

File No. 260666

Committee Item No. 1

Board Item No. \_\_\_\_\_

## COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

### AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Rules Committee

Date July 20, 2026

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date \_\_\_\_\_

#### Cmte Board

- |                                     |                          |                                              |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Motion                                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Resolution                                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Ordinance                                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Legislative Digest                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Budget and Legislative Analyst Report        |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Youth Commission Report                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Introduction Form                            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)            |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Information Form                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Budget                                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Subcontract Budget                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Contract/Agreement                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Form 126 - Ethics Commission                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Award Letter                                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Application                                  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Form 700                                     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Information/Vacancies (Boards/Commissions)   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | 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 July 16, 2026

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

1 [Mayoral Reappointment, Public Utilities Commission - Joshua Arce]

2  
3 **Motion approving/rejecting the Mayor's nomination for the reappointment of Joshua**  
4 **Arce to the Public Utilities Commission, for a term ending August 1, 2030.**

5  
6 WHEREAS, Pursuant to Charter, Section 4.112, Mayor Daniel Lurie has submitted a  
7 communication notifying the Board of Supervisors of the nomination for the reappointment of  
8 Joshua Arce to Seat 2 on the Public Utilities Commission, received by the Clerk of the Board  
9 on June 5, 2026; and

10 WHEREAS, Charter, Section 4.112, requires that seat 2 shall be a member with  
11 experience in ratepayer or consumer advocacy, appointed by the Mayor and subject to  
12 confirmation by a majority of the Board of Supervisors; now, therefore, be it

13 MOVED, That the Board of Supervisors hereby approves/rejects the Mayor's  
14 nomination for the reappointment of Joshua Arce, seat 2, succeeding himself, to the Public  
15 Utilities Commission, for the unexpired portion of a four-year term beginning August 1, 2026,  
16 and ending August 1, 2030.



## Notice of Nomination

June 5, 2026

San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
City Hall, Room 244  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to Charter §4.112(a), of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following nomination:

Kate Herrmann Stacy (seat 4), for the Public Utilities Commission for a four-year term ending August 1, 2030. Kate fulfills the seat requirement of experience in water systems, power systems, or public utility management.

Joshua Arce (seat 2), for the Public Utilities Commission for a four-year term ending August 1, 2030. Joshua fulfills the seat requirement of experience in ratepayer or consumer advocacy.

I am confident that they will continue to serve our community well. Attached are their qualifications to serve, which demonstrate how their nomination represents the communities of interest, neighborhoods, and diverse populations of the City and County of San Francisco.

I encourage your support and am pleased to advise you of these nominations. Should you have any questions about this nomination, please contact my Director of Appointments, Andre Adeyemi, at 415-554-4000.

All my best,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "D. Lurie", written over a horizontal line.

Daniel Lurie  
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco

# JOSHUA ARCE

*Public Sector Executive and Private Sector Champion of San Francisco and Beyond, with 15 years of experience in community and labor coalition-building, infrastructure investment, workforce development, environmental stewardship, energy/power management, land acquisition, community engagement, and public policy advocacy.*

## LEADERSHIP PROFILE

Executive leader driving infrastructure investment, labor-management alignment, and public policy outcomes across California. Proven track record advancing multi-billion-dollar capital programs, securing funding through complex political environments, and building durable coalitions across labor, industry, and government. Trusted by elected leaders, union leadership, and business stakeholders to deliver high-impact economic and workforce initiatives.

- **Coalition Leadership** — Built and aligned partnerships across labor unions, contractors, elected officials, and agencies to advance shared infrastructure and economic priorities.
- **Infrastructure & Capital Strategy** — Directed and influenced \$2B+ in public investment, shaping capital programs across water, energy, transportation, and community infrastructure.
- **Executive Leadership of Large-Scale Organizations** — Led large teams, complex budgets, and governing bodies delivering job-generating programs with regional economic impact.
- **Legislative & Political Strategy** — Advanced policy and funding initiatives to translate advocacy into infrastructure investment and project delivery through close collaboration with local, state, and federal leaders, regulators, and stakeholder coalitions.
- **Workforce Development Systems** — Built and scaled workforce pipelines aligned with infrastructure investment, connecting residents to union careers and high-growth industries.

## EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA COLLEGE OF THE LAW, SAN FRANCISCO  
**Juris Doctor (JD) | California State Bar**

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES  
**Bachelor of Arts (BA) in Political Science**

## PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

CALIFORNIA ALLIANCE FOR JOBS Northern California

### **Consultant and Advisor | Oct 2023-Present**

Lead strategic initiatives to expand infrastructure investment, align labor and industry priorities, and strengthen coalition partnerships across Northern California.

- Coordinate advocacy and coalition-building around major infrastructure investments, including the \$215B California Forever project, \$12.7B BART Silicon Valley Phase II, \$7.6B Portal/Downtown San Francisco Rail Extension, \$6–8B Highway 37 causeway, \$1B SMART Train expansion, and \$535M San Francisco Earthquake Safety Bond.

## CALIFORNIA ALLIANCE FOR JOBS (continued)

- Represent the Alliance in Sacramento, testifying before State Legislative Committees, Transportation and Water Commissions, and engaging directly with State Senators, Assemblymembers, and senior legislative staff.
- Develop policy framework and advocacy strategies for major funding initiatives, including the Bay Area Regional Transit Measure, Cap-and-Invest reauthorization, High Speed Rail funding, and broader climate infrastructure investment.
- Organize Alliance convenings and events for labor, contractor, and government leaders—including the Lieutenant Governor, State Controller, Members of Congress, State Senators, Assemblymembers, Mayors, County Supervisors, City Councilmembers, and senior agency officials—to align priorities and advance infrastructure funding and project delivery.
- Support strategies that translate advocacy into real project pipeline and construction activity, helping advance billions in infrastructure investment across Northern California.

## NORTHERN CALIFORNIA DISTRICT COUNCIL OF LABORERS Pleasanton, CA

### Senior Program Manager | Oct 2023-Present

Provide legislative, political, and coalition-building support to the 30,000-member Northern California Council of the Laborers' International Union of North America (LIUNA).

- Deliver coordination and capacity to the Basic Crafts Alliance, a political coalition including LIUNA, Operating Engineers Local 3 and the North Coast States Carpenters Union, to align around candidates and ballot measures that promote the unionized construction industry.
- Represent LIUNA in labor-management collaboration events and activities, including joint legislative efforts and industry conferences.
- Assist LIUNA's Northern California locals in activities such as working with other construction unions, industry partnerships with union signatory contractors, and relationship-building with government agency and elected officials.

## SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION San Francisco, CA

### Commission President & Commissioner | Oct 2024-Present

Oversee infrastructure policy, capital investment, and system performance for one of California's largest public utilities.

- Govern a \$2.2B annual budget supporting water (2.7M), wastewater (800K), and power (400K) customers.
- Manage a \$12.5B ten-year capital plan focused on modernizing critical infrastructure, including an aging combined sewer system.
- Reduce projected rate increases by 9% through coordinated financial and stakeholder strategy.
- Advance land acquisition and public asset strategy to expand infrastructure capacity.
- Lead cross-agency response to system outages, improving reliability and restoring public trust.

## OFFICE OF ECONOMIC &amp; WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT San Francisco, CA

**Director of Workforce Development | Aug 2018-Oct 2023**

Managed San Francisco's workforce development system and citywide workforce strategy, aligning public investment with employer demand and industry growth, serving over 70,000 jobseekers at peak.

- Scaled workforce system to \$61M – 3x growth over 3 years – through increased federal, state, and private sector investment.
- Coordinated \$145M annual workforce investment across 17 City departments.
- Reported to the San Francisco Workforce Development Board, also known as Workforce Investment San Francisco, consisting of business, labor, education, and government leaders.
- Partnered with federal and state agencies to align workforce development strategies in crucial industries such as construction, tech, healthcare, transportation, and hospitality.
- Implemented data-driven systems to improve performance, funding allocation, and outcomes.

## CITYBUILD San Francisco, CA

**Program Director, Pre-Apprenticeship Training | Sep 2017-Aug 2018**

Directed a nationally recognized construction industry pre-apprenticeship program connecting San Francisco residents to union construction careers through coordinated partnerships with labor, contractors, and public agencies.

- Expanded program capacity and access, increasing pathways for underserved residents into union apprenticeships and family-sustaining careers.
- Advanced implementation of project labor agreements, aligning workforce pipelines with major infrastructure projects.
- Developed partnerships with labor, contractors, and anchor projects, including Chase Center and India Basin, linking training directly to active construction opportunities.
- Aligned workforce training with real-time project demand, strengthening placement outcomes and long-term career retention.

## BRIGHTLINE DEFENSE PROJECT San Francisco, CA

**Executive Director | Nov 2006-Feb 2015**

Built and scaled an environmental justice organization advancing infrastructure, workforce, and clean energy policy across California and nationally.

- Delivered landmark local hiring policy, establishing one of the nation's most impactful models connecting communities to public infrastructure jobs.
- Organized and mobilized coalitions across community, labor, academic, and government stakeholders to advance policy and project outcomes.
- Advocated in California Public Utilities Commission proceedings, influencing energy policy, ratepayer protections, and infrastructure investment decisions.
- Drove transition from polluting power generation to clean energy solutions, improving public health and supporting local economic growth.
- Expanded organizational model to multiple U.S. cities, including Seattle, Baltimore, and Newark.

**Chair: Mission Housing Development Corporation, San Francisco (Dec 2013-Jul 2021)**

- Governed the board of one of San Francisco's oldest and largest nonprofit affordable housing developers, generating tens of millions in reinvestment in 30 dwellings to build 400 new units.

**Alternate Commissioner: Bay Conservation & Development Commission, San Francisco (Jun 2013-Apr 2021)**

- Represented CA Speakers of the Assembly on regional planning, weighing in on matters of sea-level rise, waterfront management, sustainable transportation, and affordable housing.

**President: San Francisco Commission on the Environment, San Francisco (Sep 2012-Feb 2016)**

- Chaired group advising the mayor on environmental policy and law, including counsel on leveraging \$22M budget to advance initiatives in zero waste, renewable energy, clean transportation, and biodiversity.

