with FPPC). In most cases, the agency, board, or commission will retain the statements.

**Members of Newly Created Boards and Commissions:** File with your agency or with your agency's code reviewing body pursuant to Regulation 18754.

**Employees in Newly Created Positions of Existing Agencies:** File with your agency or with your agency's code reviewing body. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 3.)

Candidates file as follows

State offices, Judicial offices and multi-county office	⇒	County elections official with whom you file your declaration of candidacy
County office	⇒	County elections official
City office	⇒	City Clerk
Public Employee's Retirement System (CalPERS)	⇒	CalPERS
State Teacher's Retirement Board (CalSTRS)	⇒	CalSTRS

### How to file:

The Form 700 is available at [www.fppc.ca.gov](http://www.fppc.ca.gov). Form 700 schedules are also available in Excel format. Each Statement must have a handwritten "wet" signature or "secure electronic signature," meaning either (1) a signature submitted using an approved electronic filing system or (2) if permitted by the filing office, a digital signature submitted via the filing office's agency email address. (See Regulations 18104 and 18757.) Companies such as Adobe and DocuSign offer digital signature services. All statements are signed under the penalty of perjury and must be verified by the filer. See Regulation 18723.1(c) for filing instructions for copies of expanded statements.

### When to file:

#### Annual Statements

##### ⇒ March 1, 2022

- Elected State Office
- Judges and Court Commissioners
- State Board and State Commission Members listed in Government Code Section 87200

##### ⇒ April 1, 2022

- Most other filers

Individuals filing under conflict of interest codes in city and county jurisdictions should verify the annual filing date with their filing official or filing officer.

Statements postmarked by the filing deadline are considered filed on time.

Statements of 30 pages or less may be emailed or faxed by the deadline as long as the originally signed paper version is sent by first class mail to the filing official within 24 hours.

#### Assuming Office and Leaving Office Statements

Most filers file within 30 days of assuming or leaving office or within 30 days of the effective date of a newly adopted or amended conflict of interest code.

#### Exception:

If you assumed office between October 1, 2021, and December 31, 2021, and filed an assuming office statement, you are not required to file an annual statement until March 1, 2023, or April 1, 2023, whichever is applicable. The annual statement will cover the day after you assumed office through December 31, 2022. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 6, for additional exceptions.)

#### Candidate Statements

File no later than the final filing date for the declaration of candidacy or nomination documents. A candidate statement is not required if you filed an assuming office or annual statement for the same jurisdiction within 60 days before filing a declaration of candidacy or other nomination documents.

#### Late Statements

**There is no provision for filing deadline extensions unless the filer is serving in active military duty. (See page 19 for information on penalties and fines.)**

#### Amendments

Statements may be amended at any time. You are only required to amend the schedule that needs to be revised. It is not necessary to amend the entire filed form. Obtain amendment schedules at [www.fppc.ca.gov](http://www.fppc.ca.gov).

## Types of Statements

### Assuming Office Statement:

If you are a newly appointed official or are newly employed in a position designated, or that will be designated, in a state or local agency's conflict of interest code, your assuming office date is the date you were sworn in or otherwise authorized to serve in the position. If you are a newly elected official, your assuming office date is the date you were sworn in.

- Report: Investments, interests in real property, and business positions held on the date you assumed the office or position must be reported. In addition, income (including loans, gifts, and travel payments) received during the 12 months prior to the date you assumed the office or position

For positions subject to confirmation by the State Senate or the Commission on Judicial Appointments, your assuming office date is the date you were appointed or nominated to the position.

- Example: Maria Lopez was nominated by the Governor to serve on a state agency board that is subject to state Senate confirmation. The assuming office date is the date Maria's nomination is submitted to the Senate. Maria must report investments, interests in real property, and business positions she holds on that date, and income (including loans, gifts, and travel payments) received during the 12 months prior to that date.

If your office or position has been added to a newly adopted or newly amended conflict of interest code, use the effective date of the code or amendment, whichever is applicable.

- Report: Investments, interests in real property, and business positions held on the effective date of the code or amendment must be reported. In addition, income (including loans, gifts, and travel payments) received during the 12 months prior to the effective date of the code or amendment.

### Annual Statement:

Generally, the period covered is January 1, 2021, through December 31, 2021. If the period covered by the statement is different than January 1, 2021, through December 31, 2021, (for example, you assumed office between October 1, 2020, and December 31, 2020 or you are combining statements), you must specify the period covered.

- Investments, interests in real property, business positions held, and income (including loans, gifts, and travel payments) received during the period covered by the statement must be reported. Do not change the preprinted dates on Schedules A-1, A-2, and B unless you are required to report the acquisition or disposition of an interest that did not occur in 2021.

- If your disclosure category changes during a reporting period, disclose under the old category until the effective date of the conflict of interest code amendment and disclose under the new disclosure category through the end of the reporting period.

### Leaving Office Statement:

Generally, the period covered is January 1, 2021, through the date you stopped performing the duties of your position. If the period covered differs from January 1, 2021, through the date you stopped performing the duties of your position (for example, you assumed office between October 1, 2020, and December 31, 2020, or you are combining statements), the period covered must be specified. The reporting period can cover parts of two calendar years.

- Report: Investments, interests in real property, business positions held, and income (including loans, gifts, and travel payments) received during the period covered by the statement. Do not change the preprinted dates on Schedules A-1, A-2, and B unless you are required to report the acquisition or disposition of an interest that did not occur in 2021.

### Candidate Statement:

If you are filing a statement in connection with your candidacy for state or local office, investments, interests in real property, and business positions held on the date of filing your declaration of candidacy must be reported. In addition, income (including loans, gifts, and travel payments) received during the 12 months prior to the date of filing your declaration of candidacy is reportable. Do not change the preprinted dates on Schedules A-1, A-2, and B.

Candidates running for local elective offices (e.g. county sheriffs, city clerks, school board trustees, or water district board members) must file candidate statements, as required by the conflict of interest code for the elected position. The code may be obtained from the agency of the elected position.

### Amendments:

If you discover errors or omissions on any statement, file an amendment as soon as possible. You are only required to amend the schedule that needs to be revised; it is not necessary to refile the entire form. Obtain amendment schedules from the FPPC website at [www.fppc.ca.gov](http://www.fppc.ca.gov).

**Note:** Once you file your statement, you may not withdraw it. All changes must be noted on amendment schedules.

### Expanded Statement:

If you hold multiple positions subject to reporting requirements, you may be able to file an expanded statement for each position, rather than a separate and distinct statement for each position. The expanded statement must cover all reportable interests for all jurisdictions and list all positions for which it is filed. The rules and processes governing the filing of an expanded statement are set forth in Regulation 18723.1

**STATEMENT OF ECONOMIC INTERESTS  
COVER PAGE  
A PUBLIC DOCUMENT**

Please type or print in ink.

NAME OF FILER (LAST) (FIRST) (MIDDLE)

**1. Office, Agency, or Court**

Agency Name (Do not use acronyms)

Division, Board, Department, District, if applicable Your Position

► If filing for multiple positions, list below or on an attachment. (Do not use acronyms)

Agency: Position:

**2. Jurisdiction of Office (Check at least one box)**

State Judge, Retired Judge, Pro Tem Judge, or Court Commissioner (Statewide Jurisdiction)  
Multi-County County of  
City of Other

**3. Type of Statement (Check at least one box)**

Annual: The period covered is January 1, 2021, through December 31, 2021. Leaving Office: Date Left (Check one circle.)  
-or- The period covered is through December 31, 2021. The period covered is January 1, 2021, through the date of leaving office.  
Assuming Office: Date assumed -or- The period covered is through the date of leaving office.  
Candidate: Date of Election and office sought, if different than Part 1:

**4. Schedule Summary (must complete) ► Total number of pages including this cover page:**

**Schedules attached**

Schedule A-1 - Investments – schedule attached Schedule C - Income, Loans, & Business Positions – schedule attached  
Schedule A-2 - Investments – schedule attached Schedule D - Income – Gifts – schedule attached  
Schedule B - Real Property – schedule attached Schedule E - Income – Gifts – Travel Payments – schedule attached

-or- None - No reportable interests on any schedule

**5. Verification**

MAILING ADDRESS STREET CITY STATE ZIP CODE  
(Business or Agency Address Recommended - Public Document)

to the best of my knowledge the information contained herein and in any attached schedules is true and complete. I acknowledge this is a public document.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date Signed Signature  
(month, day, year) (File the originally signed paper statement with your filing official.)

**SCHEDULE B**  
**Interests in Real Property**  
 (Including Rental Income)

Name \_\_\_\_\_

▶ ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER OR STREET ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

CITY \_\_\_\_\_

---

FAIR MARKET VALUE      IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

\$2,000 - \$10,000		
\$10,001 - \$100,000	____/____/21	____/____/21
\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	ACQUIRED	DISPOSED
Over \$1,000,000		

NATURE OF INTEREST

Ownership/Deed of Trust	Easement
Leasehold _____	_____
Yrs. remaining	Other

IF RENTAL PROPERTY, GROSS INCOME RECEIVED

\$0 - \$499	\$500 - \$1,000	\$1,001 - \$10,000
\$10,001 - \$100,000	OVER \$100,000	

SOURCES OF RENTAL INCOME: If you own a 10% or greater interest, list the name of each tenant that is a single source of income of \$10,000 or more.

None

▶ ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER OR STREET ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

CITY \_\_\_\_\_

---

FAIR MARKET VALUE      IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

\$2,000 - \$10,000		
\$10,001 - \$100,000	____/____/21	____/____/21
\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	ACQUIRED	DISPOSED
Over \$1,000,000		

NATURE OF INTEREST

Ownership/Deed of Trust	Easement
Leasehold _____	_____
Yrs. remaining	Other

IF RENTAL PROPERTY, GROSS INCOME RECEIVED

\$0 - \$499	\$500 - \$1,000	\$1,001 - \$10,000
\$10,001 - \$100,000	OVER \$100,000	

SOURCES OF RENTAL INCOME: If you own a 10% or greater interest, list the name of each tenant that is a single source of income of \$10,000 or more.

