

File No. 260766

Committee Item No. 7

Board Item No. 49

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Rules Committee

Date July 13, 2026

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date July 21, 2026

Cmte Board

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

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	

Completed by: Victor Young Date July 9, 2026

Completed by: _____ Date _____

1 [Mayoral Appointment, Port Commission – Vanessa Hartigan]

2
3 **Motion approving the Mayor’s nomination for appointment of Vanessa Hartigan to the**
4 **Port Commission, term ending May 1, 2030.**

5
6 MOVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco does
7 hereby approve the nomination for appointment by Mayor Daniel Lurie of the following
8 designated person to serve as a member of the San Francisco Port Commission, pursuant to
9 Charter, Section 4.114, for the term specified:

10 Vanessa Hartigan, seat 5, succeeding Gail Gilman, must be appointed by the Mayor
11 and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors, for the unexpired portion of a four-year term
12 ending May 1, 2030.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



DANIEL LURIE
MAYOR

Notice of Nomination

June 30, 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 §4.114, of the City and County of San Francisco, I, of the City and County of San Francisco make the following nominations:

Willie Adams (seat 2), Richard Lee (replacing Steven Lee (seat 1)– term expired), and Vanessa Hartigan (replacing Gail Gilman (seat 5)– term expired), to the Port Commission for a four-year term ending May 1, 2030.

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

Should you have any questions about these nominations, 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

Vanessa Tapia Hartigan | Founder, CEO & Board Director

Vanessa Tapia Hartigan is a San Francisco-based executive and civic leader with a career built at the intersection of institutional finance, technology, and governance. A Stanford "Triple Cardinal" and 2023 recipient of the Stanford Associates Governors' Award, honoring exemplary volunteer service to the university over an extended period, she brings over 30 years of experience across investment banking, capital markets, and venture-scale operations.

Vanessa began her career at Goldman Sachs in Investment Banking, covering Global Consumer and Latin American markets, before moving to Bank of America Merrill Lynch where she served as Director under the Head of the Western Region, covering the firm's top institutional clients across \$10 trillion in AUM while taking on operational and compliance leadership for the division. She later served as CFO of BlueX Trade, a FreightTech platform operating across the U.S. and Taiwan, where she built the financial infrastructure for a global digital marketplace. She is currently Co-Founder and CEO of MUSE, focused on designing business and economic models where financial return and community impact are mutually reinforcing.

Her governance work is where finance and civic commitment converge. Vanessa serves as Trustee, Co-Head of the Finance Committee, and Treasurer of the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy, the nonprofit stewardship partner of the National Park Service responsible for Alcatraz, the Presidio, Muir Woods, and Crissy Field. She is also a Foundation Board Member of the National Society of High School Scholars Foundation and a Board Member of the Stanford Latino Alumni Association. This fall, she will begin her term as a member of the Stanford Associates Board of Governors — the governing body that oversees Stanford's alumni volunteer awards program and directs grants to campus organizations deepening alumni engagement.

Vanessa is bilingual in English and Spanish, with firsthand experience working across Latin America and Taiwan. She is deeply rooted in San Francisco, having lived in the city for over 23 years, with her husband and son.

Education — Stanford University: BA, International Relations · MA, Developmental Economics, Food Research Institute · MBA, Graduate School of Business

STATEMENT OF ECONOMIC INTERESTS
COVER PAGE
A PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Date Initial Filing Received
Filing Official Use Only

Please type or print in ink.

NAME OF FILER (LAST)	(FIRST)	(MIDDLE)
Hartigan	Vanessa	Tapia

1. Office, Agency, or Court

Agency Name (Do not use acronyms)

City and County of San Francisco

Division, Board, Department, District, if applicable

Port Commission

Your Position

Commissioner

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

Agency: N/A 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 San Francisco

☐ Other

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

☐ **Annual:** The period covered is January 1, 2025, through December 31, 2025.

☐ **Leaving Office:** Date Left ____/____/_____
(Check one circle below.)

-or-

The period covered is ____/____/_____, through December 31, 2025.

☐ 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: _____

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 (Business or Agency Address Recommended - Public Document)	STREET	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
Pier 1, The Embarcadero		San Francisco	CA	94111
DAYTIME TELEPHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS			
(415) 274-0400	webmaster@sfport.com			

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 April 29, 2026
(month, day, year)

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

SCHEDULE A-1

Investments Stocks, Bonds, and Other Interests (Ownership Interest is Less Than 10%) Do not attach brokerage or financial statements.