**Member: Mayor's Construction Workforce Advisory Committee, San Francisco (Aug 2012-Feb 2016)**

- Represented community-based organizations in implementing Local Hiring Policy for Construction. Worked with Mayor, City Administrator, Board of Supervisors, SFUSD, and City College of San Francisco.

**Delegate: San Francisco Building & Construction Trades Council, San Francisco (Jun 2013-Sep 2017)**

- Represented Laborers Union membership in partnering with other building trade unions to advocate for San Francisco construction opportunities and support project labor agreements.

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

Date Initial Filing Received

Filing Official Use Only

 E-Filed  
 03/30/2026  
 13:57:36

 Filing ID:  
 216438194

Please type or print in ink.

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

Arce, Joshua

**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

Public Utilities 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)**☐ State☐ Judge (Supreme, Appellate, Superior Court), Retired Judge, Pro Tem Judge, or Court Commissioner (Statewide Jurisdiction)☐ Multi-County \_\_\_\_\_☒ County of San Francisco☐ City of \_\_\_\_\_☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_**3. Type of Statement (Check at least one box)**☒ **Annual:** The period covered is January 1, 2025, through December 31, 2025.

-or-

The period covered is 10 / 20 / 2024, through December 31, 2025.

☐ **Leaving Office:** Date Left \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_  
(Check one circle below.)☐ The period covered is January 1, 2025, through the date of leaving office.

-or-

☐ The period covered is \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_, through the date of leaving office.☐ **Assuming Office:** Date assumed \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_☐ **Candidate:** Date of Election \_\_\_\_\_ and office sought, if different than Part 1: \_\_\_\_\_**4. Schedule Summary (required)**

► Total number of pages including this cover page: 5

**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☐ **Attachment 700-P - Prospective Employment (87200 Filers Only)** – 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)

San Francisco

CA

94102

DAYTIME TELEPHONE NUMBER

EMAIL ADDRESS

( )

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 03/30/2026  
 (month, day, year)

 Signature Joshua Arce  
 (File the originally signed paper statement with your filing official.)



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

Name

Arce, Joshua

## ▶ ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER OR STREET ADDRESS

3-5 Balmy Street

CITY

San Francisco

FAIR MARKET VALUE

☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☒ Over \$1,000,000

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/25  
ACQUIRED\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/25  
DISPOSED

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

☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☐ Over \$1,000,000

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/25  
ACQUIRED\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/25  
DISPOSED

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 and 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: \_\_\_\_\_

# SCHEDULE C

## Income, Loans, & Business Positions

(Other than Gifts and Travel Payments)

|                                            |
|--------------------------------------------|
| <b>CALIFORNIA FORM 700</b>                 |
| <b>FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION</b> |
| Name<br><br>Arce, Joshua                   |

**▶ 1. INCOME RECEIVED**

NAME OF SOURCE OF INCOME

California Alliance for Jobs

ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)

Sacramento, CA 95814

BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE

Infrastructure advocacy

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION

Adviser

GROSS INCOME RECEIVED ☐ No Income - Business Position Only☐ \$500 - \$1,000☐ \$1,001 - \$10,000☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000☒ OVER \$100,000

CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH INCOME WAS RECEIVED

☒ Salary ☐ Spouse's or registered domestic partner's income  
(For self-employed use Schedule A-2.)☐ Partnership (Less than 10% ownership. For 10% or greater use Schedule A-2.)☐ Sale of \_\_\_\_\_  
(Real property, car, boat, etc.)☐ Loan repayment☐ Commission or ☐ Rental Income, list each source of \$10,000 or more\_\_\_\_\_  
(Describe)☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_  
(Describe)**▶ 1. INCOME RECEIVED**

NAME OF SOURCE OF INCOME

Stanford Law School

ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)

Stanford, CA 94305

BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE

Legal instruction

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION

Associate Director, Lecturer in Law

GROSS INCOME RECEIVED ☐ No Income - Business Position Only☐ \$500 - \$1,000☐ \$1,001 - \$10,000☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000☒ OVER \$100,000

CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH INCOME WAS RECEIVED

☐ Salary ☒ Spouse's or registered domestic partner's income  
(For self-employed use Schedule A-2.)☐ Partnership (Less than 10% ownership. For 10% or greater use Schedule A-2.)☐ Sale of \_\_\_\_\_  
(Real property, car, boat, etc.)☐ Loan repayment☐ Commission or ☐ Rental Income, list each source of \$10,000 or more\_\_\_\_\_  
(Describe)☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_  
(Describe)**▶ 2. LOANS RECEIVED OR OUTSTANDING DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD**

\* You are not required to report loans from a commercial lending institution, or any indebtedness created as part of a retail installment or credit card transaction, 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 and 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

HIGHEST BALANCE DURING REPORTING PERIOD

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

INTEREST RATE

TERM (Months/Years)

\_\_\_\_\_% ☐ None

SECURITY FOR LOAN

☐ None☐ Personal residence☐ Real Property \_\_\_\_\_

Street address

City

☐ Guarantor \_\_\_\_\_☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

(Describe)

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

# SCHEDULE C

## Income, Loans, & Business Positions

(Other than Gifts and Travel Payments)

|                                            |
|--------------------------------------------|
| <b>CALIFORNIA FORM 700</b>                 |
| <b>FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION</b> |
| Name<br><br>Arce, Joshua                   |

**▶ 1. INCOME RECEIVED**

NAME OF SOURCE OF INCOME  
Northern California District Council of Laborers/PSWROC

ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)  
  
Pleasanton, CA 94588

BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE  
  
Labor representation

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION  
  
Senior Program Manager

GROSS INCOME RECEIVED ☐ No Income - Business Position Only  
☐ \$500 - \$1,000 ☐ \$1,001 - \$10,000  
☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000 ☒ OVER \$100,000

CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH INCOME WAS RECEIVED  
☒ Salary ☐ Spouse's or registered domestic partner's income  
 (For self-employed use Schedule A-2.)

☐ Partnership (Less than 10% ownership. For 10% or greater use Schedule A-2.)

☐ Sale of \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Real property, car, boat, etc.)

☐ Loan repayment

☐ Commission or ☐ Rental Income, list each source of \$10,000 or more  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Describe)

☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Describe)

**▶ 1. INCOME RECEIVED**

NAME OF SOURCE OF INCOME

ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)

BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION

GROSS INCOME RECEIVED ☐ No Income - Business Position Only  
☐ \$500 - \$1,000 ☐ \$1,001 - \$10,000  
☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000 ☐ OVER \$100,000

CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH INCOME WAS RECEIVED  
☐ Salary ☐ Spouse's or registered domestic partner's income  
 (For self-employed use Schedule A-2.)

☐ Partnership (Less than 10% ownership. For 10% or greater use Schedule A-2.)

☐ Sale of \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Real property, car, boat, etc.)

☐ Loan repayment

☐ Commission or ☐ Rental Income, list each source of \$10,000 or more  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Describe)

☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Describe)

**▶ 2. LOANS RECEIVED OR OUTSTANDING DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD**

\* You are not required to report loans from a commercial lending institution, or any indebtedness created as part of a retail installment or credit card transaction, 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 and 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 \_\_\_\_\_

HIGHEST BALANCE DURING REPORTING PERIOD  
☐ \$500 - \$1,000  
☐ \$1,001 - \$10,000  
☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000  
☐ OVER \$100,000

INTEREST RATE \_\_\_\_\_% ☐ None

TERM (Months/Years) \_\_\_\_\_

SECURITY FOR LOAN  
☐ None ☐ Personal residence

☐ Real Property \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Street address  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 City

☐ Guarantor \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Describe)

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

## SCHEDULE D

### Income – Gifts

Name

Arce, Joshua

► NAME OF SOURCE *(Not an Acronym)*

Bruce Agid

ADDRESS *(Business Address Acceptable)*

San Francisco, CA 94158

BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE

Friend

| DATE (mm/dd/yy) | VALUE     | DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S) |
|-----------------|-----------|------------------------|
| 09 / 13 / 25    | \$ 50.00  | Giants game ticket     |
| 07 / 11 / 25    | \$ 50.00  | Giants game ticket     |
| 04 / 15 / 25    | \$ 365.00 | Warriors game ticket   |

► NAME OF SOURCE *(Not an Acronym)*ADDRESS *(Business Address Acceptable)*

BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE

| DATE (mm/dd/yy) | VALUE    | DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S) |
|-----------------|----------|------------------------|
| ___/___/___     | \$ _____ | _____                  |
| ___/___/___     | \$ _____ | _____                  |
| ___/___/___     | \$ _____ | _____                  |

► NAME OF SOURCE *(Not an Acronym)*ADDRESS *(Business Address Acceptable)*

BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE

| DATE (mm/dd/yy) | VALUE    | DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S) |
|-----------------|----------|------------------------|
| ___/___/___     | \$ _____ | _____                  |
| ___/___/___     | \$ _____ | _____                  |
| ___/___/___     | \$ _____ | _____                  |

► NAME OF SOURCE *(Not an Acronym)*ADDRESS *(Business Address Acceptable)*

BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE

| DATE (mm/dd/yy) | VALUE    | DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S) |
|-----------------|----------|------------------------|
| ___/___/___     | \$ _____ | _____                  |
| ___/___/___     | \$ _____ | _____                  |
| ___/___/___     | \$ _____ | _____                  |

► NAME OF SOURCE *(Not an Acronym)*ADDRESS *(Business Address Acceptable)*

BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE

| DATE (mm/dd/yy) | VALUE    | DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S) |
|-----------------|----------|------------------------|
| ___/___/___     | \$ _____ | _____                  |
| ___/___/___     | \$ _____ | _____                  |
| ___/___/___     | \$ _____ | _____                  |

► NAME OF SOURCE *(Not an Acronym)*ADDRESS *(Business Address Acceptable)*

BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE

| DATE (mm/dd/yy) | VALUE    | DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S) |
|-----------------|----------|------------------------|
| ___/___/___     | \$ _____ | _____                  |
| ___/___/___     | \$ _____ | _____                  |
| ___/___/___     | \$ _____ | _____                  |

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



## PUBLIC UTILITIES 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 as "VACANT" 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      | Mayor                | Avni Jamdar      | 8/1/28      | Shall be a member with experience in environmental policy and an understanding of environmental justice issues.<br>Term: 4-years |
| 2      | Mayor                | Joshua Arce      | 8/1/26      | Shall be a member with experience in ratepayer or consumer advocacy.<br>Term: 4-years                                            |
| 3      | Mayor                | Stephen Leveroni | 8/1/28      | Shall be a member with experience in project finance.<br>Term: 4-years                                                           |
| 4      | Mayor                | Kate Stacy       | 8/1/26      | Shall be a member with expertise in water systems, power systems, or public utility management.<br>Term: 4-years                 |
| 5      | Mayor                | Meghan Thurlow   | 8/1/28      | Shall be an at-large member.<br>Term: 4-years                                                                                    |

Seats 1-5 are appointed by the Mayor, subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors.