None

\* You are not required to report loans from a commercial lending institution made in the lender's regular course of business on terms available to members of the public without regard to your official status. Personal loans a loans received not in a lender's regular course of business must be disclosed as follows:

NAME OF LENDER\* \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable) \_\_\_\_\_

BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF LENDER \_\_\_\_\_

INTEREST RATE      TERM (Months/Years)

_____%	None	_____
--------	------	-------

HIGHEST BALANCE DURING REPORTING PERIOD

\$500 - \$1,000	\$1,001 - \$10,000
\$10,001 - \$100,000	OVER \$100,000

Guarantor, if applicable \_\_\_\_\_

NAME OF LENDER\* \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable) \_\_\_\_\_

BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF LENDER \_\_\_\_\_

INTEREST RATE      TERM (Months/Years)

_____%	None	_____
--------	------	-------

HIGHEST BALANCE DURING REPORTING PERIOD

\$500 - \$1,000	\$1,001 - \$10,000
\$10,001 - \$100,000	OVER \$100,000

Guarantor, if applicable \_\_\_\_\_

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_



## POLICE COMMISSION

The below listed summary of seats, term expirations and membership information shall serve as notice of **vacancies, upcoming term expirations** and information on currently held seats, appointed by the Board of Supervisors. Appointments by other bodies are listed, if available. Seat numbers listed in **bold** are open for immediate appointment. However, you are able to submit applications for all seats and your application will be maintained for one year, in the event that an unexpected vacancy or opening occurs.

### Membership and Seat Qualifications

Seat #	Appointing Authority	Seat Holder	Term Ending	Qualification
1	BOS	Cindy Elias	4/30/23	Must be nominated by the Board of Supervisors' Rules Committee and subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors, for a four-year term.
2	BOS	Kevin Michael Benedicto	4/30/26	
3	BOS	Jesus Gabriel Yanez	4/30/25	
4	Mayor	James Byrne	4/30/24	Must be nominated by the Mayor with at least one member shall be a retired judge or an attorney with trial experience, for a four-year term.
5	Mayor	Debra Walker	4/30/24	
6	Mayor	Larry Yee	4/30/26	
7	Mayor	Max Carter-Oberstone	4/30/26	

### **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS (BOS) APPLICATION FORMS AVAILABLE HERE**

- English - [https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/vacancy\\_application.pdf](https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/vacancy_application.pdf)
- 中文 - [https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/vacancy\\_application\\_CHI.pdf](https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/vacancy_application_CHI.pdf)
- Español - [https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/vacancy\\_application\\_SPA.pdf](https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/vacancy_application_SPA.pdf)
- Filipino - [https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/vacancy\\_application\\_FIL.pdf](https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/vacancy_application_FIL.pdf)

(For seats appointed by other Authorities please contact the Board / Commission / Committee / Task Force (see below) or the appointing authority directly.)

Pursuant to Board of Supervisors Rules of Order 2.19 (Motion No. 05-92) all applicants applying for this body must complete and submit, with their application, a copy (**not original**) of Form 700, Statement of Economic Interests. Applications will not be considered if a copy of Form 700 is not received.

### **FORM 700 AVAILABLE HERE (Required)**

<https://www.fppc.ca.gov/Form700.html>



*Please Note: Depending upon the posting date, a vacancy may have already been filled. To determine if a vacancy for this Commission is still available, or if you require additional information, please call the Rules Committee Clerk at (415) 554-5184.*

Applications and other documents may be submitted to [BOS-Appointments@sfgov.org](mailto:BOS-Appointments@sfgov.org)

**Next Steps:** Applicants who meet minimum qualifications will be contacted by the Rules Committee Clerk once the Rules Committee Chair determines the date of the hearing. Members of the Rules Committee will consider the appointment(s) at the meeting and applicant(s) may be asked to state their qualifications. The appointment of the individual(s) who is recommended by the Rules Committee will be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for final approval.

---

The Police Commission shall consist of seven (7) members:

- Three (3) members shall be nominated by the Rules Committee of the Board of Supervisors; and
- Four (4) members nominated by the Mayor, at least one (1) shall be a retired judge or an attorney with trial experience.

Each nomination shall be subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors. The Mayor's nominations shall be the subject of a public hearing and vote within 60 days. If the Board of Supervisors rejects the Mayor's nomination to fill the seat designated for a retired judge or attorney with trial experience, the Mayor shall nominate a different person with such qualifications. If the Board of Supervisors fails to act on a mayoral nomination within 60 days from the date the nomination is transmitted to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, the nominee shall be deemed confirmed.

To stagger the terms of the seven members, of the first four members nominated by the Mayor, two members shall serve two year terms and two members shall serve terms of four years; and of the three members nominated by the Rules Committee, one member shall serve a term of one year, one member shall serve a term of two years, and one member shall serve a term of three years. The Clerk of the Board of Supervisors shall designate such initial terms by lot. All subsequent appointments to the commission shall be for four-year terms.

The tenure of each member shall terminate upon the expiration of the member's term. The Mayor shall transmit a nomination or re-nomination to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors no later than 60 days prior to the expiration of the term of a member nominated by the Mayor. For vacancies occurring for reasons other than the expiration of a member's term, within 60 days following the creation of such vacancy, the Mayor shall nominate a member to fill such vacancy if the vacancy is for a seat filled by nomination of the Mayor.

The District Attorney, Sheriff, and Public Defender may recommend persons to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors for nomination or appointment to the Commission.

The Mayor, with the consent of the Board, may remove a member the Mayor has nominated.  
The Board of Supervisors may remove a member the Rules Committee has nominated.

The Police Commission oversees the Police Department and the Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC). The OCC investigates complaints of police misconduct and neglect of duty. The Director of the OCC may verify and file disciplinary charges with the Police Commission against members of the Police Department arising out of citizen complaints that are sustained by the OCC after meeting and conferring with the Chief of Police.

Authority: Charter, Sections 4.109 and 4.127 (Proposition H, November 4, 2003)

Sunset Date: None

Contact: Stacy Youngblood  
Police Department  
1245 3rd Street, 6th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94158  
(415) 837-7070  
[stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org](mailto:stacy.a.youngblood@sfgov.org)

Updated: November 10, 2022

# ***GENDER ANALYSIS OF COMMISSIONS AND BOARDS***

---



City and County of San Francisco  
London N. Breed  
Mayor

Department on the Status of Women  
Emily M. Murase, PhD  
Director



## Acknowledgements

---

The data collection and analysis for this report was conducted by Public Policy Fellow Diana McCaffrey with support from Policy and Projects Director Elizabeth Newman, Associate Director Carol Sacco, and Director Emily Murase, PhD, at the San Francisco Department on the Status of Women.

The San Francisco Department on the Status of Women would like to thank the various policy body members, Commission secretaries, and department staff who graciously assisted in collecting demographic data and providing information about their respective policy bodies.

### **San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women**

President Debbie Mesloh

Vice President Breanna Zwart

Commissioner Shokooh Miry

Commissioner Carrie Schwab-Pomerantz

Commissioner Andrea Shorter

Commissioner Julie D. Soo

Emily M. Murase, PhD, Director  
Department on the Status of Women

This report is available at the San Francisco Department on the Status of Women website, <https://sfgov.org/dosw/gender-analysis-reports>.

# Contents

---

Table of Figures .....	3
Executive Summary.....	4
I. Introduction .....	7
II. Gender Analysis Findings .....	8
A. Gender .....	8
B. Race and Ethnicity.....	11
C. Race and Ethnicity by Gender .....	14
D. LGBTQ Identity.....	16
E. Disability Status.....	16
F. Veteran Status.....	17
G. Policy Bodies by Budget.....	18
H. Comparison of Advisory Body and Commission and Board Demographics .....	19
I. Demographics of Mayoral, Supervisorial, and Total Appointees .....	20
III. Conclusion.....	21
IV. Methodology and Limitations.....	23
Appendix .....	24

## Table of Figures

---

Figure 1: Summary Data of Policy Body Demographics, 2019.....	8
Figure 2: 10-Year Comparison of Representation of Women on Policy Bodies .....	8
Figure 3: Commissions and Boards with Highest Percentages of Women, 2019 Compared to 2017, 2015..	9
.....	9
Figure 4: Commissions and Boards with Lowest Percentage of Women, 2019 Compared to 2017, 2015..	10
.....	10
Figure 5: Advisory Bodies with the Highest and Lowest Percentage of Women, 2019.....	10
Figure 6: 10-Year Comparison of People of Color’s Representation of Policy Bodies.....	11
Figure 7: Race and Ethnicity of Appointees Compared to San Francisco Population, 2019.....	12
Figure 8: Commissions and Boards with Highest Percentage of People of Color, 2019 Compared to 2017, 2015 .....	12
Figure 9: Commissions and Boards with Lowest Percentage of People of Color, 2019 Compared to 2017, 2015 .....	13
Figure 10: Advisory Bodies with the Highest and Lowest Percentage of People of Color, 2019.....	14
Figure 11: 10-Year Comparison of Representation of Women of Color on Policy Bodies.....	14
Figure 12: Appointees by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 2019 .....	15
Figure 13: San Francisco Population by Race/Ethnicity, 2019 .....	15
Figure 14: LGBTQ Identity of Appointees, 2019 .....	16
Figure 15: LGBTQ Population of Appointees, 2019 .....	16
Figure 16: San Francisco Adult Population with a Disability by Gender, 2017 .....	17
Figure 17: Appointees with One or More Disabilities by Gender, 2019 .....	17
Figure 18: San Francisco Adult Population with Military Service by Gender, 2017.....	17
Figure 19: Appointees with Military Service, 2019.....	17
Figure 20: Percent of Women, Women of Color, and People of Color on Commissions and Boards with Largest and Smallest Budgets in Fiscal Year 2018-2019 .....	18
Figure 21: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Largest Budgets, 2019 .....	19
Figure 22: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Smallest Budgets, 2019 .....	19
Figure 23: Demographics of Appointees on Commission and Boards and Advisory Bodies, 2019 .....	20
Figure 24: Demographics of Mayoral, Supervisorial, and Total Appointees, 2019 .....	20
Figure 25: Policy Body Demographics, 2019.....	24
Figure 26: San Francisco Population Estimates by Race/Ethnicity, 2017 .....	26
Figure 27: San Francisco Population Estimates by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 2017 .....	26



## Executive Summary

---

In 2008, San Francisco voters overwhelmingly approved a City Charter Amendment (section 4.101) establishing as City policy for the membership of Commissions and Boards to reflect the diversity of San Francisco’s population, and that appointing officials be urged to support the nomination, appointment, and confirmation of these candidates. Additionally, it requires the San Francisco Department on the Status of Women to conduct and publish a gender analysis of Commissions and Boards every two years.