CALIFORNIA FORM

FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

700

Name

Vanessa Hartigan

<BLUE> is a required field

** Added - may need to delete

** Added - may need to delete
Last Twelve Months?

NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY	GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS ACTIVITY	Account/How Held	FAIR MARKET VALUE (Select from drop down list)	NATURE OF INVESTMENT (Select from drop down list. If "Other" describe)	Income Received	IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE (mm/dd/yyyy)	
						ACQUIRED	DISPOSED
Apple Inc.	Consumer Electronics	Personal IRA	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Analog Devices Inc.	Semiconductors	Personal IRA	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Alnylam Pharmaceutical Inc.	Biotechnology (RNAi)	Personal IRA	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499	3/26/26	
Amazon.com Inc.	E-Commerce / Cloud Computing	Personal IRA	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Broadcom, Inc.	Semiconductors	Personal IRA	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Chubb Limited	Property & Casualty Insurance	Personal IRA	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Costco Wholesale Corp	Discount Retail	Personal IRA	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499	1/8/26	
CrowdStrike Holdings Inc.	Cybersecurity	Personal IRA	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Datadog Inc.	Cloud Monitoring / Observability	Personal IRA	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Deere & Co.	Agricultural Machinery	Personal IRA	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Alphabet, Inc.	Internet / Digital Advertising	Personal IRA	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Grail, Inc.	Genomics / Early Cancer Detection	Personal IRA	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499	11/20/25	
Illumina, Inc.	Genomic Sequencing	Personal IRA	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Intuitive Surgical Inc.	Robotic Surgical Systems	Personal IRA	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
MercadoLibre Inc.	E-Commerce / Fintech (LatAm)	Personal IRA	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499	1/8/26	
Mettler Toledo International, Inc.	Precision Instruments	Personal IRA	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499	3/4/26	
Cloudflare Inc.	Network Security / CDN	Personal IRA	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499	3/19/26	
Netflix Inc.	Streaming Entertainment	Personal IRA	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Nvidia Corp	Semiconductors / AI Computing	Personal IRA	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
On Semiconductor Corp	Power & Analog Semiconductors	Personal IRA	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Beigene Medicines Ltd	Gene Therapy / Rare Disease	Personal IRA	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499	11/14/25	
Regeneron Pharmaceuticals	Biopharmaceuticals	Personal IRA	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Repligen Corp	Bioprocessing Equipment	Personal IRA	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499	1/8/26	
Ross Stores	Off-Price Retail	Personal IRA	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Synopsys Inc	EDA / Semiconductor IP	Personal IRA	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Spotify Technology	Audio Streaming	Personal IRA	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499	1/8/26	
Symbolic Inc.	Warehouse Automation / Robotics	Personal IRA	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Telsa Inc	Electric Vehicles / Energy	Personal IRA	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499	8/7/25	
Uber Technologies Inc.	Ride-Sharing / Mobility Tech	Personal IRA	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499	3/20/26	
Veeva Systems Inc.	Life Sciences Cloud Software	Personal IRA	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499	1/8/26	
Apple Inc.	Consumer Electronics	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$500 or More		
Advanced Micro Devices	Semiconductors / AI Computing	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Amgen Inc.	Biopharmaceuticals	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$500 or More		
Amazon.com Inc.	E-Commerce / Cloud Computing	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Aptiv PLC	Automotive Electrical Systems	In Trust	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Arm Holdings PLC	Semiconductor IP / CPU Architecture	In Trust	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
ASML Holding NV	Semiconductor Lithography Equipment	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$500 or More		
Broadcom, Inc.	Semiconductors	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$500 or More		
Biotech SE	mRNA Biotechnology	In Trust	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Berkshire Hathaway Inc.	Diversified Holding Company	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Caterpillar Inc.	Construction & Mining Equipment	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$500 or More		
Cadence Design Systems	EDA / Semiconductor IP	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Costco Wholesale Corp	Discount Retail	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$500 or More		
Crispr Therapeutics	Gene Editing / Biotechnology	In Trust	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Fortinet Inc.	Cybersecurity	In Trust	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
GE Vernova Inc.	Power & Energy Infrastructure	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499	6/5/25	
Guardant Health Inc.	Liquid Biopsy / Oncology Diagnostics	In Trust	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499	2/20/26	
Alphabet, Inc.	Internet / Digital Advertising	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$500 or More		

SCHEDULE A-1

Investments Stocks, Bonds, and Other Interests (Ownership Interest is Less Than 10%) Do not attach brokerage or financial statements.