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

### FORM 700 FILING REQUIREMENT

Pursuant to the Board of Supervisors Rules of Order all applicants applying for this body must complete and submit, with their application, a copy (**not original**) of a Statement of Economic Interests (Form 700). 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>

### THE APPLICATION PROCESS

*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.*

**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 Public Utilities Commission shall consist of five (5) members appointed by the Mayor, and subject to confirmation by a majority of the Board of Supervisors. Each of the members shall serve for a term of four years. Members may be removed by the Mayor only pursuant to Charter, Section 15.105 (Suspension and Removal).

- Seat 1: Shall be a member with experience in environmental policy and an understanding of environmental justice issues.
- Seat 2: Shall be a member with experience in ratepayer or consumer advocacy.
- Seat 3: Shall be a member with experience in project finance.
- Seat 4: Shall be a member with expertise in water systems, power systems, or public utility management.
- Seat 5: Shall be an at-large member.

The terms of office of members of the Public Utilities Commission who hold office on August 1, 2008 shall expire at noon on that date, and the members appointed pursuant to the Charter Amendment approved at the June 2008 Election shall succeed to said office at that time. In order to provide for staggered terms, the members appointed to Seats 2 and 4 shall serve for an initial term of two years from August 1, 2008. The remaining three members appointed to Seats 1, 3,

and 5 shall serve for an initial term of four years from August 1, 2008, and thereafter the terms of all members shall be four years.

The Commission shall have charge of the construction, management, supervision, maintenance, extension, operation, use and control of all water and energy supplies and utilities of the City as well as the real, personal and financial assets, which are under the Commission's jurisdiction on the operative date of this Charter, or assigned pursuant to Charter, Section 4.132.

Holdover Limit: Holdover tenure of commissioners is limited to 60 days after their terms expire. (Charter § 4.101.5.)

Authority: Charter, Section 4.112 (June 2008 Election, Proposition E), and Section 8B.120 (Preamble, added November 2002)

Sunset Date: None

Contact: Tiffany Lennear  
Public Utilities Commission  
525 Golden Gate Avenue, 13th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
(415) 554-0761  
[tlennear@sfwater.org](mailto:tlennear@sfwater.org)

Updated: December 3, 2025



Gender Analysis of  
San Francisco Commissions and Boards  
2023







London N. Breed  
Mayor

City and County of San Francisco  
**Department on the Status of Women**



Dear Honorable Mayor London Breed and Board of Supervisors:

Please find attached the 2023 Gender Analysis of Commissions and Boards Report. We are pleased to share that under Mayor Breed's leadership, the representation of women, people of color, and women of color in policy bodies continues to increase.

**The Department wishes to emphasize three areas of consideration for future reports.**

These areas were identified as key opportunities to increase response rates from sitting members, expand efforts to ensure most members identify with the categories presented in the survey questions and deepen insights into the diversity of our policy bodies.

First, integrating the survey for this report with the Form 700 process could enhance participation efforts. Coordination between the Department, the San Francisco Ethics Commission, and the Director of Boards and Commissions could develop a more systematic approach to data collection and establish a centralized data repository for crucial demographic information.

Second, the Department recommends a more unified and expansive approach to addressing race and ethnicity in surveys. This approach should include groups that the U.S. Census Bureau's current racial classifications overlook. For example, the Census presently directs individuals of Middle Eastern or North African origin to identify as White. However, by offering more nuanced racial and ethnic categories, members can see their identities better represented, and an additional understanding of member diversity can be gained. Revising categories to include a broader range of sexual orientations could similarly enhance our insights.

Third, this survey offers a unique opportunity to illuminate potential barriers to service on policy bodies by expanding the survey questions and, for example, collecting information about policy board members' socioeconomic status and whether they have dependents. Such questions may provide additional information about likely factors that prevent more diverse policy bodies. These three areas of consideration offer pathways to advance the Department's charge in assessing the diversity of the City's Commissions and Boards.

That said, this 2023 report offers important insights into the current make-up and diversity of San Francisco's policy bodies. Overall, policy bodies have a larger percentage of women, members of the LGBTQIA+ community, and veterans than the general San Francisco population. The rate of women of color and people with disabilities appointed to policy bodies is nearly equal to the general population. Fiscal year 2022-2023 saw the highest representation of women on policy bodies since the Department on the Status of Women started collecting data in 2009. Women of color have the highest representation of appointees to date.

Black and African American women and men are notably well-represented on San Francisco policy bodies. Black women are nine percent of appointees compared to two

percent of the general San Francisco population. Black men are five percent of appointees compared to three percent of the general San Francisco population. Additionally, almost 1-in-4 appointees who responded to the survey question identify as same-gender loving, bisexual, or some other sexual orientation than heterosexual.

While San Francisco continues to make strides in diversity, there is still work to do to achieve parity of representation for Latinx and Asian groups in appointed positions overall, as well as people of color and women of color on commissions overseeing the largest budgets. The Department applauds Mayor Breed for remaining committed to diversifying policy body appointments across all diverse categories, including for positions of influence and authority.

Thank you to the Department staff who worked on this report and to members of the Commission on the Status of Women for their ongoing advocacy for intersectional gender equity efforts.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kim Ellis", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Kimberly Ellis, J.D.  
Director of the Department on the Status of Women



## Table of Contents

|                                                                            |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| I. Introduction.....                                                       | 1  |
| II. Findings.....                                                          | 2  |
| A. Gender .....                                                            | 2  |
| B. Sexual Orientation.....                                                 | 5  |
| C. Race and Ethnicity .....                                                | 6  |
| D. Race and Ethnicity by Gender .....                                      | 10 |
| E. Disability Status.....                                                  | 12 |
| F. Veteran Status .....                                                    | 13 |
| G. Policy Bodies by Budget.....                                            | 15 |
| H. Comparison of Commission and Board and Advisory Body Demographics ..... | 17 |
| I. Demographics of Mayoral, Supervisorial, and Total Appointees .....      | 17 |
| III. Methodology and Limitations .....                                     | 18 |
| IV. Conclusion .....                                                       | 20 |
| V. Appendix I.....                                                         | 22 |
| VI. Appendix II .....                                                      | 26 |
| VII. Appendix III.....                                                     | 27 |
| VIII. Acknowledgements.....                                                | 28 |

## Table of Figures

|                                                                                                                                              |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Figure 1: Summary Data of Policy Body Demographics, 2023.....                                                                                | 2  |
| Figure 2: Gender Identities of Policy Members .....                                                                                          | 3  |
| Figure 3: 14-Year Comparison of Representation of Women on Policy Bodies.....                                                                | 3  |
| Figure 4: Policy Bodies with the Highest Percentage of Women, 2023 Compared to 2021.....                                                     | 4  |
| Figure 5: Policy Bodies with the Lowest Percentage of Women, 2023 Compared to 2021.....                                                      | 5  |
| Figure 6: Sexual Orientation of Appointees, 2023 .....                                                                                       | 6  |
| Figure 7: 14-Year Comparison Representation of People of Color on Policy Bodies.....                                                         | 7  |
| Figure 8: Race/Ethnicity of Respondents Compared to San Francisco Population, 2023 .....                                                     | 8  |
| Figure 9: Commissions and Boards with Highest Percentage of<br>People of Color, 2023 Compared to 2021 .....                                  | 9  |
| Figure 10: Commissions and Boards with the Lowest Percentage of<br>People of Color, 2023 Compared to 2021 .....                              | 9  |
| Figure 11: 14-year Comparison of Representation of Women of Color on Policy Bodies .....                                                     | 10 |
| Figure 12: Appointees by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 2023.....                                                                                | 11 |
| Figure 13: San Francisco Population by Race/Ethnicity, 2022 ACS 5-Year Estimates.....                                                        | 11 |
| Figure 14: Disability Status of Appointees. 2023 .....                                                                                       | 12 |
| Figure 15: Appointees with One or More Disabilities by Gender Identity, 2023.....                                                            | 13 |
| Figure 16: Policy Board Member with Military Service, 2023.....                                                                              | 14 |
| Figure 17: San Francisco Adult Population with Military Service by Gender .....                                                              | 14 |
| Figure 18: Appointees with Military Service by Gender, 2023.....                                                                             | 15 |
| Figure 19: Percent of Women, People of Color, and Women of Color on Commissions and Boards with<br>Largest and Smallest Budgets in 2023..... | 15 |
| Figure 20: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Largest Budgets, 2023.....                                                            | 16 |
| Figure 21: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Smallest Budgets, 2023 .....                                                          | 16 |
| Figure 22: Demographics of Appointees on Commission and Boards and<br>Advisory Bodies, 2023 .....                                            | 17 |
| Figure 23: Demographics of Mayoral, Supervisorial, and Total Appointees, 2023.....                                                           | 18 |
| Figure 24: Policy Body Demographics, 2023.....                                                                                               | 22 |
| Figure 25: San Francisco Population Estimates by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 2022.....                                                        | 26 |

## Executive Summary

---

In 2008, San Francisco voters 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 appointing officials to 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 2023 Gender Analysis of Commissions and Boards Report (2023 Gender Analysis Report) evaluates the representation of the following groups across appointments to San Francisco policy bodies:

- Women
- People of color
- Sexual orientation and gender identity
- People with disabilities
- Veterans

The report includes policy bodies such as task forces, committees, and Advisory Bodies, in addition to Commissions and Boards.

This year, data was collected from 99 policy bodies and a total of 685 members, generally appointed by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. The policy bodies surveyed for the 2023 Gender Analysis Report 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 functions whose members do not submit financial disclosures to the Ethics Commission. The report comprehensively examines policy bodies and appointees, considering them as a whole and separately by the two categories.

