File No	250954	Committee Item No	2
		Board Item No. 50	

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

0	Dulas Osmanittas	D -1- O-10 0005
Committee:		Date Oct 6, 2025
Board of Su	pervisors Meeting	Date October 21, 2025
Cmte Boar	Motion Resolution Ordinance Legislative Digest Budget and Legislative Analyst Report Introduction Form Department/Agency Cover Letter and Memorandum of Understanding (MO Grant Information Form Grant Budget Subcontract Budget Contract/Agreement Form 126 - Ethics Commission Award Letter Application Form 700 Information/Vacancies (Boards/Commission/Vacancies)	d/or Report U)
	Public Correspondence	
OTHER	(Use back side if additional space is	needed)
H		
H		
Completed I	by: Victor Young	Date Oct 2, 2025
-	oy:	Date

PREPARED IN COMMITTEE

FILE NO. 250954 10/6/2025

MOTION NO.

1	[Appointment, Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee - Benjamin Tingle]
2	
3	Motion appointing Benjamin Tingle, term ending November 21, 2026, to the Citizens'
4	General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee.
5	
6	MOVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco does
7	hereby appoint the hereinafter designated person to serve as members of the Citizens'
8	General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee, pursuant to the provisions of the
9	Administrative Code, Sections 5.30-5.36, for the terms specified:
10	Benjamin Tingle, seat 3, succeeding Kristin Chu, resigned, must be active in a
11	community organization, for the unexpired portion of a two-year term ending November 21,
12	2026.
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

Application for Boards / Commissions / Committees / Task Forces INSTRUCTIONS AND APPLICATION

San Francisco is a diverse City and County with a wide range of people and issues affecting it. In order to take advantage of the extensive experience and knowledge available throughout our communities, various Boards/Commissions/Committees/Task Forces have been established to bring that knowledge together. These groups and their membership requirements are established by legislation approved through the local, state, and/or federal government.

In addition to setting up the purpose and goals of the various groups, the governing legislation outlines the type of person - in terms of desirable skills and/or knowledge - who can contribute their knowledge and perspective. In this manner, a group of San Franciscans, who are representative of the City and County, can be active participants in addressing issues affecting the entire City and County.

If you are interested in serving the City and County of San Francisco, the following procedures are provided:

- 1. A list of vacancies and expected vacancies, with their qualifications, can be found at the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, at the San Francisco Main Public Library, and online on the Board of Supervisors' website (http://www.sfbos.org/vacancy). Please review this list for positions of interest.
- 2. Submit an application (http://www.sfbos.org/vacancy_application) (List all of the appropriate seat number(s) and/or category/categories for which you qualify. We request applications be received ten (10) days before the scheduled hearing.)
 - Applicants may also need to submit a Form 700, Statement of Economic Interests (https://www.fppc.ca.gov/Form700.html), along with their application for all bodies listed in Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code, Section 3.1-103(a)(1).
- 3. If the seat(s) you are applying for is vacant and requires the Board of Supervisors' confirmation, the Rules Committee may schedule your application for review. Applicants should expect to appear before the Rules Committee to speak on their qualifications and answer questions during a public hearing. (There are no set instructions on what you are expected to present to the Rules Committee; however, a brief description of how your qualifications distinguish you from other applicants, reasons for your interest in the subject, and/or a short summarization on why you would make a good candidate is appropriate.)
- 4. The Rules Committee may or may not make a recommendation for appointment. If a recommendation is made by the Rules Committee, the recommendation is forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for approval. It generally takes approximately 15 days from the date the Rules Committee makes their recommendation, for the individual to become officially appointed.
- 5. Depending on the type of organization, a new appointee may need to take an Oath of Office.

If there are no vacancies, your application will be retained for one year. If any openings occur during this time, your application will be submitted to the Rules Committee for review.

If you have any further questions, please contact the Rules Committee Clerk at (415) 554-5184. If you require detailed information concerning the operations of a particular Board/Commission/Committee/Task Force, please contact the administering department directly.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

Application for Boards, Commissions, Committees, & Task Forces

Name of Board/Commission/Committee/Task Ford	
Seat # (Required - see Vacancy Notice for qualific	ations): 3, 5, 9
Full Name: Benjamin Tingle	
Home Address:	Zip Code:
Home Phone:	Occupation: Management Consultant
Work Phone: (510) 592-8766	Employer: Self-Employed
Business Address: 490 Post St, Ste	Self-Employed 500, PMB 2047 Zip Code: 94102
Business Email: bentingleanc@gmail.co	
residents of the City and County of San Francisco w authority). For certain appointments, the Board of S Resident of San Francisco: Yes ■ No □ If 18 Years of Age or Older: Yes ■ No □	No, place of residence:
experience that reflect the City's diverse neincome areas and relied on a range of city Franciscans face in securing stable housing government processes. As a member of the LGBTQ+ community, I progress and continued advocacy for equit Toklas LGBTQ Democratic Club, where I etraditionally underrepresented groups. I als	mmunity member, I bring lived and professional eighborhoods. As a renter who has lived in mixed services, I understand firsthand the challenges Sang, navigating city programs, and engaging with contribute a perspective shaped by decades of y and inclusion. I am an active member of the Alice B. ngage in policy discussions centering the needs of the volunteered on the current Mayor's transition team, andidates for policy roles—a process that prioritized hip.
cleanups, and athletic groups across San F concerns at both the local and citywide leve	ighborhood associations, civic campaigns, community Francisco, giving me perspective on community el. Collectively, these experiences shape my belief that oritize transparency, accountability, and equitable

Business and/or Professional Experience:

I bring over 15 years of experience in public policy, organizational strategy, and government operations, including oversight of public budgets and community-centered programs.