CALIFORNIA FORM

FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

700

Name

Vanessa Hartigan

<BLUE> is a required field

** Added - may need to delete

** Added - may need to delete Last Twelve Months?

NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY	GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS ACTIVITY	Account/How Held	FAIR MARKET VALUE (Select from drop down list)	NATURE OF INVESTMENT (Select from drop down list. If "Other" describe)	Income Received	IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE (mm/dd/yyyy)	
						ACQUIRED	DISPOSED
Grail, Inc.	Genomics / Early Cancer Detection	In Trust	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Samsara Inc.	Fleet & Industrial IoT	In Trust	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Intuitive Surgical Inc.	Robotic Surgical Systems	In Trust	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Illinois Tool Works Inc.	Diversified Industrial Manufacturing	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$500 or More		
Eli Lilly & Co.	Biopharmaceuticals	In Trust	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$500 or More	5/1/25	
Lowes Companies Inc.	Home Improvement Retail	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$500 or More		
Moodys Corp	Credit Ratings / Financial Analytics	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$500 or More		
Mongodb Inc.	Cloud Database	In Trust	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
MercadoLibre Inc.	E-Commerce / Fintech (LatAm)	In Trust	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Microsoft Corp.	Cloud Computing / Enterprise Software	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$500 or More		
Micron Technologies Inc.	Memory Semiconductors (DRAM/NAND)	In Trust	Over \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$500 or More	4/21/25	
Cloudflare Inc.	Network Security / CDN	In Trust	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Netflix Inc.	Streaming Entertainment	In Trust	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499	2/1/26	
Nvidia Corp	Semiconductors / AI Computing	In Trust	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Beigene Medicines Ltd	Gene Therapy / Rare Disease	In Trust	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Rubrik Inc.	Cloud Data Security	In Trust	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499	8/6/25	
Rockwell Automation Inc.	Industrial Automation	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$500 or More	8/8/25	
Sherwin-Williams Co.	Paints & Coatings	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$500 or More		
Snowflake Inc.	Cloud Data Warehousing	In Trust	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Sofi Technologies Inc.	Digital Banking / Fintech	In Trust	Over \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
TJX Companies	Off-Price Retail	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$500 or More		
Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc.	Life Sciences Tools & Equipment	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$500 or More		
Travelers Companies Inc.	Property & Casualty Insurance	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$500 or More		
Tesla Inc.	Electric Vehicles / Energy	In Trust	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing	Semiconductor Foundry	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$500 or More	5/7/25	
Texas Instruments Inc.	Analog & Embedded Semiconductors	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$500 or More		
Union Pac Corp	Freight Rail	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$500 or More		
Versigent Ltd	Life Sciences / Biotech (Private)	In Trust	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Vertiv Holdings Co	Data Center Power & Thermal Mgmt	In Trust	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499	3/2/26	
Vertex Pharmaceuticals Inc.	Biopharmaceuticals / Rare Disease	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499	9/10/25	
Genex Holdings Corp	Genomic Diagnostics	In Trust	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499	6/4/25	
Walmart Inc.	Mass Merchandise Retail	In Trust	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000	Stock	Income Received of \$500 or More		
Zscaler Inc.	Cloud Security / Zero Trust	In Trust	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499	3/19/26	
Broadcom, Inc.	Semiconductors	Husband's IRA	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Alphabet, Inc.	Internet / Digital Advertising	Husband's IRA	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Amazon.com Inc.	E-Commerce / Cloud Computing	Husband's IRA	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Nvidia Corp	Semiconductors / AI Computing	Husband's IRA	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Tesla Inc.	Electric Vehicles / Energy	Husband's IRA	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Ross Stores	Off-Price Retail	Husband's IRA	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499		
Netflix Inc.	Streaming Entertainment	Husband's IRA	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499	2/2/06	
Analog Devices Inc.	Semiconductors	Husband's IRA	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499	3/24/26	
Spotify Technology	Audio Streaming	Husband's IRA	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock	Income Received of \$0-\$499	1/8/26	

Investments
 Stocks, Bonds, and Other Interests
 (Ownership Interest is Less Than 10%)
Do not attach brokerage or financial statements.

FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Name
Vanessa Hartigan

** Added - may need to delete

** Added - may need to delete Last Twelve Months?

[illegible]

SCHEDULE A-2

Investments, Income, and Assets of Business Entities/Trusts (Ownership Interest is 10% or Greater)

<BLUE> is a required field

* Select from drop down list

CALIFORNIA FORM

700

FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Name

Vanessa Hartigan

1. Business Entity or Trust (For reporting a trust, enter the name then skip to box 2.)							2. Gross Income Received	3. Sources of Income of \$10,000 or more	4. Investments or Interests in Real Property Held by the Business Entity or Trust (Use a separate line for each investment or real property interest.)					
NAME AND ADDRESS OF BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST (Business Address Acceptable) (If Trust, go to 2)	GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF BUSINESS ACTIVITY	FAIR MARKET VALUE*	LIST DATE ACQUIRED OR DISPOSED (mm/dd/yyyy)	A or D	NATURE OF INVESTMENT (if "other," describe)*	YOUR BUSINESS POSITION	INCLUDE YOUR PRO RATA SHARE OF GROSS INCOME TO ENTITY/TRUST*	LIST SINGLE SOURCES OF INCOME OF \$10,000 OR MORE	INVESTMENT-BUSINESS ENTITY/NAME, AND BUSINESS ACTIVITY	REAL PROPERTY-LIST PRECISE LOCATION OF REAL PROPERTY	FAIR MARKET VALUE*	LIST DATE ACQUIRED OR DISPOSED (mm/dd/yyyy)	A or D	NATURE OF INTEREST (if "other," describe)*
Hartigan Family Living Trust - 36 Elizabeth Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	Revocable living trust — personal estate planning vehicle	Over \$1,000,000			Beneficial interest as trustee/grantor	Trustee/Beneficiary	\$0-\$499		Marketplace Fund 1, Marketplace Fund 2, Conventus Advisor Shares	Primary Residence: 36 Elizabeth Street, SF, CA 94110				
Mutual Society, Inc. - 36 Elizabeth Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	Consulting business	\$10,001 - \$100,000			Shareholder	Board Member	\$0-\$499							
Trusted Ventures LLC - 36 Elizabeth Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	Consulting business	\$10,001 - \$100,000			Community Property Interest	50% Community Property Interest in Spouse's LLC	Over \$100,000							
Era3 LLC - 36 Elizabeth Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	Venture Fund Mangement Company	\$10,001 - \$100,000			Community Property Interest	50% Community Property Interest in Spouse's LLC	\$10,001-\$100,000							
Marketplace Fund 1 LP - 36 Elizabeth Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	Venture capital fund	\$100,001 - \$1,000,000			Community Property Interest in GP/LP interest	Spouse is GP / Managing Member - 50% Community Property Interest	\$0-\$499		Conventus Holding Corp- Lending & Asset Management		\$100,001 - \$1,000,000			Indirect interest via fund, less than 10% fund ownership
Marketplace Fund 2 LP - 36 Elizabeth Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	Venture capital fund	\$10,001 - \$100,000			Community Property Interest in GP/LP interest	Spouse is GP / Managing Member - 50% Community Property Interest	\$0-\$499		Conventus Holding Corp- Lending & Asset Management		\$10,001 - \$100,000			Indirect interest via fund, less than 10% fund ownership
									Bioz - AI-driven search engine and data analytics platform designed for life science research		\$2,000 - \$10,000			Indirect interest via fund, less than 10% fund ownership
Hamony 501©(3) - 36 Elizabeth Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	Philanthropy - Liberia & Ghana	\$0 - \$1,999			None — nonprofit	Dependent child's organization	\$0-\$499							

SCHEDULE A-2
Investments, Income, and Assets
of Business Entities/Trusts
(Ownership Interest is 10% or Greater)