The *2019 Gender Analysis of Commissions and Boards* includes more policy bodies such as task forces, committees, and advisory bodies, than previous analyses, which were limited to Commissions and Boards. Data was collected from 84 policy bodies and from a total of 741 members mostly appointed by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. These policy bodies fall under two categories designated by the San Francisco Office of the City Attorney.<sup>1</sup> The first category, referred to as “Commissions and Boards,” are policy bodies with decision-making authority and whose members are required to submit financial disclosures to the Ethics Commission. The second category, referred to as “Advisory Bodies,” are policy bodies with advisory function whose members do *not* submit financial disclosures to the Ethics Commission. This report examines policy bodies and appointees both comprehensively as a whole and separately by the two categories.


The *2019 Gender Analysis* evaluates the representation of women; people of color; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and questioning (LGBTQ) individuals; people with disabilities; and veterans on San Francisco policy bodies.

### Key Findings

#### Gender

- Women’s representation on policy bodies is 51%, slightly above parity with the San Francisco female population of 49%.
- Since 2009, there has been a small but steady increase in the representation of women on San Francisco policy bodies.

**10-Year Comparison of Representation of Women on Policy Bodies**



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.


---

<sup>1</sup> “List of City Boards, Commissions, and Advisory Bodies Created by Charter, Ordinance, or Statute,” Office of the City Attorney, <https://www.sfcityattorney.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Commission-List-08252017.pdf>, (August 25, 2017).

## Race and Ethnicity

- People of color are underrepresented on policy bodies compared to the population. Although people of color comprise 62% of San Francisco’s population, just 50% of appointees identify as a race other than white.
- While the overall representation of people of color has increased between 2009 and 2019, as the Department collected data on more appointees, the representation of people of color has decreased over the last few years. The percentage of appointees of color decreased from 53% in 2017 to 49% in 2019.
- As found in previous reports, Latinx and Asian groups are underrepresented on San Francisco policy bodies compared to the population. Latinx individuals are 14% of the population but make up only 8% of appointees. Asian individuals are 31% of the population but make up only 18% of appointees.

**10-Year Comparison of Representation of People of Color on Policy Bodies**




Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

## Race and Ethnicity by Gender

- On the whole, women of color are 32% of the San Francisco population, and 28% of appointees. Although still below parity, 28% is a slight increase compared to 2017, which showed 27% women of color appointees.
- Meanwhile, men of color are underrepresented at 21% of appointees compared to 31% of the San Francisco population.
- Both White women and men are overrepresented on San Francisco policy bodies. White women are 23% of appointees compared to 17% of the San Francisco population. White men are 26% of appointees compared to 20% of the population.
- Black and African American women and men are well-represented on San Francisco policy bodies. Black women are 9% of appointees compared to 2.4% of the population, and Black men are 5% of appointees compared to 2.5% of the population.
- Latinx women are 7% of the San Francisco population but 3% of appointees, and Latinx men are 7% of the population but 5% of appointees.
- Asian women are 17% of the San Francisco population but 11% of appointees, and Asian men are 15% of the population but just 7% of appointees.

**10-Year Comparison of Representation of Women of Color on Policy Bodies**



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.



### Additional Demographics

- Out of the 74% of appointees who responded to the survey question on LGBTQ identity, 19% identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, nonbinary, queer, or questioning, and 81% of appointees identify as straight/heterosexual.
- Out of the 70% of appointees who responded to the question on disability, 11% identify as having one or more disabilities, which is just below the 12% of the adult population with a disability in San Francisco.
- Out of the 67% of appointees who responded to the question on veteran status, 7% have served in the military compared to 3% of the San Francisco population.

### Proxies for Influence: Budget & Authority

- Although women are half of all appointees, those Commissions and Boards with the largest budgets have fewer women and especially fewer women of color. Meanwhile, women exceed representation on Boards and Commissions with the smallest budgets and women of color reach parity with the population on the smallest budgeted Commissions and Boards.
- Although still underrepresented relative to the San Francisco population, there is a larger percentage of people of color on Commissions and Boards with both the largest and smallest budgets compared to overall appointees.
- The percentage of total women is greater on Advisory Bodies than Commissions and Boards. Women are 54% of appointees on Advisory Bodies and 48% of appointees on Commissions and Boards. However, the percentages of people of color and women of color on Commissions and Boards exceed the percentages of people of color and women of color on Advisory Bodies.

### Appointing Authorities

- Mayoral appointments include 55% women, 52% people of color, and 30% women of color, which is more diverse by gender and race compared to both Supervisorial appointments and total appointments.

### Demographics of Appointees Compared to the San Francisco Population

	Women	People of Color	Women of Color	LGBTQ	Disability Status	Veteran Status
San Francisco Population	49%	62%	32%	6%-15%*	12%	3%
Total Appointees	51%	50%	28%	19%	11%	7%
10 Largest Budgeted Commissions & Boards	41%	55%	23%			
10 Smallest Budgeted Commissions & Boards	52%	54%	32%			
Commissions and Boards	48%	52%	30%			
Advisory Bodies	54%	49%	28%			

Sources: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis, 2019, \*Note: Estimates vary by source. See page 16 for a detailed breakdown.

## I. Introduction

---

Inspired by the 4th UN World Conference on Women in Beijing, San Francisco became the first city in the world to adopt a local ordinance reflecting the principles of the U.N. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination (CEDAW), an international bill of rights for women. The CEDAW Ordinance was passed unanimously by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and signed into law by Mayor Willie L. Brown, Jr. on April 13, 1998.<sup>2</sup> In 2002, the CEDAW Ordinance was revised to address the intersection of race and gender and incorporate reference to the UN Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Race Discrimination. The Ordinance requires City Government to take proactive steps to ensure gender equity and specifies “gender analysis” as a preventive tool to identify and address discrimination. Since 1998, the Department on the Status of Women has employed this tool to analyze the operations of 10 City Departments using a gender lens.

In 2007, the Department on the Status of Women conducted the first gender analysis to evaluate the number of women appointed to City Commissions and Boards. The findings of this analysis informed a City Charter Amendment developed by the Board of Supervisors for the June 2008 Election. This City Charter Amendment (Section 4.101) was overwhelmingly approved by voters and made it city policy that:

- The membership of Commissions and Boards are to reflect the diversity of San Francisco’s population,
- Appointing officials are to be urged to support the nomination, appointment, and confirmation of these candidates, and
- The Department on the Status of Women is required to conduct and publish a gender analysis of Commissions and Boards every 2 years.

The *2019 Gender Analysis* examines the representation of women; people of color; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and questioning (LGBTQ) individuals; people with disabilities; and veterans on San Francisco policy bodies primarily appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. This year’s analysis included more outreach to policy bodies as compared to previous analyses that were limited to Commissions and Boards. As a result, more appointees were included in the data collection and analysis than even before. These policy bodies fall under two categories designated by the San Francisco Office of the City Attorney. The first category, referred to as “Commissions and Boards,” are policy bodies with decision-making authority and whose members are required to submit financial disclosures to the Ethics Commission, and the second category, referred to as “Advisory Bodies,” are policy bodies with advisory function whose members do not submit financial disclosures to the Ethics Commission. A detailed description of methodology and limitations can be found at the end of this report on page 23.

---

<sup>2</sup> San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 33.A.  
[http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/administrative/chapter33alocalimplementationoftheunited?f=templates\\$fn=default.htm\\$3.0\\$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco\\_ca\\$anc=JD\\_Chapter33A](http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/administrative/chapter33alocalimplementationoftheunited?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca$anc=JD_Chapter33A).

## II. Gender Analysis Findings

Many aspects of San Francisco’s diversity are reflected in the overall population of appointees on San Francisco policy bodies. The analysis includes 84 policy bodies, of which 823 of the 887 seats are filled leaving 7% vacant. As outlined below in the summary chart, slightly more than half of appointees are women, half of appointees are people of color, 28% are women of color, 19% are LGBTQ, 11% have a disability, and 7% are veterans.

**Figure 1: Summary Data of Policy Body Demographics, 2019**

Appointee Demographics	Percentage of Appointees
Women (n=741)	51%
People of Color (n=706)	50%
Women of Color (n=706)	28%
LGBTQ Identified (n=548)	19%
People with Disabilities (n=516)	11%
Veteran Status (n=494)	7%


*Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.*

However, further analysis reveals underrepresentation of particular groups. Subsequent sections present comprehensive data analysis providing comparison to previous years, detailing the variables of gender, race/ethnicity, LGBTQ identity, disability, veteran status, and policy body characteristics of budget size, decision-making authority, and appointment authority.

### A. Gender

On San Francisco policy bodies, 51% of appointees identify as women, which is slightly above parity compared to the San Francisco female population of 49%. The representation of women remained stable at 49% from 2013 until 2017. This year, the representation of women increased by 2 percentage points, which could be partly due to the larger sample size used in this year’s analysis compared to previous years. A 10-year comparison shows that the representation of women appointees has gradually increased since 2009 by a total of six percentage points.