Several changes were made to the survey questions for the 2023 Gender Analysis Report. Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity (SOGI) categories were aligned with the latest classifications used by the Office of Transgender Initiatives. The classification of veteran status was reverted to its 2019 form to include only individuals who have served in the military and armed forces.

The overall number of policy bodies that submitted data increased compared to 2021 and the total number of individual members who participated in the survey was almost double those in 2021.

---


<sup>1</sup> San Francisco Administrative Code 4.101

[https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san\\_francisco/latest/sf\\_charter/0-0-0-52865](https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/sf_charter/0-0-0-52865)

## Key Findings


### Gender

- Women's representation on policy bodies is 55%, above parity with the San Francisco female population of 49%.
- 2023 saw no change in the overall representation of women since our 2021 report.



### Race and Ethnicity


- The representation of people of color on policy bodies is 55%. Comparatively, in San Francisco, 62% of the population are people of color.
- The overall representation of people of color has increased by one percent since our 2021 report, however, this is still below the 57% reported in 2015.
- As found in previous reports, Latinx and Asian groups are underrepresented on San Francisco policy bodies as compared to the population. Latinx individuals are 16% of the population but make up only 8% of appointees. Asian individuals are 31% of the population but make up only 20% of appointees, a marked decrease from the 26% share in our previous report. Some of this decrease can be attributed to an increased rate of those reporting "Two or More Races" and the inclusion of an "Other" category for the Race/Ethnicity question.





### ***Race and Ethnicity by Gender***

- On the whole, women of color are 32% of the San Francisco population and 32% of appointees. This is the same as our previous report but represents a large increase from the pre-pandemic period.
- Meanwhile, men of color are underrepresented at 23% of appointees compared to 33% 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 22% of appointees compared to 20% of the population.
- Black and African American women and men are overrepresented on San Francisco policy bodies. Black women comprise nine percent of appointees compared to two percent of the population, and Black men comprise five percent of appointees compared to three percent of the population.
- Latinx men and women are underrepresented on San Francisco policy bodies. Latinx women are eight percent of the San Francisco population but five percent of appointees, and Latinx men are seven percent of the population but three percent of appointees.
- Asian men and women are also underrepresented on San Francisco policy boards. Asian women are 18% of the San Francisco population but 12% of appointees, and Asian men are 16% of the population but eight percent of appointees.

### ***Additional Demographics***

- 76% of appointees identified as straight/heterosexual, 16% identified as gay/lesbian/same gender loving, six percent of respondents identified as bisexual, and two percent as some other sexual orientation.
- 11% identified as having one or more disabilities, which is just at parity of the 11% of the adult population with a disability status in San Francisco.
- Four percent of respondents said they have served in the military, representative of the four percent of San Franciscans who have served.

### ***Proxies for Influence: Budget and Authority***

- Although women are just over half of all appointees (55%), they have a higher representation in those Commissions and Boards with the largest budgets (63%) while women of color are underrepresented in these same boards.
- Although still underrepresented relative to the San Francisco population, there is a larger percentage of people of color on Commissions and Boards with the smallest budgets, and to a lesser degree, boards with the largest budgets.
- The percentage of total women is slightly larger on Advisory Bodies than Commissions and Boards. Women are 58% of appointees on Advisory Bodies and 56% of appointees on Commissions and Boards.

### **Demographics of Respondents Compared to the San Francisco Population**

|                                             | Women | People of Color | Women of Color | LGBTQIA+ | Disability Status | Veteran Status |
|---------------------------------------------|-------|-----------------|----------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|
| San Francisco Population                    | 48%   | 66%             | 33%            | 5%-15%   | 11%               | 3%             |
| Total Appointees                            | 55%   | 55%             | 32%            | 24%      | 11%               | 4%             |
| 10 Largest Budgeted Commissions and Boards  | 63%   | 58%             | 36%            | 8%       | -                 | -              |
| 10 Smallest Budgeted Commissions and Boards | 57%   | 64%             | 41%            | 3%       | -                 | -              |
| Commissions and Boards                      | 56%   | 55%             | 33%            | 26%      | 8%                | 4%             |
| Advisory Bodies                             | 58%   | 53%             | 33%            | 27%      | 18%               | 4%             |

## I. Introduction

---

Inspired by the fourth U.N. 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 Against Women (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 U.N. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. The Ordinance requires the City to take proactive steps to ensure gender equity and specifies "gender analysis" as a preventive tool to identify and address discrimination.

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 (see Footnote 1) was overwhelmingly approved by voters and made it City policy that:

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

The 2023 Gender Analysis Report examines the representation of women, people of color, gender and sexual orientation, people with disabilities, and veteran status of appointees on San Francisco policy bodies. As was the case for the 2019 and 2021 Gender Analysis Reports, this year's analysis involved increased outreach to policy bodies compared to previous analyses limited to Commissions and Boards. As a result, the data collection and analysis examine a more diverse and expansive layout of City policy bodies. These policy bodies fall under two categories designated by the San Francisco Office of the City Attorney. The first category, "Commissions and Boards," comprises policy bodies with decision-making authority whose members must submit financial disclosures to the Ethics Commission<sup>3</sup>. The second category, "Advisory Bodies," consists of policy bodies with advisory functions whose members do not submit financial disclosures to the Ethics Commission. A detailed description of the methodology and limitations can be found on page 19.

---

<sup>2</sup> San Francisco Administrative Code 33A.1

[https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san\\_francisco/latest/sf\\_admin/0-0-0-59871](https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/sf_admin/0-0-0-59871)

<sup>3</sup> San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Code of Conduct Section 3.1-103

[https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san\\_francisco/latest/sf\\_campaign/0-0-0-979](https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/sf_campaign/0-0-0-979)

## II. Findings

San Francisco's diversity is reflected in the overall population of appointees on San Francisco policy bodies. The analysis in this report includes data from 99 policy bodies, of which 925 of the 1160 seats are filled, leaving 20% (235) vacant. Of the 925 non-vacant seats, we received responses from 685 individuals (a 74% response rate). This represents a much higher participation rate than our 2021 report, almost double the number of respondents. As outlined below in Figure 1, slightly more than half of appointees are women and people of color, 32% are women of color, 24% identify as LGBTQIA+<sup>4</sup>, 11% have a disability, and four percent are veterans. Each question in our survey allowed respondents to decline to answer. Therefore, sample sizes (n) vary for each category.

**Figure 1: Summary Data of Policy Body Demographics, 2023**

| Appointee Demographics           | Percentage of Appointees     |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Women (n=673)                    | Women- 55%                   |
| People of Color (n=660)          | People of Color- 55%         |
| Women of Color (n=658)           | Women of Color- 32%          |
| Sexual Orientation (n=641)       | LGBTQIA+ -24%                |
| People with Disabilities (n=647) | People with Disabilities-11% |
| Veteran Status (n=670)           | Veteran Status-4%            |

The following sections present comprehensive data analysis comparing previous years, detailing the variables of gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability status, veteran status, and policy body characteristics of budget size, decision-making authority, and appointment authority.


### A. Gender

Information on gender identity was collected from 673 individuals out of 685 respondents. On San Francisco policy bodies, 55% (375) of policy board members identified as women, including four who identified as trans women. Of the 673 individuals who provided gender identity information, 43% (288) identified as male, including one who identified as a trans man. Further, 1.5% (10) identified as gender-queer or nonbinary. Figure 2 shows a breakdown of the gender identities of our sample.

---

<sup>4</sup> We use LGBTQIA+ to refer to the broader community. Limitations in the data collection process prevented a more robust analysis of the diverse identities that are included in this umbrella term.


**Figure 2: Gender Identities of Policy Members**



At 55%, the percentage of women represented in San Francisco's policy bodies is above parity compared to the San Francisco female population of 48%. This is similar to previously reported numbers. The representation of women remained stable at 49% from 2013 until 2017, with a slight increase to 51% in 2019, and increasing again to 55% in 2021. Our previous report had to conclude that the increase in representation from 2019 to 2021 may have been due to the low participation in the 2021 survey. However, the replication of that level of representation in this report provides much stronger evidence that the representation of women in City policy bodies has gone up considerably.

Figure 3 shows a 14-year comparison, which demonstrates that the representation of women appointees has gradually increased since 2009 by a total of 10 percentage points and has remained stable over the last two reports.

**Figure 3: 14-Year Comparison of Representation of Women on Policy Bodies**



Figures 4 and 5 show the policy bodies with the highest and lowest percent of women<sup>5</sup>. For these figures, policy bodies were only evaluated if they had at least a 75% response rate, as we cannot speak confidently on the composition of agencies where individuals did not respond. This analysis includes both Commissions and Boards and Advisory Bodies.

Figure 4 showcases the 10 Commissions and Boards with the highest representation of women appointees as compared to 2021. The Commission on the Status of Women is currently comprised of all women appointees. This finding has been consistent for the Commission on the Status of Women since 2015. The Commission on Investment and Infrastructure and the Early Childhood Community Oversight and Advisory Committee are also comprised entirely of women.

**Figure 4: Policy Bodies with the Highest Percentage of Women, 2023 Compared to 2021**

| Policy Body                                                | Percent of Women | Response Rate | Active Seats | 2021 Percent* |
|------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| Commission on the Status of Women                          | 100%             | 100%          | 6            | 100%          |
| Commission on Investment and Infrastructure                | 100%             | 100%          | 4            | 50%           |
| Early Childhood Community Oversight and Advisory Committee | 100%             | 89%           | 8            | -             |
| Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee              | 89%              | 82%           | 11           | -             |
| Children and Families First Commission                     | 88%              | 100%          | 9            | 75%           |
| Elections Commission                                       | 86%              | 100%          | 7            | 60%           |
| Recreation and Park Commission                             | 86%              | 100%          | 7            | -             |
| Mental Health SF Implementation Working Group              | 86%              | 78%           | 9            | -             |
| Health Commission                                          | 83%              | 100%          | 6            | 71%           |
| Port Commission                                            | 83%              | 86%           | 7            | 60%           |

\*This column shows the percent of women in 2021. Policy bodies with less than a 50% response rate in 2021 were marked as "-".

Figure 5 shows the 12 policy bodies with the lowest percentage of women. The Board of Appeals and Board of Examiners have the lowest representation (among boards with more than a 75% response rate). Both policy bodies have no members who identify as women. The Board of Examiners has not had any female representation since at least 2019, the year we began collecting data on the board. There are five policy bodies whose membership is between 14% and 29% women, and five boards with one-third of their members identifying as women.