CALIFORNIA FORM

700

FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Name

Vanessa Hartigan

<BLUE> is a required field

* Select from drop down list

1. Business Entity or Trust (For reporting a trust, enter the name then skip to box 2.)							2. Gross Income Received	3. Sources of Income of \$10,000 or more	4. Investments or Interests in Real Property Held by the Business Entity or Trust (Use a separate line for each investment or real property interest.)					
NAME AND ADDRESS OF BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST (Business Address Acceptable) (If Trust, go to 2)	GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF BUSINESS ACTIVITY	FAIR MARKET VALUE*	LIST DATE ACQUIRED OR DISPOSED (mm/dd/yyyy)	A or D	NATURE OF INVESTMENT (if "other," describe)*	YOUR BUSINESS POSITION	INCLUDE YOUR PRO RATA SHARE OF GROSS INCOME TO ENTITY/TRUST*	LIST SINGLE SOURCES OF INCOME OF \$10,000 OR MORE	INVESTMENT-BUSINESS ENTITY/NAME, AND BUSINESS ACTIVITY	REAL PROPERTY-LIST PRECISE LOCATION OF REAL PROPERTY	FAIR MARKET VALUE*	LIST DATE ACQUIRED OR DISPOSED (mm/dd/yyyy)	A or D	NATURE OF INTEREST (if "other," describe)*
Golden Gate National Parks Concervancy - Building 201, Fort Mason, San Francisco, CA 94123	Nonprofit — national parks preservation and stewardship	\$0 - \$1,999			None — nonprofit	Treasurer, Co-Chair Finance Committee, ExCom Member	\$0-\$499							
Stanford Latino Alumni Association - Frances C. Amillaga Alumni Center, 326 Galvez Street, Stanford, CA 94305	Nonprofit — alumni organization, Latino community engagement	\$0 - \$1,999			None — nonprofit	Treasurer	\$0-\$499							
The National Society of High School Scholars Foundation - 1930 North Druid Hills Road, Atlanta, GA 30319	Nonprofit — student scholarships and education	\$0 - \$1,999			None — nonprofit		\$0-\$499							

SCHEDULE B
Interests in Real Property
(Including Rental Income)

<BLUE> is a required field

* Select from drop down list

Real Property Disclosure							Lender Disclosure				
STREET ADDRESS OR PRECISE LOCATION AND CITY	FAIR MARKET VALUE*	LIST DATE ACQUIRED OR DISPOSED (mm/dd/yyyy)	A or D	NATURE OF INTEREST* (if "other," describe)	IF RENTAL PROPERTY, LIST GROSS INCOME	SOURCE OF RENTAL INCOME OF \$10,000 OR MORE	NAME AND ADDRESS OF LENDER* (<i>Business Address Acceptable</i>) AND GUARANTOR, IF	BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY	INTEREST RATE (%)	TERM (Mos/Yrs)	HIGHEST BALANCE*
36 Elizabeth Street, San Francisco, CA 94110	Over \$1,000,000			Ownership — held in living trust		\$1,001-\$10,000	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

*You are not required to report loans from commercial lending institutions 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:

Schedule D

Income - Gifts

CALIFORNIA FORM
FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

700

Name

Vanessa Hartigan

<BLUE> is a required field

[illegible]

CALIFORNIA FORM
FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Name
Vanessa Hartigan

- Mark either the gift or income box.
- Mark the “501(c)(3)” box for a travel payment received from a nonprofit 501(c)(3) organization or the “Speech” box if you made a speech or participated in a panel. These payments are not subject to the gift limit, but may result in a disqualifying conflict of interest.
- For gifts of travel, provide the travel destination.

[illegible]

Form 700x Comments

Schedules A-1 through E Comments

CALIFORNIA FORM
FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

70

Name

Vanessa Harti

Schedule A-1 Comments

Acquisition dates reflect earliest purchase within 12-month reporting period where positions were initiated prior to and added to during the reporting period
Investments held in Hartigan Family Living Trust unless otherwise noted

Schedule A-2 Comments

Spousal business interests reported at 50% community property share per California law
Fair market values for private business entities calculated using net book value (total assets minus total liabilities)

Schedule B Comments

Schedule C Comments

Schedule D Comments

Schedule E Comments



PORT 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	VACANT Term Expired 5/1/26 Holdover Member Steven Lee	5/1/30	Nominated by the Mayor, subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors. Term: 4-years
2	Mayor	VACANT Term Expired 5/1/26 Holdover Member William Adams	5/1/30	
3	Mayor	Ken McNeely	5/1/29	
4	Mayor	Stephen Engblom	5/1/28	
5	Mayor	VACANT Term Expired 5/1/26 Holdover Member Gail Gilman	5/1/30	

Seats are nominated 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 Port Commission consists of five voting members appointed by the Mayor, subject to confirmation by a majority of the Board of Supervisors.

The Port Commission shall have the power and duty to use, conduct, operate, maintain, manage, regulate, and control the port area of San Francisco and to do all things it deems necessary in connection with the use, conduct, operation, management, maintenance, regulation, improvement and control of said port area, or which may further the interests of the port in world trade.

The Commission shall have the composition and organization, and the powers, duties and responsibilities with respect to the Port that are set forth in the Burton Act, Statutes of 1968, Chapter 1333, as amended, and in the Agreement relating to the Transfer of the Port of SF from the State of California to CCSF. The Commission shall be subject to the provisions of Sections 4.101 through 4.103 of the Charter, so far as those powers and duties are not inconsistent with the Burton Act and the Transfer Agreement.