**Figure 2: 10-Year Comparison of Representation of Women on Policy Bodies**



*Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.*

Figures 3 and 4 analyze Commissions and Boards. Figure 3 showcases the five Commissions and Boards with the highest representation of women appointees as compared to 2015 and 2013. The Children and Families (First Five) Commission and the Commission on the Status of Women are currently comprised of all women appointees. This finding has been consistent for the Commission on the Status of Women in 2015 and 2017. While the Ethics Commission has 100% women appointees, much more than 2015 and 2017, its small size of five appointees means that minimal changes in its demographic composition greatly impacts percentages. This is also the case for other policy bodies with a small number of members. The Library Commission and the Commission on the Environment are fourth and fifth on the list at 71% and 67% women, respectively, with long standing female majorities on each.

**Figure 3: Commissions and Boards with Highest Percentages of Women, 2019 Compared to 2017, 2015**



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

Out of the Commissions and Boards in this section, 23 have 40% or less women. The five Commissions and Boards with the lowest representation of women are displayed in Figure 4. The lowest percentage is found on the Board of Examiners where currently *none* of the 13 appointees are women. Unfortunately, demographic data is unavailable for the Board of Examiners for 2017 and 2015. Next is the Building Inspection Commission at 14%, which is a decrease of female representation compared to 2017 and 2015. The Oversight Board of Community Investment and Infrastructure, Fire Commission, and Sunshine Ordinance Task Force also have some of the lowest percentages of women at 17%, 20%, and 27%, respectively. Unfortunately, the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force did not participate in previous analyses and therefore demographics data is unavailable for 2017 and 2015.

**Figure 4: Commissions and Boards with Lowest Percentage of Women, 2019 Compared to 2017, 2015**



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

In addition to Commissions and Boards, Advisory Bodies were examined for the highest and lowest percentages of women. This is the first year such bodies have been included, thus comparison to previous years is unavailable. Figure 9 below displays the five Advisory Bodies with the highest and the five with the lowest representations of women. The Workforce Community Advisory Committees has the greatest representation of women at 100%, followed by the Office of Early Care and Education Citizen’s Advisory Committee at 89%. The Advisory Bodies with the lowest percentage of women are the Urban Forestry Council at 8% of the 13-member body and the Abatement Appeals Board at 14% of the 7-member body.

**Figure 5: Advisory Bodies with the Highest and Lowest Percentage of Women, 2019**



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

## B. Race and Ethnicity

Data on racial and ethnic identity was collected for 706, or 95%, of the 741 surveyed appointees. Although half of appointees identify as a race or ethnicity other than white or Caucasian, people of color are still underrepresented compared to the San Francisco population of 62%. The representation of people of color has increased since 2009 but has decreased following 2015. The number of appointees analyzed increased substantially in 2017 and 2019 compared to 2015, and these larger data samples have coincided with smaller percentages of people of color. The percentage decrease following 2017 could be partially due to the inclusion of more policy and advisory bodies, as the representation of people of color on Commissions and Boards dropped only slightly from 53% in 2017 to 52% in 2019.

**Figure 6: 10-Year Comparison of Representation of People of Color on Policy Bodies**



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

The racial and ethnic breakdown of policy body members compared to the San Francisco population is shown in Figure 7. This analysis reveals underrepresentation and overrepresentation in San Francisco policy bodies for certain racial and ethnic groups. Half of all appointees are white, an overrepresentation by more than 10 percentage points. The Black and African American community is well represented on appointed policy bodies at 14% compared to 5% of the population of San Francisco. Characterizing this as an overrepresentation is inaccurate given the representation of Black or African American people on policy bodies has been consistent over the years while the San Francisco population has declined over the same period.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, the most recent nationwide estimate for the Black or African American population is 13%, which is nearly equal to the 14% of Black or African American appointees present on San Francisco policy bodies.<sup>4</sup>

Considerably underrepresented racial and ethnic groups on San Francisco policy bodies compared to the San Francisco population are individuals who identify as Asian or Latinx. While Asians are 31% of the San Francisco population, they only make up 18% of appointees. While the Latinx population of San Francisco is 14%, only 8% of appointees are Latinx. Although there is a small population of Native

<sup>3</sup> Samir Gambhir and Stephen Menendian, "Racial Segregation in the Bay Area, Part 2," *Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society* (2018).

<sup>4</sup> US Census Bureau, 2018, Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045218>.

Americans and Alaska Natives in San Francisco of 0.4%, none of the surveyed appointees identified themselves as such.

**Figure 7: Race and Ethnicity of Appointees Compared to San Francisco Population, 2019**



Sources: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

The next two graphs illustrate Commissions and Boards, and Advisory Bodies with the highest and lowest percentages of people of color. As shown in Figure 8, the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure remained at 100% from 2017, while the Juvenile Probation Commission has returned to 100% this year after a dip in 2017. Next is the Health Commission, Immigrant Rights Commission, and Housing Authority Commission at 86%, 85%, and 83%, respectively. Percentages of people of color on both the Health Commission and the Housing Authority Commission increased following 2015, and have remained consistent since 2017.


**Figure 8: Commissions and Boards with Highest Percentage of People of Color, 2019 Compared to 2017, 2015**



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

There are 23 policy bodies that have 40% or less appointees who identified a racial and ethnic category other than white. Although the Public Utilities Commission has two vacancies, *none* of the current appointees identify as people of color. The Historic Preservation Commission and Building Inspection Commission are both at 14% representation for people of color. The Building Inspection Commission had a large drop from 43% in 2015, with the percentage of people of color decreasing to 14% in 2017 and remaining at this percent for 2019. Lastly, the War Memorial Board of Trustees and City Hall Preservation Advisory Commission have 18% and 20%, respectively.

**Figure 9: Commissions and Boards with Lowest Percentage of People of Color, 2019 Compared to 2017, 2015**




Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

In addition to Commissions and Boards, Advisory Bodies were examined for the highest and lowest percentages of people of color. This is the first year such bodies have been included, thus comparison to previous years is unavailable. All members of the Workforce Community Advisory Committee are people of color. People of color comprise 80% of the Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee, and 75% of appointees on the Children, Youth and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee, the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority, and the Local Homeless Coordinating Board. Out of the five Advisory Bodies with the lowest representation of people of color, the Ballot Simplification Committee and the Mayor’s Disability Council have 25% appointees of color, and the Abatement Appeals Board has 14% appointees of color. The Urban Forestry and the Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee have no people of color currently serving.



**Figure 10: Advisory Bodies with the Highest and Lowest Percentage of People of Color, 2019**




Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

**C. Race and Ethnicity by Gender**

White men and women are overrepresented on San Francisco policy bodies, while Asian and Latinx men and women are underrepresented. While women of color continue to be underrepresented at 28% compared to the San Francisco population of 32%, this is a slight increase from 2017 which showed 27% women of color. Meanwhile, men of color are 21% of appointees compared to 31% of the San Francisco population.

**Figure 11: 10-Year Comparison of Representation of Women of Color on Policy Bodies**



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

The following figures present the breakdown for appointees and the San Francisco population by race and ethnicity and gender. White men and women are overrepresented, holding 27% and 23% of appointments, respectively, compared to 20% and 17% of the population, respectively. Asian men and women are both greatly underrepresented with Asian women making up 11% of appointees compared to 17% of the population while Asian men comprise 7% of appointees and 15% of the population. Latinx men and women are also underrepresented, particularly Latinx women, who are 3% of appointees and 7% of the population, while Latinx men are 5% of appointees and 7% of the population. Black or African American men and women are well-represented with Black women comprising 9% of appointees and Black men comprising 5% of appointees. Pacific Islander men and women, and multiethnic women also exceed parity with the population. Although Native American men and women make up only 0.4% of San Francisco’s population, none of the surveyed appointees identified themselves as such.

**Figure 12: Appointees by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 2019**



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

**Figure 13: San Francisco Population by Race/Ethnicity, 2019**



Source: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

## D. LGBTQ Identity

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and questioning (LGBTQ) identity data was collected from 548, or 75%, of the 741 surveyed appointees, which is much more data on LGBTQ identity compared to previous reports. Due to limited and outdated information on the population of the LGBTQ community in San Francisco, it is difficult to adequately assess the representation of the LGBTQ community. However, compared to available San Francisco, larger Bay Area, and national data, the LGBTQ community is well represented on San Francisco policy bodies. Recent research estimates the national LGBT population is 4.5%.<sup>5</sup> The LGBT population of the San Francisco and greater Bay Area is estimated to rank the highest of U.S. cities at 6.2%,<sup>6</sup> while a 2006 survey found that 15.4% of adults in San Francisco identify as LGBT<sup>7</sup>.

Of the appointees who responded to this question, 19% identify as LGBTQ and 81% identify as straight or heterosexual. Of the LGBTQ appointees, 48% identify as gay, 23% as lesbian, 17% as bisexual, 7% as queer, 5% as transgender, and 1% as questioning. Data on LGBTQ identity by race was not captured. Efforts to capture data on LGBTQ identity by race for future reports would enable more intersectional analysis.

**Figure 14: LGBTQ Identity of Appointees, 2019**

(N=548)



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

**Figure 15: LGBTQ Population of Appointees, 2019**

(N=104)



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

## E. Disability Status

Overall, 12% of adults in San Francisco have one or more disabilities, and when broken down by gender, 6.2% are women and 5.7% are men. Disability data for transgender and gender non-conforming individuals in San Francisco is currently unavailable. Data on disability was obtained from 516, or 70%, of the 714 appointees who participated in the survey. Of the 516 appointees, 11.2% reported to have one

<sup>5</sup> Frank Newport, "In U.S., Estimate of LGBT Population Rises to 4.5%," *GALLUP* (May 22, 2018) <https://news.gallup.com/poll/234863/estimate-lgbt-population-rises.aspx>.

<sup>6</sup> Gary J. Gates and Frank Newport, "San Francisco Metro Area Ranks Highest in LBGT Percentage," *GALLUP* (March 20, 2015) [https://news.gallup.com/poll/182051/san-francisco-metro-area-ranks-highest-lgbt-percentage.aspx?utm\\_source=Social%20Issues&utm\\_medium=newsfeed&utm\\_campaign=tiles](https://news.gallup.com/poll/182051/san-francisco-metro-area-ranks-highest-lgbt-percentage.aspx?utm_source=Social%20Issues&utm_medium=newsfeed&utm_campaign=tiles).