<sup>5</sup> This encompasses respondents who selected Female or Trans Female.

**Figure 5: Policy Bodies with Lowest Percentage of Women, 2023 Compared to 2021**

| Policy Body                                     | Percent of Women | Response Rate | Active Seats | 2021 Percent* |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| Board of Appeals                                | 0%               | 100%          | 5            | 40%           |
| Board of Examiners                              | 0%               | 100%          | 10           | 0%            |
| Cannabis Oversight Committee                    | 14%              | 100%          | 7            | -             |
| Urban Forestry Council                          | 18%              | 100%          | 11           | -             |
| Airport Commission                              | 20%              | 100%          | 5            | 40%           |
| Police Commission                               | 29%              | 100%          | 7            | 20%           |
| Retirement Board                                | 29%              | 100%          | 7            | 14%           |
| Assessment Appeals Board                        | 33%              | 100%          | 16           | -             |
| Health Services Board                           | 33%              | 100%          | 7            | 14%           |
| Sunshine Ordinance Task Force                   | 33%              | 100%          | 11           | 56%           |
| Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee | 33%              | 86%           | 7            | -             |
| Capital Planning Committee                      | 33%              | 82%           | 9            | -             |

\*This column shows the percent of women in 2021. Policy bodies with less than a 50% response rate in 2021 were marked as "-".

## B. Sexual Orientation

Sexual orientation data was collected from 641 participants, or 94% of the surveyed appointees. Figure 6 shows that among the appointees who responded to this question, 16% identify as Lesbian/Gay, six percent identify as Bisexual, two percent identify as an "Other" sexual orientation, and 76% identify as Straight/Heterosexual. Comparison of San Francisco's policy boards to the general San Francisco population is difficult, given limited data.


Recent research estimates the California LGBT population is 5.1%<sup>6</sup>. The LGBTQ population of the San Francisco and greater Bay Area ranks highest of U.S. cities at 6.2%<sup>7</sup>. Additionally, a 2006 survey found that 15.4% of adults in the San Francisco metropolitan area identify as LGB<sup>8</sup>. Therefore, compared to available San Francisco, greater Bay Area, and national data, the LGBTQ community is well represented on San Francisco policy bodies.

<sup>6</sup> Flores, Andrew R. and Kerith J. Conron, "Adult LGBT Population in the United States, 2023," <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/publications/adult-lgbt-pop-us/>

<sup>7</sup> Gary J. Gates and Frank Newport, "San Francisco Metro Area Ranks Highest in LGBT Percentage," GALLUP (March 20, 2015) [https://news.gallup.com/poll/182051/san-francisco-metro-area-ranks-highest-lgbtpercentage.aspx?utm\\_source=Social%20Issues&utm\\_medium=newsfeed&utm\\_campaign=tiles](https://news.gallup.com/poll/182051/san-francisco-metro-area-ranks-highest-lgbtpercentage.aspx?utm_source=Social%20Issues&utm_medium=newsfeed&utm_campaign=tiles).

<sup>8</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).

**Figure 6: Sexual Orientation of Appointees, 2023**



### **C. Race and Ethnicity**


Data on racial and ethnic identity was collected from 660 participants, or 96% of the surveyed appointees, with 25 respondents (4%) preferring not to answer. Although 55% of respondents identify as a race or ethnicity other than White or Caucasian, people of color are still underrepresented compared to the San Francisco population<sup>9</sup> of 66%. It should be noted that the percentage of people of color has grown over time. In 2020 about 63% of the population was listed as non-White. As seen in Figure 7, the representation of people of color has increased by nine percent since 2009, but not linearly. The representation of people of color increased from 2009 to 2015, then decreased until 2019, and has increased in our last two reports. The highest reported share of people of color was 57% in 2015, though it should be noted that this was a small sample.

---

<sup>9</sup> Bureau, US Census. "American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2009-2022)." Census.Gov, 26 Jan. 2024, [www.census.gov/data/developers/data-sets/acs-5year.html](https://www.census.gov/data/developers/data-sets/acs-5year.html).



**Figure 7: 14-Year Comparison of Representation of People of Color on Policy Bodies**




The racial and ethnic breakdown of policy body members compared to the San Francisco population is shown in Figure 8. Population data uses 5-year estimates from the 2022 American Communities Survey<sup>10</sup>. This analysis reveals an underrepresentation and an overrepresentation in San Francisco policy bodies for certain racial and ethnic groups. Nearly half of all appointees are White, an overrepresentation of about 12 percentage points. Our previous reports have found a similar disparity<sup>11</sup>. The Black community is represented on policy bodies at 13.8% compared to being only 4.6% of the population of San Francisco. This level of representation has increased since 2021, when Black representation was about 11%, but about the same as 2019 (which had a much more substantial sample size).

<sup>10</sup> Ibid

<sup>11</sup> Our 2021 report listed the White population as about 40% of the population, when Census data suggests it would have been about 34%. When correcting for this, the disparity described above is similar from 2021 to 2023.

**Figure 8: Race/Ethnicity of Respondents Compared to San Francisco Population, 2023**



Considerably underrepresented racial and ethnic groups on San Francisco policy bodies compared to the San Francisco population are individuals who identify as Asian, Latinx/Hispanic, or some other race. While the Asian population is 31% of the San Francisco population, they make up 20% of appointees. This represents a six percent decrease from the Asian representation reported in 2021, but a two percent increase from the representation reported in 2019 (our last report with a similar sample size). While Latinx individuals are about 14% of the SF population they were only eight percent of respondents, an almost seven percent disparity. This disparity is similar to previously reported data.

The representation of Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islanders, Native American or Alaskan Natives, and those who identify with two or more races are close to parity with their shares of the population.

Taken together, our data shows persistent disparities in the racial and ethnic composition of San Francisco's policy bodies. In general Whites and Black/African Americans are over-represented, while Asian, Latinx/Hispanic, and other races are underrepresented. While the specific levels of representation have changed, the level of disparity has remained roughly consistent since data collection began.

The following figures illustrate Commissions and Boards with the highest and lowest percentages of people of color. As shown in Figure 9, the Ethics Commission and Refuse Rate Board have the highest representation of people of color at 100%, with a 100% response rate. However, it should be noted that the Refuse Rate Board only comprises two members at the time of the survey, with the third seat on their board being vacant.

**Figure 9: Commission and Boards with Highest Percentage of People of Color, 2023 Compared to 2021**

| Policy Body                                                            | Percent of POC | Response Rate | Active Seats | 2021 Percent* |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| Ethics Commission                                                      | 100%           | 100%          | 4            | 25%           |
| Refuse Rate Board                                                      | 100%           | 100%          | 2            | -             |
| Immigrant Rights Commission                                            | 93%            | 100%          | 15           | 50%           |
| Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committees. | 88%            | 100%          | 6            | -             |
| Shelter Monitoring Committee                                           | 86%            | 100%          | 8            | -             |
| Sheriff's Department Oversight Board                                   | 86%            | 100%          | 7            | -             |
| Commission on the Status of Women                                      | 83%            | 100%          | 6            | 86%           |
| Youth Commission                                                       | 83%            | 100%          | 17           | 71%           |
| Citizen's Committee on Community Development                           | 80%            | 100%          | 5            | 50%           |
| Commission on Investment and Infrastructure                            | 80%            | 100%          | 4            | 33%           |
| Local Agency Formation Commission                                      | 80%            | 100%          | 5            | 50%           |

\*This column shows the percent of women in 2021. Policy bodies with less than a 50% response rate in 2021 were marked as "-".

Figure 10 shows the policy bodies with the lowest representation of people of color. There were no boards above the 75% response rate threshold that had no people of color. The Fine Arts Museum Board of Trustees has the lowest representation of people of color at 13%, followed by the Commission on Animal Control and Welfare at 14% and the Urban Forestry Council at 18%.

**Figure 10: Commissions and Boards with the Lowest Percentage of People of Color, 2023 Compared to 2021**


| Policy Body                                     | Percent of POC | Response Rate* | Active Seats | 2021 Percent* |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|
| Fine Arts Museum Board of Trustees              | 13%            | 100%           | 8            | -             |
| Commission of Animal Control and Welfare        | 14%            | 100%           | 7            | -             |
| Urban Forestry Council                          | 18%            | 100%           | 9            | -             |
| Capital Planning Committee                      | 22%            | 81%            | 11           | -             |
| Elections Commission                            | 29%            | 100%           | 7            | 40%           |
| Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee            | 30%            | 78%            | 9            | -             |
| War Memorial Board of Trustees                  | 33%            | 91%            | 11           | -             |
| Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee   | 33%            | 81%            | 11           | -             |
| Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee | 33%            | 86%            | 7            | -             |
| Port Commission                                 | 33%            | 86%            | 7            | 40%           |
| Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board            | 33%            | 100%           | 4            | 25%           |

\*This column shows the percent of women in 2021. Policy bodies with less than a 50% response rate in 2021 were marked as "-".

## D. Race and Ethnicity by Gender

This report also examines the representation of race and gender simultaneously. Women of color are represented in about 32% of seats and make up about 32% of the population<sup>12</sup>, at parity. The representation of women of color has generally increased over time since our first report in 2009. Conversely, men of color are underrepresented, making up about 23% of policy board members while being about 33% of the San Francisco population. Figure 11 shows the levels of representation for women of color since 2009.

**Figure 11: 14-year Comparison of Representation of Women of Color on Policy Bodies**




Figures 12 and 13 present the breakdown for policy board members and the San Francisco population<sup>13</sup> by race, ethnicity, and gender. White men and White women are overrepresented, holding 22% and 23% of appointments, respectively, compared to 20% and 17% of the population. Black men and Black women are also overrepresented, but more acutely. Black men make up five percent of the policy board members and three percent of the population, and Black women make up nine percent of the policy board members and two percent of the population. Characterizing these as overrepresentations is inaccurate given the representation of Black or African American people on policy bodies has been consistent over the years, while the Black population in San Francisco has declined over the same period.

Asian men and women are underrepresented, with Asian women making up 12% of policy board members compared to 17% of the population, while Asian men comprise eight percent of policy board members and 15% of the population, representing the highest disparity in our data. Latinx/Hispanic men and women are also underrepresented. Latinx/Hispanic men are three percent of policy board members while being seven percent of the population and their female counterparts are five percent of policy board members while making up 6.5% of the population.