My career began in the federal government, where I worked on congressional appropriations and economic policy analysis. While earning my Master's in Public Policy at Georgetown University, I supported the D.C. Commission on African American Affairs, analyzing demographic and housing data to guide funding strategies addressing gentrification and displacement in historically Black neighborhoods.

As a management consultant and independent advisor, I have led large-scale transformations for government agencies, nonprofits, and mission-driven organizations. These projects often involved entities funded through public budgets or capital allocations, such as public health departments, infrastructure agencies, and regulated utilities. My work has focused on aligning capital investments with equitable development goals, strengthening service delivery, and implementing oversight structures that ensure resources reach intended communities.

I also advised a public financial institution primarily invested in fixed income instruments, which gave me direct exposure to municipal bond issuance, regulatory processes, and the stewardship obligations tied to public capital. Across roles, I have helped leaders design governance systems, conduct risk reviews, and improve accountability, all of which directly support the mission of the Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee.

Civic Activities:

I am actively engaged in civic life across San Francisco. I currently serve as a member of the Alice B. Toklas LGBTQ Democratic Club, and during the most recent mayoral transition I helped lead the policy appointments process, reviewing hundreds of applications and interviewing candidates to ensure competence, equity, and lived experience were represented in city leadership.

At the neighborhood level, I participate in park stewardship, local cleanups, and my neighborhood association, collaborating on issues of safety, inclusion, and livability. I have also volunteered with campaigns and community initiatives across the Tenderloin, Civic Center, Mission, and Nob Hill.

These experiences keep me grounded in the daily concerns of residents while maintaining a citywide perspective. I would bring this balance to GOBOC, ensuring that San Francisco's bond-funded projects deliver accountable, equitable, and visible results for the communities they are meant to serve.

Have you attended any meeting	s of the body to which you are ar	oplying? Yes □ No □
	· ·	uled public hearing, prior to the Board of Supervisors eived ten (10) days prior to the scheduled public
Date: 8/28/25	_ Applicant's Signature (required)	Enjamin Tingle (Manually sign or type your complete name. NOTE: By typing your complete name, you are hereby consenting to use of electronic signature.)
<u>Please Note</u> : Your application will public record.	be retained for one year. Once comp	eleted, this form, including all attachments, become
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:		
Appointed to Seat #:	_Term Expires:	Date Vacated:

(4/5/2023) Page 2 of 2



STATEMENT OF ECONOMIC INTERESTS COVER PAGE

Date Initial Filing Received

A PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Please type or print in ink.				
NAME OF FILER (LAST)	(FIRST)		(MIDDLE)	
Tingle	Benjamin		Franklin	í e
1. Office, Agency, or Court				
Agency Name (Do not use acrony)	ms)			
Division, Board, Department, District	t, if applicable	Your Position	-	
CITIZENS' GENERAL	OBLIGATION BOND	OVI Commit	tee Member	
► If filing for multiple positions, list	below or on an attachment. (Do not	t use acronyms)		
Agency:		Position:		
2. Jurisdiction of Office (Ch	eck at least one box)			
State		Judge, Retir (Statewide J		dge, or Court Commissioner
Multi-County		County of	San Francisco	
City of San Francisco				
3. Type of Statement (Check	at least one box)			
Annual: The period covered in December 31, 2024,	is January 1, 2024, through	Leaving O	ffice: Date Left (Check one circ	
The period covered in December 31, 2024.	is, throug	gh The pe		1, 2024, through the date of
Assuming Office: Date assu	med/	☐ The pe	riod covered is/ e of leaving office.	, through
Candidate: Date of Election	and office sou	ight, if different than Part	1)	
4. Schedule Summary (requ Schedules attached	ıired) ► Total numl	ber of pages includ	ing this cover pag	ie:
Schedule A-1 - Investments	s - schedule attached	Schedule C - Incom	me, Loans, & Business	Positions - schedule attached
Schedule A-2 - Investments			me – Gifts – schedule a	
Schedule B - Real Property	/ - schedule attached	Schedule E - Incor	me – Gifts – Travel Pay	ments - schedule attached
-or- None - No reportable	e interests on any schedule			
5. Verification	Tilleresis on any schedule			
MAILING ADDRESS STREET	CITY		STATE	ZIP CODE
(Business or Agency Address Recommended		n Eronologo	CA	94102
490 Post St, Ste 500, # DAYTIME TELEPHONE NUMBER	2041 Sa	n Francisco EMAIL ADDRESS	CA	94102
(510) 592-8766		bentingleanc@	omail com	
	e in preparing this statement. I have r			wledge the information contained
herein and in any attached schedul	les is true and complete. I acknowle	dge this is a public docur	nent.	
I certify under penalty of perjury	under the laws of the State of Cal	ifornia that the foregoin	g is true and correct.	
Date Signed 08/28/2025	day, year)	Signature	Tajamin the originally signed paper state	
(monut, c	uj, jvaij	(File	and originally signed paper state	area and you using united /

SCHEDULE A-1 Investments

Stocks, Bonds, and Other Interests (Ownership Interest is Less Than 10%)

Investments must be itemized. Do not attach brokerage or financial statements.