Each of the members shall serve for a term of four years. They shall be subject to recall, suspension and removal in the same manner as an elected official.

Report: Annual report describing its activities, and shall file such report with the Mayor and the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

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

Authority: Charter Section 4.114 (previously Charter Section 3.580)

Sunset Date: None

Contact: Elaine Forbes
Executive Director
Pier 1, The Embarcadero
San Francisco, CA 94111
(415) 274-0400
elaine.forbes@sfport.com

Jenica Liu
Commission Affairs Manager
Pier 1, The Embarcadero
San Francisco, CA 94111
(415) 274-0405
jenica.liu@sfport.com

Updated: April 27, 2026



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 People of Color, 2023 Compared to 2021	9
Figure 10: Commissions and Boards with the Lowest Percentage of 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 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 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 Attorney¹. 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.


¹ San Francisco Administrative Code 4.101

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, 1998². 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 Commission³. 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.

² San Francisco Administrative Code 33A.1
https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/sf_admin/0-0-0-59871

³ 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

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+⁴, 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.

⁴ 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 women⁵. 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.

⁵ 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%⁶. The LGBTQ population of the San Francisco and greater Bay Area ranks highest of U.S. cities at 6.2%⁷. Additionally, a 2006 survey found that 15.4% of adults in the San Francisco metropolitan area identify as LGB⁸. Therefore, compared to available San Francisco, greater Bay Area, and national data, the LGBTQ community is well represented on San Francisco policy bodies.

⁶ 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/>

⁷ 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.

⁸ 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 population⁹ 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.

⁹ 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.

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 Survey¹⁰. 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 disparity¹¹. 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).

¹⁰ Ibid

¹¹ 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 population¹², 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 population¹³ 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.

¹² 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.

¹³ 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 population¹⁴ 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



¹⁴ 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.

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 military¹⁵. Out of 685 who participated in the survey, 670 (98%) provided information on their veteran status¹⁶.

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 reports¹⁷.

¹⁵ 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.

¹⁶ 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.

¹⁷ 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%
Total	\$10.5B	72	64	84%	63%	58%	36%


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%
Total	\$6.7M	70	63	72%	57%	64%	41%

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 survey¹⁸. 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.

¹⁸ 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 Statute¹⁹. 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.

¹⁹ "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 options²⁰:
 - 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

²⁰ 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
dosw@sfgov.org
415.252.2570



July 7, 2026

To Whom It May Concern,

I am pleased to write this letter of recommendation for Vanessa Hartigan. As Chief Financial Officer of the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy, I have had the privilege of working closely with Vanessa over the past three years in her role first as Assistant Treasurer and now Treasurer of our Board of Trustees and as an active member of our Finance Committee, Investment Committee and Retirement Benefits Committee.

Throughout our time working together, Vanessa has consistently demonstrated exceptional financial judgment, thoughtful leadership, and a deep commitment to our organization's mission. She approaches every discussion with curiosity, insight, and a collaborative spirit, making her an invaluable thought partner to me, other executives and trustees.

As Treasurer, Vanessa does far more than fulfill the traditional oversight responsibilities of the role. She actively engages in complex financial discussions, asks thoughtful and strategic questions, and helps the committee evaluate opportunities, risks, and long-term implications. Her ability to balance sound financial stewardship with the broader mission, strategic objectives and values of the organization has strengthened our decision-making and governance.

I have particularly appreciated Vanessa's willingness to serve as a trusted sounding board on financial matters. Whether discussing annual budgets, investment strategies, reserve policies, or retirement benefits planning, she brings a depth of experience, practical perspective, and analytical thinking that elevates every conversation. She has recently contributed significantly to improving our organizational investment policy, refining our approach to managing operating reserves and shaping our retirement plan benefits to best support staff.

Vanessa is a very supportive and engaged board leader. She prepares thoroughly, listens carefully to diverse viewpoints, and helps build consensus around well-informed decisions. Her professionalism, integrity, and sound judgment have earned the respect of fellow board members and the executive leadership team alike.

Any organization would benefit from her financial expertise, strategic mindset, collaborative leadership, and commitment to strong governance. I am confident she will continue to make meaningful contributions wherever she serves.

Please feel free to contact me if I can provide any additional information.

Sincerely,

Jen Trahan

Jen Trahan
Chief Financial Officer