<sup>12</sup> Bureau, US Census. "American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2009-2022)." Census.Gov, 26 Jan. 2024, [www.census.gov/data/developers/data-sets/acs-5year.html](https://www.census.gov/data/developers/data-sets/acs-5year.html).

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

**Figure 12: Appointees by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 2023**



**Figure 13: San Francisco Population by Race/Ethnicity, 2022 ACS 5-Year Estimates**




## E. Disability Status

Data on disability status was obtained from 647 of our 685 respondents, with a response rate of about 94%. Figure 14 shows about 11% of those who responded to the survey reported having one or more disabilities, mirroring the 11% of the San Francisco population<sup>14</sup> living with a disability. Therefore, our data suggested that those with disabilities are represented relative to their population size. Further, our data shows that policy board members who are disabled are more likely to be female.


Figure 15 shows that of those with one or more disabilities, 63% are women, 30% are men, three percent are trans women, one percent are trans men, and three percent are gender-queer/nonbinary individuals.

**Figure 14: Disability Status of Appointees, 2023**



<sup>14</sup> Bureau, US Census. "American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2009-2022)." Census.Gov, 26 Jan. 2024, [www.census.gov/data/developers/data-sets/acs-5year.html](https://www.census.gov/data/developers/data-sets/acs-5year.html).

**Figure 15: Appointees with One or More Disabilities by Gender Identity, 2023**



## F. Veteran Status

Overall, approximately 2.7% of the adult population in San Francisco have served in the military<sup>15</sup>. Out of 685 who participated in the survey, 670 (98%) provided information on their veteran status<sup>16</sup>.

Of the policy board members who responded to this question, 3.7% served in the military. Figure 16 shows the breakdown of veteran status in our data. This level of representation is slightly above parity with the share of the population; however, this also represents a decrease in the level of representation described in our previous reports<sup>17</sup>.

<sup>15</sup> Bureau, US Census. "American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2009-2022)." Census.Gov, 26 Jan. 2024, [www.census.gov/data/developers/data-sets/acs-5year.html](https://www.census.gov/data/developers/data-sets/acs-5year.html).

<sup>16</sup> For the 2023 report, veteran status was reverted to its 2019 form to include only individuals who have served in the military and armed forces. This decision was driven primarily by the desire to maintain comparability across previous reports. Future reports should consider adding a second question measuring whether respondents have close family members who are in the military or have served. Such an approach would maintain comparability and collect military service prevalence among appointees.

<sup>17</sup> Compared to previous reports, it is important to note that our 2021 report included both veterans and close family members of veterans, inflating their percentage by necessity. The 3.7% in our current data is still lower than other reports that only included veterans.

**Figure 16: Policy Board Member with Military Service, 2023**





Figure 17 shows the breakdown of the adult San Francisco population and the breakdown of the veteran population by gender. Figure 18 shows the breakdown of gender identities among those who are veterans. We can see that the vast majority of veterans in the population are male, the opposite of what our data shows. Men comprise 42% and women make up 58% of the total number of veteran policy board members. No respondents with veteran status were from any other gender identity.


**Figure 17: San Francisco Adult Population with Military Service by Gender\***



*\* This graph fails to identify nonbinary individuals with military experience, as data was not collected for that population. However, this graph highlights the gender disparity amongst male and female veterans, with only 0.2% of 2.6% identifying as women.*



**Figure 18: Appointees with Military Service by Gender, 2023**




## G. Policy Bodies by Budget

This 2023 Gender Analysis Report examines the demographic representativeness of policy bodies by budget size, as a proxy for influence. This report will examine all reporting policy bodies in this section, regardless of response rate. Figure 19 shows the representation of women, people of color, and women of color in these policy bodies.

Overall, appointees from the 10 **largest** budgeted policy bodies are 63% women, 58% people of color, and 36% women of color. In contrast, appointees from the 10 **smallest** budgeted policy bodies are 57% women, 64% people of color, and 41% women of color. While women are better represented in the higher-budgeted bodies, people and women of color are more strongly represented in the lower-budgeted bodies.

**Figure 19: Percent of Women, People of Color, and Women of Color on Commissions and Boards with Largest and Smallest Budgets in 2023**



**Figure 20: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Largest Budgets, 2023**

| Policy Body                                        | FY20-21 Budget | Total Seats | Filled Seats | Response Rate | Women      | People of Color | Women of Color |
|----------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Health Commission                                  | \$2.20B        | 7           | 6            | 100%          | 83%        | 66%             | 50%            |
| Public Utilities Commission                        | \$1.65B        | 5           | 5            | 100%          | 60%        | 60%             | 40%            |
| Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors | \$1.47B        | 7           | 7            | 100%          | 71%        | 71%             | 57%            |
| Health Authority                                   | \$1.37B        | 19          | 13           | 15%           | 100%       | 100%            | 100%           |
| Airport Commission                                 | \$1.02B        | 5           | 5            | 100%          | 20%        | 60%             | 0%             |
| Commission on Investment and Infrastructure        | \$717M         | 5           | 4            | 100%          | 100%       | 80%             | 80%            |
| Homelessness Oversight Commission                  | \$672M         | 7           | 7            | 100%          | 57%        | 43%             | 30%            |
| Human Services Commission                          | \$624M         | 5           | 5            | 100%          | 40%        | 40%             | 0%             |
| Fire Commission                                    | \$499B         | 5           | 5            | 100%          | 80%        | 50%             | 25%            |
| Recreation and Park Commission                     | \$368M         | 7           | 7            | 43%           | 85%        | 43%             | 43%            |
| <b>Total</b>                                       | <b>\$10.5B</b> | <b>72</b>   | <b>64</b>    | <b>84%</b>    | <b>63%</b> | <b>58%</b>      | <b>36%</b>     |


**Figure 21: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Smallest Budgets, 2023**

| Policy Body                                                    | FY20-21 Budget | Total Seats | Filled Seats | Response Rate | Women      | People of Color | Women of Color |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Civil Service Commission                                       | \$1.51M        | 5           | 5            | 100%          | 100%       | 75%             | 66%            |
| Film Commission                                                | \$1.25M        | 11          | 11           | 82%           | 56%        | 67%             | 44%            |
| Board of Appeals                                               | \$1.20M        | 5           | 5            | 100%          | 0%         | 40%             | 0%             |
| SOMA Community Stabilization Fund Community Advisory Committee | \$1.00M        | 7           | 5            | 20%           | 0%         | 0%              | 0%             |
| Local Agency Formation Commission                              | \$550,477      | 7           | 5            | 100%          | 80%        | 80%             | 80%            |
| Youth Commission                                               | \$444,847      | 17          | 17           | 100%          | 82%        | 82%             | 76%            |
| Public Works Commission                                        | \$250,000      | 5           | 4            | 100%          | 40%        | 40%             | 0%             |
| Sanitation and Streets Commission                              | \$250,000      | 5           | 4            | 50%           | 50%        | 0%              | 0%             |
| Retiree Health Care Trust Fund Board                           | \$111,000      | 5           | 5            | 20%           | 100%       | 100%            | 100%           |
| Residential Users Appeal Board                                 | \$90,000       | 3           | 2            | 50%           | 0%         | 0%              | 0%             |
| <b>Total</b>                                                   | <b>\$6.7M</b>  | <b>70</b>   | <b>63</b>    | <b>72%</b>    | <b>57%</b> | <b>64%</b>      | <b>41%</b>     |

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

The comparison of the two policy body categories in this section provides another proxy for influence. 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 similar disclosures. Commissions have a higher percentage of people of color than Advisory Bodies but lower percentages of women, women of color, LGBTQIA+ people, and disabled people.

**Figure 22: Demographics of Appointees on Commission and Boards and Advisory Bodies, 2023**




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

This section analyzes the demographic compositions of mayoral and supervisorial-appointed policy bodies. For this analysis, mayoral boards are those boards entirely composed of mayoral appointments, and supervisorial boards are those composed entirely of supervisorial appointments. We do not have individual appointment information for boards of mixed appointments, though future reports should consider additional data collection efforts to determine individual-level appointment types. An important caveat of the following data analysis is that far more boards are comprised of mayoral appointments than supervisorial appointments. As the total number of supervisorial appointments in this analysis is low, any findings concerning the demographic composition of supervisorial appointments may be a relic of the limited number of observations. This is especially important to note because the demographic composition shown in our analysis shows supervisorial appointments as being far less diverse than in previous years, suggesting that the true nature of the data is likely more diverse than our data suggests.

Figure 23 compares the representation of women, people of color, and women of color for appointments made by the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and the population of San Francisco. Mayoral appointments are more diverse and consist of more women, people of color, and women of color compared to Supervisorial appointments. Mayoral appointments include 62% women, 56% people of color, and 34% women of color, while Supervisorial appointments are 45% women, 53% people of color, and 25% women of color. As noted above, the low diversity shown for supervisorial appointments may be due to a relatively

small amount of data. However, previous reports have indicated that this disparity may also be partly due to the appointment selection 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”). In contrast, the Mayor typically can take total appointments into account during selections and can, therefore, better address gaps in diversity.

**Figure 23: Demographics of Mayoral, Supervisorial, and Total Appointees, 2023**



### III. 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 have jurisdiction limited to the City. The 2023 Gender Analysis Report reflects data from the policy bodies that provided information to the Department on the Status of Women through digital or paper survey<sup>18</sup>. Following initial email outreach, policy bodies were contacted three to five times via email and phone. All possible measures were taken to obtain accurate and complete data.

Participation rates for this report exceeded our 2021 report, with the highest participation of Commission and Boards and Advisory Bodies to date. We requested data from 130 policy bodies and received responses from 99, covering 685 policy board members. Comparatively, the 2021 Gender Analysis Report received data from 92 policy bodies and 349 policy body members.

Data elements such as a Commissioner or Board member's gender identity, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability status, and veteran status were collected on a *voluntary* basis. As a result, some responses were incomplete or unavailable but were included to the extent possible.

<sup>18</sup> Our previous 2021 report used an all-online participation format that significantly decreased participation, due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Given the primary objective of this report, surfacing patterns of underrepresentation, every attempt has been made to reflect accurate and complete information. Data for some policy bodies was incomplete, and all appointees who responded were included in the total demographic categories.