CALIFORNIA FORM 700 FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION
Name
Benjamin Tingle

► NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY
Nextera Energy Co.
GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS
Green energy co.
FAIR MARKET VALUE
\$2,000 - \$10,000 \$10,001 - \$100,000
\$100,001 - \$1,000,000 Over \$1,000,000
NATURE OF INVESTMENT
Stock Other
(Describe) Partnership Income Received of \$0 - \$499 Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)
IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
ACQUIRED DISPOSED
► NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY
UnitedHealth Group Inc.
GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS
Health insurance
FAIR MARKET VALUE
\$2,000 - \$10,000 \$10,001 - \$100,000
\$100,001 - \$1,000,000 Over \$1,000,000
NATURE OF INVESTMENT
Stock Other
(Describe) Partnership Income Received of \$0 - \$499 Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)
Partnership Income Received of \$0 - \$499 Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
Partnership Income Received of \$0 - \$499 Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)
Partnership Income Received of \$0 - \$499 Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE: / /24 / /24
Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE://24
Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE: //24 ACQUIRED DISPOSED NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY Airbnb GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS Hospitality FAIR MARKET VALUE ☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000
Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE: //24 ACQUIRED DISPOSED NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY Airbnb GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS Hospitality FAIR MARKET VALUE
Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE: // /24 ACQUIRED DISPOSED NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY Airbnb GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS HOSpitality FAIR MARKET VALUE ☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000 ☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 NATURE OF INVESTMENT ■ Stock ☐ Other
Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE: //24 ACQUIRED DISPOSED NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY Airbnb GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS HOSpitality FAIR MARKET VALUE ☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000 ☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000 ☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 ☐ Over \$1,000,000 NATURE OF INVESTMENT ☐ Stock ☐ Other
Partnership Income Received of \$0 - \$499 Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

SCHEDULE A-1 Investments

Stocks, Bonds, and Other Interests (Ownership Interest is Less Than 10%)

Investments must be itemized. Do not attach brokerage or financial statements.

CALIFORNIA FORM 700 FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION
Name
Benjamin Tingle

► NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY
Nextera Energy Co.
GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS
Green energy co.
FAIR MARKET VALUE
\$2,000 - \$10,000 \$10,001 - \$100,000
\$100,001 - \$1,000,000 Over \$1,000,000
NATURE OF INVESTMENT
Stock Other
(Describe) Partnership Income Received of \$0 - \$499 Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)
IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
ACQUIRED DISPOSED
► NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY
UnitedHealth Group Inc.
GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS
Health insurance
FAIR MARKET VALUE
\$2,000 - \$10,000 \$10,001 - \$100,000
\$100,001 - \$1,000,000 Over \$1,000,000
NATURE OF INVESTMENT
Stock Other
(Describe) Partnership Income Received of \$0 - \$499 Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)
Partnership Income Received of \$0 - \$499 Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
Partnership Income Received of \$0 - \$499 Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)
Partnership Income Received of \$0 - \$499 Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE: / /24 / /24
Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE://24
Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE: //24 ACQUIRED DISPOSED NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY Airbnb GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS Hospitality FAIR MARKET VALUE ☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000
Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE: //24 ACQUIRED DISPOSED NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY Airbnb GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS Hospitality FAIR MARKET VALUE
Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE: // /24 ACQUIRED DISPOSED NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY Airbnb GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS HOSpitality FAIR MARKET VALUE ☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000 ☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 NATURE OF INVESTMENT ■ Stock ☐ Other
Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE: //24 ACQUIRED DISPOSED NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY Airbnb GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS HOSpitality FAIR MARKET VALUE ☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000 ☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000 ☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000 ☐ Over \$1,000,000 NATURE OF INVESTMENT ☐ Stock ☐ Other
Partnership Income Received of \$0 - \$499 Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C) IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

Instructions – Schedules A-1 and A-2 Investments

"Investment" means a financial interest in any business entity (including a consulting business or other independent contracting business) that is located in, doing business in, planning to do business in, or that has done business during the previous two years in your agency's jurisdiction in which you, your spouse or registered domestic partner, or your dependent children had a direct, indirect, or beneficial interest totaling \$2,000 or more at any time during the reporting period. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 14.)

Reportable investments include:

- Stocks, bonds, warrants, and options, including those held in margin or brokerage accounts and managed investment funds (See Reference Pamphlet, page 14.)
- · Sole proprietorships
- Your own business or your spouse's or registered domestic partner's business (See Reference Pamphlet, page 9, for the definition of "business entity.")
- Your spouse's or registered domestic partner's investments even if they are legally separate property
- Partnerships (e.g., a law firm or family farm)
- Investments in reportable business entities held in a retirement account (See Reference Pamphlet, page 16.)
- If you, your spouse or registered domestic partner, and dependent children together had a 10% or greater ownership interest in a business entity or trust (including a living trust), you must disclose investments held by the business entity or trust. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 17, for more information on disclosing trusts.)
- · Business trusts

You are not required to disclose:

- Government bonds, diversified mutual funds, certain funds similar to diversified mutual funds (such as exchange traded funds) and investments held in certain retirement accounts. (See Reference Pamphlet, page 14.) (Regulation 18237)
- Bank accounts, savings accounts, money market accounts and certificates of deposits
- Cryptocurrency
- Insurance policies
- Annuities
- Commodities
- · Shares in a credit union
- Government bonds (including municipal bonds)

Reminders

- Do you know your agency's jurisdiction?
- Did you hold investments at any time during the period covered by this statement?
- Code filers your disclosure categories may only require disclosure of specific investments.

- Retirement accounts invested in non-reportable interests (e.g., insurance policies, mutual funds, or government bonds) (See Reference Pamphlet, page 16.)
- Government defined-benefit pension plans (such as CalPERS and CalSTRS plans)
- Certain interests held in a blind trust (See Reference Pamphlet, page 17.)

Use Schedule A-1 to report ownership of less than 10% (e.g., stock). Schedule C (Income) may also be required if the investment is not a stock or corporate bond. (See second example below.)

Use Schedule A-2 to report ownership of 10% or greater (e.g., a sole proprietorship).

To Complete Schedule A-1:

Do not attach brokerage or financial statements.