<sup>7</sup> Gary J. Gates, "Same Sex Couples and the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual Population: New Estimates from the American Community Survey," *The Williams Institute on Sexual Orientation Law and Public Policy, UCLA School of Law* (2006).

or more disabilities, which is near parity with the San Francisco population. Of the 11.2% appointees with one or more disabilities, 6.8% are women, 3.9% are men, 0.4% are trans women, and 0.2% are trans men.

**Figure 16: San Francisco Adult Population with a Disability by Gender, 2017**


(N=744,243)



Source: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

**Figure 17: Appointees with One or More Disabilities by Gender, 2019**

(N=516)



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

## F. Veteran Status

Overall, 3.2% of the adult population in San Francisco has served in the military. There is a considerable difference by gender, as male veterans are 3% and female veterans are 0.2% of the population. Data on veteran status was obtained from 494, or 67%, of appointees who participated in the survey. Of the 494 appointees who responded to this question, 7.1% have served in the military. Like the San Francisco population, there is a large difference by gender, as men comprise 5.7% and women make up only 1.2% of the total number of veteran appointees. Of participating appointees, 0.2% of veterans are trans women. Veteran status data on transgender and gender non-conforming individuals in San Francisco is currently unavailable.

**Figure 18: San Francisco Adult Population with Military Service by Gender, 2017**


(N=747,896)



Source: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

**Figure 19: Appointees with Military Service, 2019**

(N=494)




Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

## G. Policy Bodies by Budget

This report also examines whether policy bodies with the largest and smallest budget sizes and other characteristics are demographically representative of the San Francisco population. In this section, budget size is used as a proxy for influence. Although this report has expanded the scope of analysis to include more policy bodies compared to previous reports, this section of analysis was limited to Commissions and Boards with decision-making authority and whose members file financial disclosures with the Ethics Commission. The purpose of this analysis is to evaluate the demographics for the spectrum of budgetary influence of policy bodies with decision-making authority in San Francisco.

Overall, appointees from the 10 largest budgeted Commissions and Boards are 55% people of color, 41% women, and 23% women of color. Appointees from the 10 smallest budgeted Commissions and Boards are 54% people of color, 52% women, and 32% women of color. Although still below parity with the San Francisco population, the representation of people of color on both the largest and smallest budgeted policy bodies is greater than the percentage of people of color for all appointees combined (50%). For women and women of color, their representation meets or exceeds parity with the population on the 10 smallest budgeted bodies. However, it falls far below parity for the 10 largest budgeted bodies. The representation of total women and women of color is greater on smaller budgeted policy bodies by 27%, and 39%, respectively.

**Figure 20: Percent of Women, Women of Color, and People of Color on Commissions and Boards with Largest and Smallest Budgets in Fiscal Year 2018-2019**



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

**Figure 21: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Largest Budgets, 2019**

Body	FY18-19 Budget	Total Seats	Filled seats	Women	Women of Color	People of Color
Health Commission	\$2,200,000,000	7	7	29%	14%	86%
Public Utilities Commission	\$1,296,600,000	5	3	67%	0%	0%
MTA Board of Directors and Parking Authority Commission	\$1,200,000,000	7	7	57%	14%	43%
Airport Commission	\$1,000,000,000	5	5	40%	20%	40%
Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure	\$745,000,000	5	5	60%	60%	100%
Police Commission	\$687,139,793	7	7	43%	43%	71%
Health Authority (Plan Governing Board)	\$666,000,000	19	15	33%	27%	47%
Human Services Commission	\$529,900,000	5	5	40%	0%	40%
Fire Commission	\$400,721,970	5	5	20%	20%	40%
Aging and Adult Services Commission	\$334,700,000	7	7	43%	14%	57%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$9,060,061,763</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>55%</b>

Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

**Figure 22: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Smallest Budgets, 2019**

Body	FY18-19 Budget	Total Seats	Filled Seats	Women	Women of color	People of Color
Rent Board Commission	\$8,543,912	10	9	44%	11%	33%
Commission on the Status of Women	\$8,048,712	7	7	100%	71%	71%
Ethics Commission	\$6,458,045	5	4	100%	50%	50%
Human Rights Commission	\$4,299,600	12	10	50%	50%	70%
Small Business Commission	\$2,242,007	7	7	43%	29%	43%
Civil Service Commission	\$1,262,072	5	4	50%	0%	25%
Board of Appeals	\$1,072,300	5	5	40%	20%	40%
Entertainment Commission	\$1,003,898	7	7	29%	14%	57%
Assessment Appeals Board No.1, 2, & 3	\$663,423	24	18	39%	22%	44%
Youth Commission	\$305,711	17	16	56%	44%	75%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$33,899,680</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>54%</b>

Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

## H. Comparison of Advisory Body and Commission and Board Demographics

The comparison of the two policy body categories in this section provides another proxy for influence, as Commissions and Boards whose members file disclosures of economic interest have greater decision-making authority in San Francisco than Advisory Bodies whose members do not file economic interest disclosures. The percentages of total women, LGBTQ people, people with disabilities, and veterans are larger for total appointees on Advisory Bodies. However, the percentages of women of color and people of color on Commissions and Boards slightly exceeds the percentages of women of color and people of color on Advisory Bodies.

**Figure 23: Demographics of Appointees on Commission and Boards and Advisory Bodies, 2019**



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

### I. Demographics of Mayoral, Supervisorial, and Total Appointees

Figure 24 compares the representation of women, women of color, and people of color for appointments made by the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and by the total of all approving authorities combined. Mayoral appointments are more diverse, and consist of more women, women of color, and people of color compared to Supervisorial appointments. Mayoral appointments include 55% women, 30% women of color, and 52% people of color, while Supervisorial appointments are 48% women, 24% women of color, and 48% people of color. The total of all approving authorities combined average out at 51% women, 28% women of color, and 50% people of color. This disparity in diversity between Mayoral and Supervisorial appointments may be due in part to the appointment section process for each authority. The 11-member Board of Supervisors only sees applicants for specific bodies through the 3-member Rules Committee or by designees, stipulated in legislation (e.g. “renter,” “landlord,” “consumer advocate”), whereas the Mayor typically has the ability to take total appointments into account during selections, and can therefore better address gaps in diversity.

**Figure 24: Demographics of Mayoral, Supervisorial, and Total Appointees, 2019**



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

### III. Conclusion

---

Since the first gender analysis of Commissions and Boards in 2007, the representation of women appointees on San Francisco policy bodies has gradually increased. The *2019 Gender Analysis* finds the percentage of women appointees is 51%, which slightly exceeds the population of women in San Francisco.

When appointee demographics are analyzed by gender and race, women of color continue to be underrepresented on San Francisco policy bodies compared to the San Francisco population. Most notably underrepresented are Asian women who make up 17% of the population but only 11% of appointees, and Latinx women who make up 7% of the population but only 3% of appointees. Additionally, men of color are underrepresented relative to their San Francisco population, primarily Asian and Latinx men.

Furthermore, when analyzing the demographic composition of larger and smaller budgeted Commissions and Boards, women are underrepresented on those with the largest budgets, and overrepresented or reach parity with the population on smaller budgeted Commissions and Boards. These two trends are amplified for women of color appointees. Women comprise 41% of total appointees on the largest budgeted policy bodies, which is 8 percentage points below the population, and women of color comprise 23% of total appointees on the largest budgeted policy bodies, 9 percentage points below their San Francisco population. Comparatively, women are 52% of total appointees on the smallest budgeted policy bodies, and women of color are 32% of appointees, which is equal to the San Francisco population. However, the issue of largest and smallest budgeted policy bodies does not seem to impact the representation of people of color. People of color make up 55% of appointees on the largest budgeted policy bodies and 54% of appointees on the smallest budgeted policy bodies compared to 50% of total appointees. Nonetheless, these percentages still fall below the San Francisco population of people of color at 62%.

In addition to using budget size as a proxy for influence, this report analyzed demographic characteristics of appointees on Commissions and Boards who file disclosures of economic interest and have decision-making authority, and appointees on Advisory Bodies who do not file economic interest disclosures. Over half (54%) of appointees on Advisory Bodies are women, while 48% of appointees on Commissions and Boards are women. Although 48% is only slightly below the San Francisco population of women, women comprise a decently higher percentage of appointees on Advisory Bodies compared to Commissions and Boards.

This year's report features more data on LGBTQ identity, veteran status, and disability than previous gender analyses. The *2019 Gender Analysis* found a relatively high representation of LGBTQ individuals on San Francisco policy bodies. For the appointees that provided LGBTQ identity information, 19% identify as LGBTQ with the largest subset being gay men at 48%. It is recommended for future gender analyses to collect LGBTQ data by race and gender to provide additional intersectional analysis. The representation of appointees with disabilities is 11%, just below the 12% population. Veterans are highly represented on San Francisco policy bodies at 7% compared to the veteran population of 3%.

Additionally, this report evaluates and compares the representation of women, women of color, and people of color appointees by the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and by the total of all approving authorities combined. Mayoral appointees include 55% women, 30% women of color, and 52% people



of color, which overall is more diverse by gender and race compared to both Supervisorial appointees and total appointees.

This report is intended to advise the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and other appointing authorities, as they select appointments for policy bodies of the City and County of San Francisco. In spirit of the 2008 City Charter Amendment that establishes this biennial Gender Analysis report requirement and the importance of diversity on San Francisco policy bodies, efforts to address gaps in diversity and inclusion should remain at the forefront when making appointments in order to accurately reflect the population of San Francisco.

## IV. Methodology and Limitations

---

This report focuses on City and County of San Francisco Commissions, Boards, Task Forces, Councils, and Committees that have the majority of members appointed by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors and that have jurisdiction limited to the City. The gender analysis reflects data from the policy bodies that provided information to the Department on the Status of Women through digital and paper survey.