To ensure that low response rates did not distort our analysis, we established response rate thresholds in examinations of policy boards with the highest or lowest representation of specific groups. 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. This should be kept in mind when interpreting these percentages and any changes over time.

While this report's survey had a higher level of participation than our 2021 report, missing data is still the biggest limitation. Given this limitation, ensuring participation from all policy bodies could significantly improve or further efforts to address underrepresentation. Some methods of guaranteeing participation include surveying all appointees during their initial onboarding training with the City, as well as relying on more paper/in-person survey outreach for future reports.

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>19</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 to the Ethics Commission. 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 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates provides a comparison to the San Francisco population. Figure 25 in the Appendix displays these population estimates by race/ethnicity and gender.

---

<sup>19</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).

## IV. Conclusion

---

Since the first Gender Analysis of Commissions and Boards in 2009, the representation of women appointees on San Francisco policy bodies has gradually increased. The 2023 Gender Analysis Report finds that the percentage of women appointees is 55%, which is above parity with the population of women in San Francisco.

When appointee demographics are analyzed by gender and race, the representation of women of color is 32%, which mirrors the data in our 2021 report and roughly matches the San Francisco population. Most notably underrepresented are individuals identifying as Asian, making up 31% of the San Francisco population but only 20% of appointees. Similarly, Latinx-identifying individuals, who make up 14% of the population, are only eight percent of appointees. Additionally, men of color are underrepresented at 23% of appointees relative to their San Francisco population of 33%.

Furthermore, when analyzing the demographic composition of larger and smaller budgeted Commissions and Boards, women of color are roughly at parity on Commissions and Boards with both the largest and smallest budgets. Women comprise 63% of total appointees on the largest budgeted policy bodies compared to their population of 48%, and women of color comprise 36% of total appointees on the largest budgeted policy bodies, with the San Francisco population at 33%. Comparatively, women are 57% of total appointees on the smallest budgeted policy bodies, and women of color are 41% of appointees. However, the representation of people of color is seven percentage points higher on smaller budgeted policy bodies than on larger budgeted policy bodies. People of color make up 58% of appointees on the largest budgeted policy bodies and 64% of appointees on the smallest budgeted policy bodies. The San Francisco population of people of color exceeds these percentages at 66%.

In addition to using budget size as a proxy for influence, this report analyzed the 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. Women, women of color, people of color, LGBTQIA+ populations, and veterans are evenly represented across both Commissions and Boards and Advisory Bodies. Individuals with disabilities, however, have more robust representation within Advisory Bodies than Commissions and Boards. Women comprise a slightly higher percentage of Advisory Bodies appointees than Commissions and Boards.

The 2023 Gender Analysis Report found satisfactory representation of LGBTQIA+ individuals on San Francisco policy bodies. Of the appointees who provided LGBTQIA+ identity information, 24% identified as LGBTQIA+, with the largest subset identifying as gay or lesbian (16%). Eight percent of appointees from the largest budgeted policy bodies identify as LGBTQIA+, and three percent from the smallest budgeted bodies. There was also a similar representation of LGBTQIA+ appointees between Commissions and Boards (26%) and Advisory Bodies (27%).

The representation of appointees with disabilities in Commissions and Boards is 18%, more than double the representation in Advisory Bodies (8%). Veterans are adequately represented on San Francisco policy bodies at 3.7%, compared to the veteran population of 2.7%, and are evenly represented between Commissions and Boards and Advisory Bodies.

This report is intended to advise the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and other appointing authorities as they select appointments to the City and County of San Francisco policy bodies. In the spirit of the 2008 City Charter Amendment, which 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 to accurately reflect the population of San Francisco.

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, particularly former Department Intern Liliana Pacheco for the data collection and analysis of this report.

## Appendix I

**Figure 24: Policy Body Demographics, 2023**

| Policy Body                                                         | Total Seats | Filled Seats | FY22-23 Budget  | Women | Women of Color | People of Color | Survey Response Rate |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|-------|----------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Access Appeals Commission                                           | 5           | 5            | -               | 0%    | 0%             | 0%              | 60%                  |
| African American Reparations Advisory Committee                     | 15          | 15           | -               | 83%   | 67%            | 83%             | 40%                  |
| Airport Commission                                                  | 5           | 5            | \$1,017,000,000 | 20%   | 0%             | 60%             | 100%                 |
| Arts Commission                                                     | 15          | 15           | \$42,741,948    | 60%   | 43%            | 64%             | 100%                 |
| Asian Art Commission                                                | 27          | 22           | -               | 42%   | 25%            | 50%             | 55%                  |
| Assessment Appeals Board                                            | 24          | 16           | -               | 33%   | 7%             | 43%             | 100%                 |
| Bayview Hunters Point Citizens Advisory Committee                   | 12          | 7            | -               | 25%   | 25%            | 100%            | 57%                  |
| Behavioral Health Commission                                        | 17          | 10           | -               | 60%   | 60%            | 100%            | 50%                  |
| Board of Appeals                                                    | 5           | 5            | \$1,195,116     | 0%    | 0%             | 40%             | 100%                 |
| Board of Examiners                                                  | 13          | 10           | -               | 0%    | 0%             | 44%             | 100%                 |
| Board of Supervisors                                                | 11          | 11           | \$23,600,000    | 36%   | 18%            | 36%             | 100%                 |
| Building Inspection Commission                                      | 7           | 6            | \$92,844,927    | 57%   | 29%            | 43%             | 117%                 |
| Cannabis Oversight Committee                                        | 9           | 7            | -               | 14%   | 14%            | 71%             | 100%                 |
| Capital Planning Committee                                          | 11          | 11           | \$159,000,000   | 33%   | 11%            | 22%             | 82%                  |
| Children and Families First Commission                              | 9           | 8            | \$27,305,805    | 88%   | 57%            | 71%             | 100%                 |
| Children, Youth and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee | 11          | 6            | \$333,011,845   | 75%   | 63%            | 88%             | 133%                 |
| Citizen Committee on Community Development                          | 9           | 5            | \$36,000,000    | 40%   | 40%            | 80%             | 100%                 |
| Citizens General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee                | 9           | 6            | -               | 40%   | 0%             | 40%             | 100%                 |
| Civil Service Commission                                            | 5           | 5            | \$1,511,609     | 80%   | 50%            | 75%             | 100%                 |
| Code Advisory Committee                                             | 17          | 17           | -               | 0%    | 0%             | 25%             | 47%                  |
| Commission of Animal Control and Welfare                            | 7           | 7            | -               | 57%   | 0%             | 14%             | 100%                 |
| Commission on Investment and Infrastructure                         | 5           | 4            | \$717,300,000   | 100%  | 80%            | 80%             | 125%                 |
| Commission on the Environment                                       | 7           | 7            | \$35,349,283    | 43%   | 43%            | 71%             | 100%                 |



**Figure 24: Policy Body Demographics, 2023, Continued**

| Policy Body                                                | Total Seats | Filled Seats | FY22-23 Budget  | Women | Women of Color | People of Color | Survey Response Rate |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|-------|----------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Commission on the Status of Women                          | 7           | 6            | \$14,434,165    | 100%  | 80%            | 83%             | 100%                 |
| Committee on City Workforce Alignment                      | 17          | 17           | -               | 60%   | 60%            | 91%             | 65%                  |
| Committee on Information Technology                        | 18          | 16           | \$27,000,000    | 56%   | 22%            | 44%             | 56%                  |
| Community Corrections Partnership                          | 13          | 12           | -               | 20%   | 20%            | 60%             | 42%                  |
| Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee              | 11          | 11           | -               | 89%   | 22%            | 33%             | 82%                  |
| Disability and Aging Commission                            | 8           | 8            | \$365,000,000   | 75%   | 38%            | 63%             | 100%                 |
| Early Childhood Community Oversight and Advisory Committee | 9           | 9            | \$27,305,805    | 100%  | 71%            | 71%             | 89%                  |
| Eastern Neighborhoods Community Advisory Committee         | 11          | 8            | -               | 50%   | 50%            | 63%             | 100%                 |
| Elections Commission                                       | 7           | 7            | \$24,000,000    | 86%   | 29%            | 29%             | 100%                 |
| Entertainment Commission                                   | 7           | 7            | -               | 50%   | 33%            | 67%             | 100%                 |
| Ethics Commission                                          | 5           | 4            | \$7,586,853     | 67%   | 67%            | 100%            | 100%                 |
| Family Violence Council                                    | 28          | 28           | -               | 77%   | 31%            | 38%             | 46%                  |
| Film Commission                                            | 11          | 11           | \$1,250,000     | 63%   | 50%            | 75%             | 82%                  |
| Fine Arts Museums Board of Trustees                        | 62          | 8            | -               | 38%   | 13%            | 13%             | 100%                 |
| Fire Commission                                            | 5           | 5            | \$498,585,516   | 80%   | 25%            | 50%             | 100%                 |
| Food Security Task Force                                   | 20          | 18           | -               | 80%   | 38%            | 63%             | 56%                  |
| Free City College Oversight Committee                      | 15          | 13           | -               | 63%   | 43%            | 57%             | 62%                  |
| Health Authority                                           | 19          | 13           | \$1,373,782,524 | 100%  | 100%           | 100%            | 15%                  |
| Health Commission                                          | 7           | 6            | \$2,200,000,000 | 83%   | 33%            | 67%             | 100%                 |
| Health Service Board                                       | 7           | 7            | \$14,200,000    | 33%   | 20%            | 40%             | 100%                 |
| Homelessness Oversight Commission                          | 7           | 7            | \$672,000,000   | 57%   | 14%            | 43%             | 100%                 |
| Housing Conservatorship Working Group                      | 12          | 8            | -               | 75%   | 0%             | 25%             | 50%                  |
| Housing Stability Fund Oversight Board                     | 11          | 9            | -               | 0%    | 0%             | 100%            | 11%                  |
| Human Rights Commission                                    | 11          | 10           | \$15,120,673    | 40%   | 40%            | 70%             | 100%                 |
| Human Services Commission                                  | 5           | 5            | \$624,500,000   | 40%   | 0%             | 40%             | 100%                 |
| Immigrant Rights Commission                                | 15          | 15           | -               | 60%   | 50%            | 93%             | 100%                 |
| Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council                      | 20          | 18           | -               | 80%   | 33%            | 47%             | 83%                  |