- Disclose the name of the business entity. Do not use acronyms for the name of the business entity, unless it is one that is commonly understood by the public.
- Provide a general description of the business activity of the entity (e.g., pharmaceuticals, computers, automobile manufacturing, or communications).
- Check the box indicating the highest fair market value of your investment during the reporting period. If you are filing a candidate or an assuming office statement, indicate the fair market value on the filing date or the date you took office, respectively. (See page 21 for more information.)
- Identify the nature of your investment (e.g., stocks, warrants, options, or bonds).
- An acquired or disposed of date is only required if you initially acquired or entirely disposed of the investment interest during the reporting period. The date of a stock dividend reinvestment or partial disposal is not required. Generally, these dates will not apply if you are filing a candidate or an assuming office statement.

Examples:

Frank Byrd holds a state agency position. Frank's conflict of interest code requires full disclosure of investments. Frank must disclose stock holdings of \$2,000 or more in any company that is located in or does business in California, as well as those stocks held by Franks's spouse or registered domestic partner and dependent children.

Alice Lance is a city council member. Alice has a 4% interest, worth \$5,000, in a limited partnership located in the city. Alice must disclose the partnership on Schedule A-1 and income of \$500 or more received from the partnership on Schedule C.

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

Application for Boards, Commissions, Committees, & Task Forces

Name of Board/Commission/Committee/Task Force:	Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee
Seat # (Required - see Vacancy Notice for qualification	ons): <u>3</u>
_{ull Name} . Min Chang	
	_{Zip Code:} 94105
	upation: CEO
Nork Phone: 415-930-1888	Employer: Homebridge
Business Address: 1035 Market Stree	
Business Email: mchang@homebridgeca.org	Home Email:
uthority). For certain appointments, the Board of Sup	are 18 years of age or older (unless otherwise stated in the covervisors may waive the residency requirement.
residents of the City and County of San Francisco who authority). For certain appointments, the Board of Sup Resident of San Francisco: Yes No If No 8 Years of Age or Older: Yes No I	are 18 years of age or older (unless otherwise stated in the concervisors may waive the residency requirement. o, place of residence: how your qualifications represent the communities of interest ge, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, types of disabilities

I am the CEO of a 500+ healthcare organization that serves over 75,000 of the most underserved populations and caregivers in San Francisco and across California.
I have over 35 years of experience in strategic leadership, financial management, business development, and operations, spanning six continents. Her deep understanding of cross-cultural dynamics enriches her approach to serving diverse communities. In the past, she was the Chief Strategy Officer at On Lok, a healthcare company serving older adults in the Bay Area, President and CEO of Microsurgical Technology, a global medical devices company, and CEO at Kin On Health Care Center, a healthcare company specializing in long term care. Her background includes 13 years leading global marketing communications and other leadership roles spanning 10+ years, including at Omnicom Group, Honeywell, AstraZeneca, Otis Elevators, and Procter & Gamble and 11 years in management consulting with Ernst & Young, Booz Allen and Accenture.
I hold a Doctorate in International Affairs and a Master of International Public Policy from Johns Hopkins University, School of Advanced International Studies. She received her Master of Science in Management from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Sloan School of Management and a Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Arts from the University of Pennsylvania.
Civile A estivistance
Civic Activities: I am part of the IHSS Task Force, the CA Long-term Support Services Coalition, Human Services Network and other key groups and initiatives focused on older adults and adults with disabilities. I also work very closely with DAS, CDA, CDSS, HSA, OEWD, Justice in Aging, MOHCD, SF Dept of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, SEIU, On Lok, IOA, Self-Help, ECS, DISH, TNDC, HomeRise, Laguna Honda, CAPA, CICA, CWDB, CA Dept of Small Business Advocate and many other CBOs and organizations in SF. We are also currently working with the Mayor's office on shelter care. I also active with SFUSD and ran for the school board as a first-time candidate. I have attended many school board meetings, parents/community meetings, canvassed the neighborhoods to better understand key issues and spoken out on key challenges impacting our public school system.
Have you attended any meetings of the body to which you are applying? Yes □ No ■
An appearance before the Rules Committee may be required at a scheduled public hearing, prior to the Board of Supervisors considering the recommended appointment. Applications should be received ten (10) days prior to the scheduled public hearing.
Date: 2/17/25 Applicant's Signature (required): (Manually sign or type your complete name. NOTE: By typing your complete name, you are hereby consenting to use of electronic signature.)
Please Note: Your application will be retained for one year. Once completed, this form, including all attachments, become public record.
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:
Appointed to Seat #: Term Expires: Date Vacated:

Business and/or Professional Experience:

AMENDMENT		COVER PAGE
	ANG	KIN
Office, Agency, or Court Agency Sans (Se refuse amount)		
Bond Over	squt Co	moute
in I files the multiple profilers for the on-te-on		
Aprily	manuer (resp	
2. Jurisdiction of Office (special material		Proteet
Total or Outce today is and a	×4 201)	Judge Helmit Autge, Pro Ten Jodge or Count Connectices: (Connects Jumb 2001)
Tuescoly Or Final		Control of
Your San Fran		Other
Type of Statement (there is east new of American Transmission of American American)		Coaring Office Core Let
Originates 11, 2001. One of the period formers of		(Check one cital deline)
Resember 31, 2014	Sens.	604 92
Assuming Officer Collegement	-	The partid courses to the design of the design of the particle
Condition Own & Season	94 Mix 1894,	(collective fact)
4. Schedule Summary (required)	 Fotal numb 	er of pages including this cover page:
Schedules attached		Maria de la responsación de la companyación de la c
Schedule A-1 - Increments - schedule ats Schedule A-2 - Investments - schedule ats		Schedule C - Poome Town: & Broken Rosenet - schedule Mached Schedule D - Noord - Offic - schedule Mached
Schedule B - Revi Projety - schedule att	KING	Schedule 5 - Novem - Gifts - Terral Payments - schedule (duries)
-OI- None - No reportion interests on a	any schedule	
. Verification		
MAERIC ACTIVITY STREET STREET STREET STREET STREET	100	State Section
399 Fremo	nd S A	of 2240 Son Francisco CX 94
506,595-5260		minuchana @ amail. co
have used at reusenable disgrams in preparing this s	stationalist filtera ras	newed this statement and to the best of my knowledge the information conti-
centify under penalty of perjury under the laws of		
alclac	Core State of Epine	1
		Signature