Data was requested from 90 policy bodies and acquired from 84 different policy bodies and a total of 741 appointees. A Commissioner or Board member's gender identity, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability status, and veteran status were among data elements collected on a voluntary basis. Data on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, or questioning (LGBTQ) identity, disability, and veteran status of appointees were incomplete or unavailable for some appointees but are included to the extent possible. As the fundamental objective of this report is to surface patterns of underrepresentation, every attempt has been made to reflect accurate and complete information in this report. Data for some policy bodies was incomplete, and all appointees who responded were included in the total demographic categories. Only policy bodies with full data on gender and race for all appointees were included in sections comparing demographics of individual bodies. It should be noted that for policy bodies with a small number of members, the change of a single individual greatly impacts the percentages of demographic categories. As such, these percentages should be interpreted with this in mind.

The surveyed policy bodies fall under two categories designated by the San Francisco Office of the City Attorney document entitled *List of City Boards, Commissions, and Advisory Bodies Created by Charter, Ordinance, or Statute*.<sup>8</sup> This document separates San Francisco policy bodies into two different categories. The first category includes Commissions and Boards with decision-making authority and whose members are required to submit financial disclosures with the Ethics Commission, and the second category encompasses Advisory Bodies whose members do not submit financial disclosures with the Ethics Commission. Depending on the analysis criteria in each section of this report, the surveyed policy bodies and appointees are either examined comprehensively as a whole or examined separately in the two categories designated by the Office of the City Attorney.

Data from the U.S. Census 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates provides a comparison to the San Francisco population. Figures 26 and 27 in the Appendix display these population estimates by race/ethnicity and gender.

---

<sup>8</sup> "List of City Boards, Commissions, and Advisory Bodies Created by Charter, Ordinance, or Statute," Office of the City Attorney, <https://www.sfcityattorney.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Commission-List-08252017.pdf>, (August 25, 2017).

## Appendix

**Figure 25: Policy Body Demographics, 2019<sup>9</sup>**

Policy Body	Total Seats	Filled Seats	FY18-19 Budget	Women	Women of Color	People of Color
Abatement Appeals Board	7	7	\$76,500,000	14%	0%	14%
Aging and Adult Services Commission	7	7	\$334,700,000	57%	33%	57%
Airport Commission	5	5	\$1,000,000,000	40%	50%	40%
Arts Commission	15	15	\$37,000,000	67%	50%	60%
Asian Art Commission	27	27	\$30,000,000	63%	71%	59%
Assessment Appeals Board No.1	8	5	\$663,423	20%	0%	20%
Assessment Appeals Board No.2	8	8	-	50%	75%	63%
Assessment Appeals Board No.3	8	4	-	50%	50%	50%
Ballot Simplification Committee	5	4	\$0	75%	33%	25%
Bayview Hunters Point Citizens Advisory Committee	12	9	\$0	33%	100%	67%
Board of Appeals	5	5	\$1,072,300	40%	50%	40%
Board of Examiners	13	13	\$0	0%	0%	46%
Building Inspection Commission	7	7	\$76,500,000	14%	0%	14%
Child Care Planning and Advisory Council	25	19	\$26,841	84%	50%	50%
Children and Families Commission (First 5)	9	8	\$28,002,978	100%	75%	75%
Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee	11	10	\$155,224,346	50%	80%	75%
Citizen's Committee on Community Development	9	8	\$39,696,467	75%	67%	63%
City Hall Preservation Advisory Commission	5	5	\$0	60%	33%	20%
Civil Service Commission	5	4	\$1,262,072	50%	0%	25%
Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure	5	5	\$745,000,000	60%	100%	100%
Commission on the Aging Advisory Council	22	15	\$0	80%	33%	31%
Commission on the Environment	7	6	\$27,280,925	67%	50%	50%
Commission on the Status of Women	7	7	\$8,048,712	100%	71%	71%
Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee	11	11	\$3,000,000	82%	33%	45%
Eastern Neighborhoods Citizens Advisory Committee	19	13	\$0	38%	40%	44%
Elections Commission	7	7	\$15,238,360	57%	25%	29%
Entertainment Commission	7	7	\$1,003,898	29%	50%	57%
Ethics Commission	5	4	\$6,458,045	100%	50%	50%
Film Commission	11	11	\$0	55%	67%	50%
Fire Commission	5	5	\$400,721,970	20%	100%	40%
Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority	7	6	\$0	50%	67%	75%

<sup>9</sup> Figure 25 only includes policy bodies with complete data on gender for all appointees. Some bodies had incomplete data on race/ethnicity of appointees. For these, percentages for people of color are calculated out of known race/ethnicity.

Policy Body	Total Seats	Filled Seats	FY18-19 Budget	Women	Women of Color	People of Color
Health Authority (Plan Governing Board)	19	15	\$666,000,000	33%	80%	50%
Health Commission	7	7	\$2,200,000,000	43%	50%	86%
Health Service Board	7	6	\$11,632,022	33%	0%	50%
Historic Preservation Commission	7	7	\$53,832,000	43%	33%	14%
Housing Authority Commission	7	6	\$60,894,150	50%	100%	83%
Human Rights Commission	12	10	\$4,299,600	60%	100%	70%
Human Services Commission	5	5	\$529,900,000	40%	0%	40%
Immigrant Rights Commission	15	13	\$0	54%	86%	85%
In-Home Supportive Services Public Authority	13	9	\$70,729,667	44%	50%	56%
Juvenile Probation Commission	7	6	\$48,824,199	33%	100%	100%
Library Commission	7	7	\$160,000,000	71%	40%	57%
Local Homeless Coordinating Board	9	9	\$40,000,000	56%	60%	75%
Mayor's Disability Council	11	8	\$0	75%	17%	25%
Mental Health Board	17	15	\$184,962	73%	64%	73%
MTA Board of Directors and Parking Authority Commission	7	7	\$1,200,000,000	57%	25%	43%
Office of Early Care and Education Citizens' Advisory Committee	9	9	\$0	89%	50%	56%
Oversight Board (COII)	7	6	\$745,000,000	17%	100%	67%
Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee	17	13	\$0	46%	17%	8%
Planning Commission	7	6	\$53,832,000	50%	67%	33%
Police Commission	7	7	\$687,139,793	43%	100%	71%
Port Commission	5	5	\$192,600,000	60%	67%	60%
Public Utilities Citizen's Advisory Committee	17	13	\$0	54%	14%	31%
Public Utilities Commission	5	3	\$1,296,600,000	67%	0%	0%
Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board	7	6	\$0	33%	100%	67%
Public Utilities Revenue Bond Oversight Committee	7	5	\$0	40%	50%	40%
Recreation and Park Commission	7	7	\$230,900,000	29%	50%	43%
Reentry Council	24	23	\$0	43%	70%	70%
Rent Board Commission	10	9	\$8,543,912	44%	25%	33%
Residential Users Appeal Board	3	2	\$0	0%	0%	50%
Retirement System Board	7	7	\$95,000,000	43%	67%	29%
Sentencing Commission	13	13	\$0	31%	25%	67%
Small Business Commission	7	7	\$2,242,007	43%	67%	43%
SRO Task Force	12	12	\$0	42%	25%	55%
Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee	16	15	\$0	67%	70%	80%
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	11	11	\$0	27%	67%	36%
Sweatfree Procurement Advisory Group	11	7	\$0	43%	67%	43%
Treasure Island Development Authority	7	6	\$18,484,130	50%	N/A	N/A

Policy Body	Total Seats	Filled Seats	FY18-19 Budget	Women	Women of Color	People of Color
Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island Citizens Advisory Board	17	13	\$0	54%	N/A	N/A
Urban Forestry Council	15	13	\$153,626	8%	0%	0%
Veterans Affairs Commission	17	11	\$0	36%	50%	55%
War Memorial Board of Trustees	11	11	\$18,185,686	55%	33%	18%
Workforce Community Advisory Committee	8	4	\$0	100%	100%	100%
Youth Commission	17	16	\$305,711	56%	78%	75%

Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis, 2019.

**Figure 26: San Francisco Population Estimates by Race/Ethnicity, 2017**

Race/Ethnicity	Total	
	Estimate	Percent
<b>San Francisco County California</b>	864,263	-
White, Not Hispanic or Latino	353,000	38%
Asian	295,347	31%
Hispanic or Latinx	131,949	14%
Some other Race	64,800	7%
Black or African American	45,654	5%
Two or More Races	43,664	5%
Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	3,226	0.3%
Native American and Alaska Native	3,306	0.4%

Source: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

**Figure 27: San Francisco Population Estimates by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 2017**

Race/Ethnicity	Total		Female		Male	
	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent
San Francisco County California	864,263	-	423,630	49%	440,633	51%
White, Not Hispanic or Latino	353,000	38%	161,381	17%	191,619	20%
Asian	295,347	31%	158,762	17%	136,585	15%
Hispanic or Latinx	131,949	14%	62,646	7%	69,303	7%
Some Other Race	64,800	7%	30,174	3%	34,626	4%
Black or African American	45,654	5%	22,311	2.4%	23,343	2.5%
Two or More Races	43,664	5%	21,110	2.2%	22,554	2.4%
Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	3,226	0.3%	1,576	0.2%	1,650	0.2%
Native American and Alaska Native	3,306	0.4%	1,589	0.2%	1,717	0.2%

Source: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

City and County of San Francisco  
Department on the Status of Women  
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 240  
San Francisco, California 94102  
[sfgov.org/dosw](http://sfgov.org/dosw)  
[dosw@sfgov.org](mailto:dosw@sfgov.org)  
415.252.2570

Member, Board of Supervisors  
District 3



City and County of San Francisco

**AARON PESKIN**

---

DATE: December 8, 2022

TO: Angela Calvillo  
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: Supervisor Aaron Peskin, Chair, Rules Committee

RE: Rules Committee  
COMMITTEE REPORT

---

Pursuant to Board Rule 4.20, as Chair of the Rules Committee, I have deemed the following matters are of an urgent nature and request them be considered by the full Board at on Tuesday, December 13, 2022, as a Committee Report:

- 221226      Mayoral Reappointment, Redevelopment Successor Agency Oversight Board - Anna Van Degna**  
Motion approving/rejecting the Mayor's nomination for reappointment of Anna Van Degna to the Redevelopment Successor Agency Oversight Board, term ending January 24, 2026.
- 221227      Mayoral Reappointment, Redevelopment Successor Agency Oversight Board - Moses Corrette**  
Motion approving/rejecting the Mayor's nomination for reappointment of Moses Corrette to the Redevelopment Successor Agency Oversight Board, for a term ending January 24, 2026.
- 221240      Hearing to consider appointing one member, term ending April 30, 2027, to the Police Commission.**  
Seat 1, succeeding Cindy Elias, term expiring April 30, 2023, must be nominated by the Board of Supervisors' Rules Committee and subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors, for a four-year term beginning April 30, 2023, and ending April 30, 2027.
- 221239      Mayoral Reappointment, Historic Preservation Commission - Kate Black**  
Motion approving/rejecting the Mayor's nomination of Kate Black for reappointment to the Historic Preservation Commission, for a term ending December 31, 2026.