**Figure 24: Policy Body Demographics, 2023, Continued**

| Policy Body                                                                                                   | Total Seats | Filled Seats | FY22-23 Budget  | Women | Women of Color | People of Color | Survey Response Rate |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|-------|----------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Juvenile Probation Commission                                                                                 | 7           | 7            | -               | 57%   | 14%            | 57%             | 100%                 |
| Local Agency Formation Commission                                                                             | 7           | 5            | \$550,477       | 80%   | 80%            | 80%             | 100%                 |
| Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee                                                               | 9           | 7            | -               | 33%   | 17%            | 33%             | 86%                  |
| Mayor's Disability Council                                                                                    | 11          | 5            | -               | 100%  | 0%             | 0%              | 40%                  |
| Mental Health SF Implementation Working Group                                                                 | 13          | 9            | -               | 86%   | 43%            | 43%             | 78%                  |
| Mission Bay Citizen's Advisory Committee                                                                      | 13          | 7            | -               | 80%   | 40%            | 40%             | 71%                  |
| Municipal Green Building Task Force                                                                           | 20          | 20           | -               | 63%   | 38%            | 50%             | 40%                  |
| Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors                                                            | 7           | 7            | \$1,472,363,382 | 71%   | 57%            | 71%             | 100%                 |
| Municipal Transportation Agency Citizens Advisory Council                                                     | 15          | 14           | -               | 42%   | 17%            | 50%             | 86%                  |
| Our City, Our Home Oversight Committee                                                                        | 9           | 7            | -               | 80%   | 40%            | 40%             | 71%                  |
| Oversight Board (to the Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco) | 7           | 6            | -               | 80%   | 50%            | 50%             | 83%                  |
| Paratransit Coordinating Council Executive Committee                                                          | 38          | 21           | -               | 75%   | 50%            | 75%             | 19%                  |
| Park, Recreation, And Open Space Advisory Committee                                                           | 24          | 17           | -               | 58%   | 42%            | 58%             | 71%                  |
| Planning Commission                                                                                           | 7           | 7            | \$60,000,000    | 50%   | 50%            | 100%            | 29%                  |
| Police Commission                                                                                             | 7           | 7            | -               | 29%   | 14%            | 71%             | 100%                 |
| Port Commission                                                                                               | 7           | 7            | \$193,700,000   | 83%   | 33%            | 33%             | 86%                  |
| Public Utilities Commission                                                                                   | 5           | 5            | \$1,651,537,786 | 60%   | 40%            | 60%             | 100%                 |
| Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board                                                                          | 7           | 4            | -               | 67%   | 33%            | 33%             | 125%                 |
| Public Utilities Revenue Bond Oversight Committee                                                             | 7           | 5            | -               | 50%   | 50%            | 50%             | 100%                 |
| Public Works Commission                                                                                       | 5           | 4            | \$250,000       | 40%   | 0%             | 40%             | 125%                 |
| Recreation and Park Commission                                                                                | 7           | 7            | \$367,800,000   | 86%   | 43%            | 43%             | 100%                 |
| Reentry Council                                                                                               | 25          | 22           | -               | 55%   | 36%            | 64%             | 100%                 |
| Refuse Rate Board                                                                                             | 3           | 2            | -               | 50%   | 50%            | 100%            | 100%                 |
| Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board                                                          | 10          | 10           | \$16,294,283    | 50%   | 17%            | 50%             | 60%                  |
| Residential Users Appeal Board                                                                                | 3           | 2            | \$900           | 0%    | 0%             | 0%              | 50%                  |
| Retiree Health Care Trust Fund Board                                                                          | 5           | 5            | \$110,000       | 100%  | 100%           | 100%            | 20%                  |

**Figure 24: Policy Body Demographics, 2023, Continued**

| Policy Body                                                    | Total Seats | Filled Seats | FY22-23 Budget | Women | Women of Color | People of Color | Survey Response Rate |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|----------------|-------|----------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Retirement Board                                               | 7           | 7            | -              | 29%   | 29%            | 57%             | 100%                 |
| San Francisco Reinvestment Working Group                       | 9           | 9            | -              | 25%   | 0%             | 75%             | 44%                  |
| Sanitation and Streets Commission                              | 5           | 4            | \$250,000      | 50%   | 0%             | 0%              | 50%                  |
| Sentencing Commission                                          | 13          | 13           | -              | 46%   | 15%            | 62%             | 100%                 |
| Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee                           | 15          | 9            | -              | 57%   | 14%            | 29%             | 78%                  |
| Shelter Monitoring Committee                                   | 12          | 8            | -              | 75%   | 71%            | 86%             | 100%                 |
| Sheriff's Department Oversight Board                           | 7           | 7            | -              | 43%   | 43%            | 86%             | 100%                 |
| Small Business Commission                                      | 7           | 5            | -              | 75%   | 50%            | 75%             | 80%                  |
| SOMA Community Stabilization Fund Community Advisory Committee | 7           | 5            | \$1,000,000    | 0%    | 0%             | 0%              | 20%                  |
| South of Market Community Planning Advisory Committee          | 11          | 7            | -              | 20%   | 0%             | 20%             | 71%                  |
| State Legislation Committee                                    | 7           | 7            | -              | 40%   | 25%            | 50%             | 71%                  |
| Street Artists and Craftsmen Examiners Advisory Committee      | 5           | 5            | -              | 100%  | 50%            | 50%             | 40%                  |
| Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee               | 16          | 16           | -              | 71%   | 57%            | 86%             | 44%                  |
| Sunshine Ordinance Task Force                                  | 11          | 9            | -              | 33%   | 22%            | 44%             | 100%                 |
| Sweatfree Procurement Advisory Group                           | 11          | 6            | -              | 50%   | 25%            | 25%             | 67%                  |
| Treasure Island Development Authority Board of Directors       | 7           | 7            | \$31,333,345   | 33%   | 0%             | 0%              | 43%                  |
| Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island Citizens Advisory Board     | 25          | 9            | -              | 50%   | 0%             | 0%              | 44%                  |
| Urban Forestry Council                                         | 15          | 11           | -              | 18%   | 0%             | 18%             | 100%                 |
| Veterans Affairs Commission                                    | 13          | 11           | -              | 100%  | 0%             | 0%              | 9%                   |
| War Memorial Board of Trustees                                 | 11          | 11           | \$19,236,764   | 50%   | 30%            | 30%             | 91%                  |
| Workforce Investment Board                                     | 28          | 27           | \$4,250,713    | 57%   | 21%            | 43%             | 52%                  |
| Youth Commission                                               | 17          | 17           | \$444,847      | 82%   | 76%            | 82%             | 100%                 |

**Figure 25: San Francisco Population Estimates by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 2022\***

| Race/Ethnicity                       | Total    |         | Male     |         | Female   |         |
|--------------------------------------|----------|---------|----------|---------|----------|---------|
|                                      | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent | Estimate | Percent |
| San Francisco County, California     | 851,036  | -       | 412,924  | 49%     | 438,093  | 51%     |
| White, non-Hispanic or Latino        | 325,900  | 34%     | 179,461  | 19%     | 146,439  | 15%     |
| Asian                                | 296,122  | 31%     | 139,015  | 15%     | 157,107  | 17%     |
| Hispanic or Latinx                   | 131,517  | 14%     | 69,384   | 7%      | 62,133   | 7%      |
| Some Other Race                      | 65,487   | 7%      | 34,703   | 4%      | 30,784   | 3%      |
| Black or African American            | 44,058   | 5%      | 24,026   | 3%      | 20,032   | 2%      |
| Two or More Races                    | 80,858   | 8%      | 41,270   | 4%      | 39,588   | 4%      |
| Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander | 3,312    | 0.5%    | 1,763    | 0.2%    | 1,549    | 0.2%    |
| Native American and Alaska Native    | 4,725    | 0.5%    | 2,781    | 0.3%    | 1,944    | 0.2%    |

*San Francisco Population estimates come from the 2022 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, chart B01001. The racial estimates use Census subpopulation charts. Please note that the subpopulations added together are larger than the estimated population size. This is primarily due to potential double counts for ethnicities and races (the only category that does not include overlap is the White population, which is specifically White non-Hispanics).*

### Survey Questions

1. "What is your gender identity?" and could select from the following:
  - Male
  - Female
  - Trans Male
  - Trans Female
  - Gender Queer/ Non-Binary
  - Other (no respondents selected other)
  - Prefer not to say
2. "What is your race/ethnicity?" and could select one of the following options<sup>20</sup>:
  - Asian (alone)
  - Black/African American (alone)
  - Latinx/Hispanic
  - Native American/American Indian or Alaska Native (alone)
  - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (alone)
  - Other (alone)
  - White/ Caucasian (alone)
  - Two or More Races
  - Prefer not to say
3. "What is your sexual orientation?"
  - Bisexual
  - Gay/ Lesbian/ Same-Gender Loving
  - Questioning/ Unsure
  - Straight/Heterosexual
  - Other
  - Prefer not to say
4. "Do you have one or more disabilities?"
  - Yes
  - No
  - Prefer not to say
5. "Have you ever served in the military of any country?"
  - Yes
  - No
  - Prefer not to say

---

<sup>20</sup> Note that respondents were instructed to select either Latinx/Hispanic or a racial category and to choose the category that best fits their identity. This eliminates any double counting issues, and in this analysis, we considered those who responded as White as White, not Latinx/Hispanic.



City and County of San Francisco  
**Department on the Status of Women**



London N. Breed  
Mayor

## Acknowledgments

---

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

This report was prepared by:

Dr. Kevin Roach, Research, Data and Evaluation Analyst, Department on the Status of Women

Dr. Alfredo Huante, Research, Data and Evaluation Analyst, Department on the Status of Women

Liliana Pacheco, Public Service Trainee, Department on the Status of Women

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

President Dr. Shokooh Miry

Vice President Sophia Andary

Commissioner Sharon Chung

Commissioner Dr. Anne Moses

Commissioner Dr. Raveena Rihal

Commissioner Ani Rivera

Commissioner Diane Jones-Lowrey

Kimberly Ellis, 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>.

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](https://sfgov.org/dosw)  
[dosw@sfgov.org](mailto:dosw@sfgov.org)  
415.252.2570