Min Chang 206-595-5260 Minxchang@gmail.com

On Mar 5, 2025, at 3:44 PM, BOS-Appointments <BOS-Appointments@sfgov.org> wrote:

Min:

I am in receipt of your application form. Upon review it appears that the required Form 700 was not included. Please provide the Form 700 and I will attach it to your application form. As we are tentatively trying to schedule the matter next week I will need it by the end of today. Thank you.

SCHEDULE A-1 Investments



Stocks. Bonds, and Other Interests
(Oursell's Press a Less Than 10%) On not attach broke upo or financial discount to 16ne bress SEMERAL DESCRIPTION DE TRIS MINISTERS. Um proft

| 1000 | 11000 | 10000 | 10000 FADR MARKET VALUE See Ore MATURE OF INVESTMENT Partierne Prome Received of \$100 or there Patiento Stroma Respond of \$6 : \$400 forma Respond of \$500 of More IF APPLICABLE LIST DATE IF APPRICABLE INTO AND ACCIONED DEPOSED ALCHRO GERLAND · NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY · NAME OF BUSINESS DATITY GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUT SEAS GENERAL DESIGNATION OF THEY SUSUAL DIS | \$7,000 | \$79,000 | \$12,000 | \$70,000 | \$12,000 | \$70,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,0 KATCHE OF INTESTMENT NATURE OF MASSIMENT Partnership Secure Received of \$0 - \$409 Secure Received of \$500 or Vors Factoring _ Income Received of \$3 - \$4.06 _ \$400ms Naconied of \$500 or Mice. - AFE CABLE CO DATE: IT APPLICABLE UST BATE ACQUITED GGFOTEE ACUUMED BISPOSED NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY Filer's Verification Print Harry Min Chang GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE BUSINESS. Office, Agency Statement Type 2024/2025 Arrus Assuming Leaving Arrusi Districtions \$10.001 - \$100.000 Over \$1,000.000 \$2,000 - \$11,000 - Arrost I have used all responsible diligence in preprinting this statement, I have reviewed this statement and to the best of my knowledge the afformation contained herein and in any attached schedules is true and complete. NATURE OF INVESTMENT Described Promises of \$0 - \$4(6) income Roce and of \$000 or More as I contify under proactly of perjury under the less of the State of Collection that the foregoing is true and control.

Date Signed 3 55 IF APPLICABLE LIST DATE

Comments: _ 990C Form 700 - Schedule & 1 (2014/701) advice@Tope ca.gon + 268-275-2772 + www.hyor.ca.go

Filer's Signature

ACQUIRED DISPOSED

SCHEDULE A-2 Investments, Income, and Assets of Business Emittes/Frusts Detailed thinks in 10% or greater



Homebra a	A STATE OF THE BUILDING SERVICE OF SERVICE O
10% markets1 SF 94103	INVESTMENT OF SEA, PROPERTY
Sharper James to come to be be part	Make of Secretary Later & Madericks 1. Accepted y Fally Secretary 22 State Addusts of Security and
Wen present	Describer of Gardiner No. 49 (a) Only of the Photos Acodolina of No. 49 (4) and 45 (4)
AND MARCO VALUE OF SPECIAL UP CASE. SE STAND SPECIAL ACCUPANT OCCUPANT OCC	TANK MACHINE
Personal Statement LEGAL PROPERTY OF THE PERSON CED	Notice of Wilders of the Character Control of the C
2. SCENTARY IN CROSS NECOME REGILINGS ONE OF YOUR PROPERTY AND SHARE ON THE CROSS SECOME 12 THE ENVIRONMENTS	Usua for action in the second proving maximum or real proving
DO COST SENSOR DO COST OF EACH REPORTANCE THROUGH BOURSE OF MACOUS OF 155 AND THE MORE THROUGH BOURSE OF THROUGH BOURS OF THROUGH BOURSE OF THROUGH BOURSE OF THROUGH BOURSE OF THROUG	Commerce:
er's Verification	
wome Un Chang	
* Agmisy or Court Board	Oversett Committee
	course Jeans, Locase
uand of his schade deposit in proposity the statement. I have meet a his many and the schades is true and complete.	Cilletto Tris statement and is) the best of my knowledge the education
y under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of C	failtherfa that the torogoing is true and correct.

1700, Farm 100 Schools 6-2 (2014/3025) administration of the 275-1771 - were last so per