## COMMITTEE REPORT MEMORANDUM

Rules Committee

---

**221224      Appointment, Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and  
Transportation District Board of Directors - Supervisor Ahsha  
Safai**

Motion appointing Supervisor Ahsha Safai, term ending January 31, 2025, to the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District Board of Directors.

**221228      Reappointment, Metropolitan Transportation Commission -  
Supervisor Hillary Ronen**

Motion reappointing Supervisor Hillary Ronen, term ending February 10, 2027, to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

These matters will be heard at the Regular Rules Committee on Monday, December 12, 2022, at 10:00 a.m.

*/s/ Aaron Peskin*



**From:** [Colleen Kavanagh](#)  
**To:** [hatun@stopcrimesf.com](mailto:hatun@stopcrimesf.com); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.  
**Date:** Monday, December 12, 2022 10:04:08 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## Comment for the Rules Committee Meeting

12/12/22, Agenda Item #3, Appointment, Police Commission

**From your constituent:** Colleen Kavanagh, [colleen0467@gmail.com](mailto:colleen0467@gmail.com)

**Message:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.

Dear Supervisors,

I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission. Commissioner Elias' term is not up until April of 2023 and there is no legitimate reason to re-appoint her 5 months early. This is clearly a political maneuver to avoid allowing our full Board of Supervisors with its newly elected members to have an opportunity to vote and/or nominate other candidates. Our democracy requires that this committee behave in a more transparent and above-board manner in this re-appointment process, particularly because Commissioner Elias' ethics have been called into question.

I urge you to allow for the nomination process to take place in the normal course, in April of 2023, when the newly elected members of the Board of Supervisors are present and able to participate. I oppose this unnecessary acceleration of the usual appointment process of a critical Police Commission seat and urge you not to do it.

This is a purely political move that suppresses community involvement. This will not sit well with voters who are tired of political games played by our elected officials.

Thank you.

**From:** [Ann Weinstock](#)  
**To:** [hatun@stopcrimesf.com](mailto:hatun@stopcrimesf.com); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.  
**Date:** Monday, December 12, 2022 10:29:04 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## Comment for the Rules Committee Meeting

12/12/22, Agenda Item #3, Appointment, Police Commission

**From your constituent:** Ann Weinstock, [annweinstock@gmail.com](mailto:annweinstock@gmail.com)

**Message:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.

Dear Supervisors,

I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission. Commissioner Elias' term is not up until April of 2023 and there is no legitimate reason to re-appoint her 5 months early. This is clearly a political maneuver to avoid allowing our full Board of Supervisors with its newly elected members to have an opportunity to vote and/or nominate other candidates. Our democracy requires that this committee behave in a more transparent and above-board manner in this re-appointment process, particularly because Commissioner Elias' ethics have been called into question.

I urge you to allow for the nomination process to take place in the normal course, in April of 2023, when the newly elected members of the Board of Supervisors are present and able to participate. I oppose this unnecessary acceleration of the usual appointment process of a critical Police Commission seat and urge you not to do it.

This is a purely political move that suppresses community involvement. This will not sit well with voters who are tired of political games played by our elected officials.

Thank you.

**From:** [Clara Abecassis](#)  
**To:** [hatun@stopcrimesf.com](mailto:hatun@stopcrimesf.com); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.  
**Date:** Monday, December 12, 2022 11:23:24 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## Comment for the Rules Committee Meeting

12/12/22, Agenda Item #3, Appointment, Police Commission

**From your constituent:** Clara Abecassis, abecassis@gmail.com

**Message:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.

Dear Supervisors,

I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission. Commissioner Elias' term is not up until April of 2023 and there is no legitimate reason to re-appoint her 5 months early. This is clearly a political maneuver to avoid allowing our full Board of Supervisors with its newly elected members to have an opportunity to vote and/or nominate other candidates. Our democracy requires that this committee behave in a more transparent and above-board manner in this re-appointment process, particularly because Commissioner Elias' ethics have been called into question.

I urge you to allow for the nomination process to take place in the normal course, in April of 2023, when the newly elected members of the Board of Supervisors are present and able to participate. I oppose this unnecessary acceleration of the usual appointment process of a critical Police Commission seat and urge you not to do it.

This is a purely political move that suppresses community involvement. This will not sit well with voters who are tired of political games played by our elected officials.

Thank you.

**From:** [Amanda Michael](#)  
**To:** [hatun@stopcrimesf.com](mailto:hatun@stopcrimesf.com); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.  
**Date:** Tuesday, December 13, 2022 6:03:11 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## Comment for the Rules Committee Meeting

12/12/22, Agenda Item #3, Appointment, Police Commission

**From your constituent:** Amanda Michael, mssamanda1@yahoo.com

**Message:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.

Dear Supervisors,

I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission. Commissioner Elias' term is not up until April of 2023 and there is no legitimate reason to re-appoint her 5 months early. This is clearly a political maneuver to avoid allowing our full Board of Supervisors with its newly elected members to have an opportunity to vote and/or nominate other candidates. Our democracy requires that this committee behave in a more transparent and above-board manner in this re-appointment process, particularly because Commissioner Elias' ethics have been called into question.

I urge you to allow for the nomination process to take place in the normal course, in April of 2023, when the newly elected members of the Board of Supervisors are present and able to participate. I oppose this unnecessary acceleration of the usual appointment process of a critical Police Commission seat and urge you not to do it.

This is a purely political move that suppresses community involvement. This will not sit well with voters who are tired of political games played by our elected officials.

Thank you.

**From:** [Tom Lee](#)  
**To:** [hatun@stopcrimesf.com](mailto:hatun@stopcrimesf.com); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.  
**Date:** Tuesday, December 13, 2022 8:10:48 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## Comment for the Rules Committee Meeting

12/12/22, Agenda Item #3, Appointment, Police Commission

**From your constituent:** Tom Lee, thl001@gmail.com

**Message:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.

Dear Supervisors,

I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission. Commissioner Elias' term is not up until April of 2023 and there is no legitimate reason to re-appoint her 5 months early. This is clearly a political maneuver to avoid allowing our full Board of Supervisors with its newly elected members to have an opportunity to vote and/or nominate other candidates. Our democracy requires that this committee behave in a more transparent and above-board manner in this re-appointment process, particularly because Commissioner Elias' ethics have been called into question.

I urge you to allow for the nomination process to take place in the normal course, in April of 2023, when the newly elected members of the Board of Supervisors are present and able to participate. I oppose this unnecessary acceleration of the usual appointment process of a critical Police Commission seat and urge you not to do it.

This is a purely political move that suppresses community involvement. This will not sit well with voters who are tired of political games played by our elected officials.

Thank you.

**From:** [Eileen Michael](#)  
**To:** [hatun@stopcrimesf.com](mailto:hatun@stopcrimesf.com); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.  
**Date:** Tuesday, December 13, 2022 8:50:47 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## Comment for the Rules Committee Meeting

12/12/22, Agenda Item #3, Appointment, Police Commission

**From your constituent:** Eileen Michael , eemmichael@aol.com

**Message:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.

Dear Supervisors,

I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission. Commissioner Elias' term is not up until April of 2023 and there is no legitimate reason to re-appoint her 5 months early. This is clearly a political maneuver to avoid allowing our full Board of Supervisors with its newly elected members to have an opportunity to vote and/or nominate other candidates. Our democracy requires that this committee behave in a more transparent and above-board manner in this re-appointment process, particularly because Commissioner Elias' ethics have been called into question.

I urge you to allow for the nomination process to take place in the normal course, in April of 2023, when the newly elected members of the Board of Supervisors are present and able to participate. I oppose this unnecessary acceleration of the usual appointment process of a critical Police Commission seat and urge you not to do it.

This is a purely political move that suppresses community involvement. This will not sit well with voters who are tired of political games played by our elected officials.

Thank you.

**From:** [Gail O'Connor](mailto:Gail.O'Connor)  
**To:** [hatun@stopcrimesf.com](mailto:hatun@stopcrimesf.com); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.  
**Date:** Tuesday, December 13, 2022 8:54:01 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## Comment for the Rules Committee Meeting

12/12/22, Agenda Item #3, Appointment, Police Commission

**From your constituent:** Gail O'Connor, gailmacd@hotmail.com

**Message:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.

Dear Supervisors,

I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission. Commissioner Elias' term is not up until April of 2023 and there is no legitimate reason to re-appoint her 5 months early. This is clearly a political maneuver to avoid allowing our full Board of Supervisors with its newly elected members to have an opportunity to vote and/or nominate other candidates. Our democracy requires that this committee behave in a more transparent and above-board manner in this re-appointment process, particularly because Commissioner Elias' ethics have been called into question.

I urge you to allow for the nomination process to take place in the normal course, in April of 2023, when the newly elected members of the Board of Supervisors are present and able to participate. I oppose this unnecessary acceleration of the usual appointment process of a critical Police Commission seat and urge you not to do it.

This is a purely political move that suppresses community involvement. This will not sit well with voters who are tired of political games played by our elected officials.

Thank you.