SCHEDULE C Income, Loans, & Business Positions



• 1. Report receives	* 1 Incom architis
How bridge	NAME OF BOLISCE OF NICTURE
ADDITED STREET ASSESSED	SCORES School Steel Avenue
10215 Nortect & SIGHES	
BUTCHESS ACTIVATE BY TO REMAIN TO T	Wylandels of finite or associate associate
VOLUMETE PROPERTY	A CA N. R. WATHER BY ARRIVED WATER
CEO	
GROSS RECORD WELEVED AS VICINE - Francis Tree	GROSS WORLD NO MORE BURNES PORTOR DAY
\$1.00 - \$1.000 \$1.001 - \$10.000	\$500 \$1.000 \$1.000 \$1.000
Stoke town process	3 \$19.00 - \$100,000 3 \$146.4 \$100.000
Companies of the section process was referred;	CONSCIPATION FOR WHICH MICHAEL WAS RECEIVED.
1) in seg-audysted from privately a 5 to	(Fig. self employed upon Schedule Av2.)
Participal Sale than IDS received the 10% or greater use (COMSTRIKE)	Factorial interfer life remarks for IPA or grade use School of ET
See of	Tang Co
Charmacounters	(Part of World (in State W/)
	☐ the manner.
Commession or	Committee of Female Committee of and account to bell and
Facility 1	Course
-	3000
Decks	(Australia)
introducts. LEARNS exception on our examination control the expositions into accommendation of the expositions of the exposition of the e	on, or any indebtedness created as part of a retail installment or un this qualities to members of the public efficient regard to your office
EARLY REGISTER OF SUIT MANIEUR COUNTY THE RESCRIPTION OF A DRIVE OF IMPLIEUR PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY OF THE OF TIMES AND A MARKET OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY OF THE AND THE PROPERTY OF THE AND THE PROPERTY OF THE AND	on, or any indebtedness created as part of a retail installment or un this qualities to members of the public efficient regard to your office
EARLY COUNTY ON SOME MANIETY CONTINUES AND RECOGNIZATION OF A COMMERCIAL RECOGNIZATION OF A CONTINUES AND RECOGNIZATION OF A CONTINUES AND A CONTINUES AND A CONTINUES AND A COUNTY AND A C	on, or any indebtedness strained as part of a retail installment or or mit available to members of the public without regard to your office the of business must be disclosed as follows:
EARLY COUNTY ON SOME MANIETY CONTINUES AND RECOGNIZATION OF A COMMERCIAL RECOGNIZATION OF A CONTINUES AND RECOGNIZATION OF A CONTINUES AND A CONTINUES AND A CONTINUES AND A COUNTY AND A C	in, or sin; indefinitionals streams as part of a reas installment or un my available to members of the public without regard to your office the of business must be disclosed as Tohors. NTEREST MATE TERM Minimum Vision
CANCE EXCENSION ON CONTENATION CONTINUE THE REPORT TO EAR In any old impured to report loanse from a commercial become restricted of terrescore, made in the leadness ample as course of burners on the Los. Province haves and issues received real or a lender's regular cou- OF LENGER' (35) (Stammer Astron. Accession)	in, or any inflethishmats instance as part of a relation installment or un in a selection to member of the public whitever regard to your offici- rity of fusioned must be disclosed as follows: INTEREST HATE YERIH Months Years: Nome
CANS EXCENSION OF CUTE PAINTED CONTROL THE REPORT PLANTS OF A 15TH VALUE OF THE PAINTED PAINTED TO THE PAINTED PAINTED PAINTED TO THE PAINTED	in, or any inflethishmats are part of a retail mutualment or un in a le above 1 o member. If the public window regard to your offici free of business must be disclosed as follows. INTEREST HATE YERIN Months Years! Nome SEDJATIY FOR LOAN Name Hemonis residence.
CANS EXCENSION OF CUTE PAINTED CONTROL THE REPORT PLANTS OF A 15TH VALUE OF THE PAINTED PAINTED TO THE PAINTED PAINTED PAINTED TO THE PAINTED	in, or any indefinitions streams as part of a relative installment or un in a weaklow to interest of the public window regard to your officiency as follows: MERCST HATE FERM Novike Years SECURITY FOR LOAN
CANS EXCEPTIVE OF CUTE PARISHON DOWNLOSS THE RECOVERY OF A STREET PROPERTY OF THE PARISH PROPERTY AND A STREET PROPERTY OF THE PARISH PARISH PROPERTY OF THE PARISH PROPERTY OF THE PARISH PROPERTY OF THE PARISH PROPERTY OF THE PARISH PARISH PROPERTY OF THE PARISH P	In or any indefendants are been of a relative installment or un in a seable to investment of the public wireout regard to your office red of business must be declared as Notice. NEERS TRATE TERM Months Years SECURITY FOR LOAN Removed residence Removed Property Removed Property
DANS EXICUTION OF COTE FAMILIAD DISTRIBUTION OF THE REPORT OF THE PROPERTY OF	In or any indefendants are been of a relative installment or un in a seable to investment of the public wireout regard to your office red of business must be declared as Notice. NEERS TRATE TERM Months Years SECURITY FOR LOAN Removed residence Removed Property Removed Property
CANS EXCENSED ON CONTRACTION DIVIDING THE REPORTING PERSON ARE YES REPORTED TO THE REPORT OF THE REP	in, or any indefinitions streams as part of a relative installment or unit as a labor 1 in member. If the public without regard to your officing of business must be disclosed as Notice. INTEREST MATE FROM SECURITY FOR LOAN Name Rear Property Description.
CANS EX CENTED ON COTE FAMILIED DOUBLE for a commercial become from a commercial become from a commercial become from a commercial become increase of the forestation, made in the sending a regular countered for a sender of the	In or any indefinitions streams as part of a relative installment or unit as a labor 1 in member. If the public without regard to your officing of business must be disclosed as Notice. INTEREST MATE FROM SECURITY FOR LOAN Name Rear Property Description Security FOR LOAN Name Rear Property Line whites
CANS EXCEIVED ON CUTETANIEND CONTROL THE REPORTING RE- size soil required to report loans from a community become presented flores.SLOP, made in the leader's regular country become presented flores.SLOP, made in the leader's regular country of the present of the flores. SE PRESENTED SAMELY AND COMMUNITY OF LEADER SE ACTIVITY. IF ANY, OF LEADER T SALENCE OUSDING REPORTING PERIOD SE 1000 1- \$10,000 1- \$10,000	In or any indefendants streams as part of a relati installment or unit a visible is member of the public whitever regard to your official of fundament and the disclosed as Notice. MITERIST MATE FROM SECURITY FOR LOAN Notice Floor Projects Guidants Guidants Continue C
CANS EXCENSION ON CUTE FAILURE DIVIDING THE REPORT FOR INTO EACH AND THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPE	in, or any infieltedness creation as part of a relati installment or unit in a laboral 1 members of the problem region to your official region of business must be discussed as follows: INTEREST HATE FROM SECURATY FOR LOAN Acres Hour Projects Guidrants Guidrants Guidrants Guidrants Guidrants
CANS EXCENSION ON CUTE FAILURE CONTROL THE REPORT FOR A COMMUNITY OF A COMMUNITY	In or any indefendants streams as part of a relati installment or unit a visible is member of the public whitever regard to your official of fundament and the disclosed as Notice. MITERIST MATE FROM SECURITY FOR LOAN Notice Floor Projects Guidants Guidants Continue C
CANS EXCENSION ON CUTE FAILURE CONTROL THE REPORT FOR A COMMUNITY OF A COMMUNITY	In or any indefinitions streams as part of a relative installment or unit as a labor 1 in member. If the public window regard to your official relatives must be disclosed as follow; INTEREST MATE FROM SECURITY FOR LOAN Name Reservation Fluid Projects Charles Charles Charles Charles Charles Charles
CANS ECCENTRY ON CUTE FAILURE DOWNTO THE EXPONENT OF A DOWNTON OF A DO	In or any indefendants streams as part of a relati installment or unit a visible is member of the public whitever regard to your official of fundament and the disclosed as Notice. MITERIST MATE FROM SECURITY FOR LOAN Notice Floor Projects Guidants Guidants Continue C
CANS RECEIVED ON CONTRACTION DURING THE REPORTING RE- LIAM TOOL ON CONTRACTION OF THE REPORT OF THE RE- LIAM THE LIAM THE RESIDENCE OF THE REPORT OF THE RE- LIAM PRESENTED HARD AND ADDRESS OF THE REPORT OF THE REPORT OF THE RESIDENCE OF THE RES	In or any indefinitions streams as part of a relative installment or unit as a labor 1 in member. If the public window regard to your official relatives must be disclosed as follow; INTEREST MATE FROM SECURITY FOR LOAN Name Reservation Fluid Projects Charles Charles Charles Charles Charles Charles
AND SECULIA ON CONTINUED DOUBLE THE RECOMPTION OF A DESCRIPTION ON CONTINUED DOUBLE THE RECOMPTION OF A PERSONAL NAME OF THE BROKESS ON THE SECOND STREET OF THE STATE OF THE SECOND OF THE SECOND OF THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE SECOND OF THE STATE	en or any inflettedness creation as part of a retail installment or unit is a state in members of the picks which regard to your official read of business must be discussed as topons. INTERCYT HATE YERIN Months Years! Nome YERIN Months Years! Nome Transcript FOR LOAN Nome Transcript Property Security: Other Disports Lawrence: Descript Lawrence: Descript Lawrence: Descript Lawrence: Descript Candidda
CANS EXCENSION ON CONTENTATION DOWNSON THE EXPONENTS OF A THE STREET OF THE PROPERTY OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROPERTY OF	en or any inflettedness creation as part of a retail installment or unit is a state in members of the picks which regard to your official read of business must be discussed as topons. INTERCYT HATE YERIN Months Years! Nome YERIN Months Years! Nome Transcript FOR LOAN Nome Transcript Property Security: Other Disports Lawrence: Descript Lawrence: Descript Lawrence: Descript Lawrence: Descript Candidda
CANS EXCENSED ON CONTEXAMINED DIVIDIOS THE EXPONENTIAL REST. LET THE REST. THE PROOF IDENTIFY IN CONTEXT. IN PROOF THE PROOF IS THE PROOF IN THE PROOF IN THE PROOF IN THE PROOF IS THE PROOF IN THE PR	en or any inflethedness ensured as part of a retail installment or unit as a labor 13 members 37 me pickle whiteval regions to your official of functional and place of supervisors. PROPERTY HATE TERM Worship Years SECURITY FOR LOAN Name Renord residence Floor Projects Colore Descript Condidate Invested this statement and to the basis of my knowledge the projected to the statement of the pass of my knowledge the projected to the basis of my knowledge the projected to the projected to the basis of my knowledge the projected to the projecte
CANS EXCENSION ON CONTEXAMINED DIVIDIOS THE EXPONENTIAL SETS AS THE CONTEXT OF TH	en or any inflethedness ensured as part of a retail installment or unit as a labor 13 members 37 me pickle whiteval regions to your official of functional and place of supervisors. PROPERTY HATE TERM Worship Years SECURITY FOR LOAN Name Renord residence Floor Projects Colore Descript Condidate Invested this statement and to the basis of my knowledge the projected to the statement of the pass of my knowledge the projected to the basis of my knowledge the projected to the projected to the basis of my knowledge the projected to the projecte
Lans as Calvino os del Establichi birolho tre establishi sia un sol moguent la report losse (from a commenza becong restino d'abressione, made o ne la sendera equal a cause el bueres su tre f.e. Personal losses and sans received rel e a sender singular coul of 164000. CESTACES (Clarify) IF ANY, OF CENCER IT SEALANCE DUSQUE REPORTING PERIOD - \$1.000 IT - \$100.000 IT - \$100.0	on or any indebtedness created as part of a retail installment or in the state to members of the public entropy regard to your or my are state to members of the public entropy regard to your or my are of business must be disclosed as follow; INTEREST HATE FROM SECURITY FOR LOAN Home SECURITY FOR LOAN Home SECURITY FOR LOAN Home SECURITY Deer without Condition