**From:** [Kristy Nelson](mailto:Kristy.Nelson@stopcrimesf.com)  
**To:** [hatun@stopcrimesf.com](mailto:hatun@stopcrimesf.com); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.  
**Date:** Tuesday, December 13, 2022 6:56:51 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## Comment for the Rules Committee Meeting

12/12/22, Agenda Item #3, Appointment, Police Commission

**From your constituent:** Kristy Nelson, [kristy@mleffers.com](mailto:kristy@mleffers.com)

**Message:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.

Dear Supervisors,

I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission. Commissioner Elias' term is not up until April of 2023 and there is no legitimate reason to re-appoint her 5 months early. This is clearly a political maneuver to avoid allowing our full Board of Supervisors with its newly elected members to have an opportunity to vote and/or nominate other candidates. Our democracy requires that this committee behave in a more transparent and above-board manner in this re-appointment process, particularly because Commissioner Elias' ethics have been called into question.

I urge you to allow for the nomination process to take place in the normal course, in April of 2023, when the newly elected members of the Board of Supervisors are present and able to participate. I oppose this unnecessary acceleration of the usual appointment process of a critical Police Commission seat and urge you not to do it.

This is a purely political move that suppresses community involvement. This will not sit well with voters who are tired of political games played by our elected officials.

Thank you.



**From:** [Norah Uyeda](#)  
**To:** [hatun@stopcrimesf.com](mailto:hatun@stopcrimesf.com); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 14, 2022 8:04:39 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## Message to Supervisor Chan and the Rules Committee

RE: Appointment, Police Commission

**From your constituent:** Norah Uyeda, yuenuyeda@hotmail.com

I live in District 2

**Message:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.

Rules Committee of the Board of Supervisors,

I strongly oppose this early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.

When Commissioner Elias was appointed to this position in 2018, there were 12 applicants for 2 open seats. We should allow people to apply to serve and stand before the rules committee to share why they want to serve.

Residents of District 1 deserve a chance to apply for this seat and be considered through an open and transparent public process. Our Supervisor's duty is to stand up for D1 residents. This rushed reappointment of Cindy Elias is the opposite of protecting D1 and reeks of corruption. District 1 has experienced a rise in crime - car break-ins, garage break-ins, and home break-ins are now common in our neighborhood. Supervisor Chan is cutting us out of the city's public safety policy conversation if she supports the reappointment of Cindy Elias without giving proper time for our community to submit applications, as currently planned in 2023.

This completely disregards the public's role in serving on commissions. Anyone interested in putting themselves forward to serve just had the door slammed in their face by Supervisor Peskin.

If the BOS is serious about engaging the public, we should be transparent, not ram through favored political appointees.

This is precisely the kind of political game voters have

rejected throughout this year.

This seat isn't up until April. There is plenty of time to have a public, transparent process for this important commission.

We are paying attention and will remember Supervisor Chan's vote on police commission appointments when she is up for re-election in 2024.

---

**From:** [Kira Gaber](#)  
**To:** [hatun@stopcrimesf.com](mailto:hatun@stopcrimesf.com); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 14, 2022 9:49:38 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## Message to Supervisor Chan and the Rules Committee

RE: Appointment, Police Commission

**From your constituent:** Kira Gaber, [kiki@kiragaber.com](mailto:kiki@kiragaber.com)

I live in District 1

**Message:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.

Rules Committee of the Board of Supervisors,

I strongly oppose this early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.

When Commissioner Elias was appointed to this position in 2018, there were 12 applicants for 2 open seats. We should allow people to apply to serve and stand before the rules committee to share why they want to serve.

Residents of District 1 deserve a chance to apply for this seat and be considered through an open and transparent public process. Our Supervisor's duty is to stand up for D1 residents. This rushed reappointment of Cindy Elias is the opposite of protecting D1 and reeks of corruption. District 1 has experienced a rise in crime - car break-ins, garage break-ins, and home break-ins are now common in our neighborhood. Supervisor Chan is cutting us out of the city's public safety policy conversation if she supports the reappointment of Cindy Elias without giving proper time for our community to submit applications, as currently planned in 2023.

This completely disregards the public's role in serving on commissions. Anyone interested in putting themselves forward to serve just had the door slammed in their face by Supervisor Peskin.

If the BOS is serious about engaging the public, we should be transparent, not ram through favored political appointees.

This is precisely the kind of political game voters have

rejected throughout this year.

This seat isn't up until April. There is plenty of time to have a public, transparent process for this important commission.

We are paying attention and will remember Supervisor Chan's vote on police commission appointments when she is up for re-election in 2024.

---

**From:** [Norah Uyeda](#)  
**To:** [hatun@stopcrimesf.com](mailto:hatun@stopcrimesf.com); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.  
**Date:** Thursday, December 15, 2022 8:15:45 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## Message to Supervisor Chan and the Rules Committee

RE: Appointment, Police Commission

**From your constituent:** Norah Uyeda, yuenuyeda@hotmail.com

I live in District 1

**Message:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.

Rules Committee of the Board of Supervisors,

I strongly oppose this early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.

When Commissioner Elias was appointed to this position in 2018, there were 12 applicants for 2 open seats. We should allow people to apply to serve and stand before the rules committee to share why they want to serve.

Residents of District 1 deserve a chance to apply for this seat and be considered through an open and transparent public process. Our Supervisor's duty is to stand up for D1 residents. This rushed reappointment of Cindy Elias is the opposite of protecting D1 and reeks of corruption. District 1 has experienced a rise in crime - car break-ins, garage break-ins, and home break-ins are now common in our neighborhood. Supervisor Chan is cutting us out of the city's public safety policy conversation if she supports the reappointment of Cindy Elias without giving proper time for our community to submit applications, as currently planned in 2023.

This completely disregards the public's role in serving on commissions. Anyone interested in putting themselves forward to serve just had the door slammed in their face by Supervisor Peskin.

If the BOS is serious about engaging the public, we should be transparent, not ram through favored political appointees.

This is precisely the kind of political game voters have

rejected throughout this year.

This seat isn't up until April. There is plenty of time to have a public, transparent process for this important commission.

We are paying attention and will remember Supervisor Chan's vote on police commission appointments when she is up for re-election in 2024.

---

**From:** [Kathryn Kalmar](#)  
**To:** [hatun@stopcrimesf.com](mailto:hatun@stopcrimesf.com); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.  
**Date:** Thursday, December 15, 2022 10:12:04 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## Comment for the Rules Committee Meeting

12/12/22, Agenda Item #3, Appointment, Police Commission

**From your constituent:** Kathryn Kalmar, kfkal@yahoo.com

**Message:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.

Dear Supervisors,

I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission. Commissioner Elias' term is not up until April of 2023 and there is no legitimate reason to re-appoint her 5 months early. This is clearly a political maneuver to avoid allowing our full Board of Supervisors with its newly elected members to have an opportunity to vote and/or nominate other candidates. Our democracy requires that this committee behave in a more transparent and above-board manner in this re-appointment process, particularly because Commissioner Elias' ethics have been called into question.

I urge you to allow for the nomination process to take place in the normal course, in April of 2023, when the newly elected members of the Board of Supervisors are present and able to participate. I oppose this unnecessary acceleration of the usual appointment process of a critical Police Commission seat and urge you not to do it.

This is a purely political move that suppresses community involvement. This will not sit well with voters who are tired of political games played by our elected officials.

Thank you.

**From:** [vince.hoenigman](mailto:vince.hoenigman)  
**To:** [hatun@stopcrimesf.com](mailto:hatun@stopcrimesf.com); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.  
**Date:** Thursday, December 15, 2022 10:02:09 PM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## Comment for the Rules Committee Meeting

12/12/22, Agenda Item #3, Appointment, Police Commission

**From your constituent:** vince hoenigman, Vince@Citymark.com

**Message:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.

Dear Supervisors,

I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission. Commissioner Elias' term is not up until April of 2023 and there is no legitimate reason to re-appoint her 5 months early. This is clearly a political maneuver to avoid allowing our full Board of Supervisors with its newly elected members to have an opportunity to vote and/or nominate other candidates. Our democracy requires that this committee behave in a more transparent and above-board manner in this re-appointment process, particularly because Commissioner Elias' ethics have been called into question.

I urge you to allow for the nomination process to take place in the normal course, in April of 2023, when the newly elected members of the Board of Supervisors are present and able to participate. I oppose this unnecessary acceleration of the usual appointment process of a critical Police Commission seat and urge you not to do it.

This is a purely political move that suppresses community involvement. This will not sit well with voters who are tired of political games played by our elected officials.

Thank you.



**From:** [Doug Lenzo](#)  
**To:** [hatun@stopcrimesf.com](mailto:hatun@stopcrimesf.com); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.  
**Date:** Friday, December 16, 2022 7:11:34 AM

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

## Comment for the Rules Committee Meeting

12/12/22, Agenda Item #3, Appointment, Police Commission

**From your constituent:** Doug Lenzo, [douglenzo@hotmail.com](mailto:douglenzo@hotmail.com)

**Message:** I strongly oppose the early appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission.

Dear Supervisors,

Our citizens have elected these new officials to reflect their beliefs about where our city should be headed. If the standard process elects Commissioner Elias again then fine but let's let our new Representatives vote in that standard process!

I strongly oppose the EARLY appointment of Commissioner Elias' seat on the Police Commission. Commissioner Elias' term is not up until April of 2023 and there is no legitimate reason to re-appoint her 5 months early. This is clearly a political maneuver to avoid allowing our full Board of Supervisors with its newly elected members to have an opportunity to vote and/or nominate other candidates. Our democracy requires that this committee behave in a more transparent and above-board manner in this re-appointment process, particularly because Commissioner Elias' ethics have been called into question.

I urge you to allow for the nomination process to take place in the normal course, in April of 2023, when the newly elected members of the Board of Supervisors are present and able to participate. I oppose this unnecessary acceleration of the usual appointment process of a critical Police Commission seat and urge you not to do it.

This is a purely political move that suppresses community involvement. This will not sit well with voters who are tired of political games played by our elected officials.

Sincerely,

Doug Lenzo