PPPC Form 760 - Scholinin C (2014/7) advice@Pppc.ca.gov = 300-275-3771 - www.foot.o.



CITIZENS' GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

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	BOS	Andrea Marmo Crawford	11/21/26	Must be active in a business organization representing the business community located within the City. Term: 2-years
2	BOS	VACANT	11/21/26	Must be active in a labor organization. Term: 2-years
3	BOS	VACANT	11/21/26	Must be active in a community organization. Term: 2-years
4	Civil Grand Jury	William Fox (first term)	11/21/26	Shall be a member of the Civil Grand Jury or a designee appointed by the Civil Grand Jury. Term: 2-years
5	Controller	VACANT	11/21/26	Expertise in auditing governmental financial statements or with expertise in public finance law. Term: 2-years
6	Controller	VACANT Term Expired 10/20/21 - Holdover Member Brian Larkin	10/20/25	Expertise in construction management. Term: 2-years

Seat #	Appointing Authority	Seat Holder	Term Ending	Qualification
7	Mayor	Tim Tung	11/21/26	Shall be active in a business organization representing the business community located within the City. Term: 2-years
8	Mayor	VACANT Term Expired 1/25/23 - Holdover Member Bartolomy Pantoja,	1/25/25	Shall be active in a labor organization. Term: 2-years
9	Mayor	VACANT	11/21/26	Shall be active in a community organization. Term: 2-years

Exclusions: No employee or official of the City shall be appointed to the Committee. No vendor, contractor, or consultant of the City that performs work funded by bonds issued by the City shall be appointed to the Committee. No appointee shall serve more than two terms.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS (BOS) APPLICATION FORMS AVAILABLE HERE

- English https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/vacancy_application.pdf
- 中文 https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/vacancy application CHI.pdf
- Español https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/vacancy_application_SPA.pdf
- Filipino https://sfbos.org/sites/default/files/vacancy_application_FIL.pdf

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

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 Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee shall actively review and report on the expenditure of taxpayers' money and inform the public concerning the expenditure of general obligation bond proceeds.

The Committee shall consist of nine (9) members:

- Three (3) members appointed by the Board of Supervisors:
 - 1. One (1) shall be active in a business organization representing the business community located within the City
 - 2. One (1) shall be active in a labor organization
 - 3. One (1) shall be active in a community organization
- Three (3) members appointed by the Mayor:
 - 1. One 1) shall be active in a business organization representing the business community located within the City
 - 2. One (1) shall be active in a labor organization
 - 3. One (1) shall be active in a community organization
- Two (2) members appointed by the Controller:
 - 1. One (1) with expertise in auditing governmental financial statements or with expertise in public finance law
 - 2. One (1) with expertise in construction management
- One (1) member shall be a member of the Civil Grand Jury or a designee appointed by the Civil Grand Jury.

Exclusions:

No employee or official of the City shall be appointed to the Committee. No vendor, contractor, or consultant of the City that performs work funded by bonds issued by the City shall be appointed to the committee. Each member shall serve for a term of two years and for no more than two consecutive terms.

Reports:

The Committee shall issue regular reports on the results of its activities. A report shall be issued at least once a year.

Holdover Limit: Not Applicable

Page 4

Authority: Administrative Code, Sections 5.30-5.36 (Proposition F, March 2002 Election)

Sunset Date: None

Contact: Natasha Mihal

Office of the City Controller

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 316

San Francisco, CA 94102

(415) 554-7429

CGOBOC.committee@sfgov.org

Updated: June 12, 2025



Gender Analysis San Francisco Commissions and Boards FY 2020-2021

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



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



Dear Honorable Mayor London N. Breed and Board of Supervisors:

Please find attached the 2021 Gender Analysis of Commissions and Boards Report. We are pleased to share that under Mayor Breed's leadership, representation of women, people of color, and women of color on policy bodies continues to increase. Mayoral appointments are more diverse based on gender and race compared to both supervisorial appointments and appointments in general.

Overall, policy bodies have a larger percentage of women, members of the LGBTQIA+ community, and Veterans¹ than the general San Francisco population. The percentage of women of color and people with disabilities appointed to policy bodies is near equal to the general population. Fiscal year 2020-2021 saw the largest increase in 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 8 percent of appointees compared to 2.4 percent of the general San Francisco population, and Black men are 4 percent of appointees compared to 2.5 percent of the general San Francisco population. Additionally, almost 1-in-4 appointees who responded to the survey question identify as a member of the LGBTQIA+ community.

Commissions that oversee the largest budgets have members of the LGBTQIA+ community, people with disabilities, and Veterans represented at higher percentages than the general population.

While San Francisco continues to make strides in diversity, there is still work to do in achieving parity of representation for Latinx and Asian groups in appointed positions overall, as well as women, 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 diversity categories, including for positions of influence and authority.

Thank you to 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.

Kimberly Ellis, Director of the Department on the Status of Women

en alli-

¹ "Veterans" refers to people who have served and/or have an immediate family member who has served in the military.

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	1
II. Findings	2
I. Introduction	2
B. Race and Ethnicity	
C. Race and Ethnicity by Gender	8
D. LGBTQIA+ Identity	1C
E. Disability Status	
F. Veteran Status	12
G. Policy Bodies by Budget	14
H. Comparison of Advisory Body, Commission, and Board Demographics	16
I. Demographics of Mayoral, Supervisorial, and Total Appointees	17
J. Religious Affiliations	
III. Methodology and Limitations	19
IV. Conclusion	
V. Appendix	23
VI. Acknowledgements	29

Table of Figures

Figure 1: Summary Data of Policy Body Demographics, 2021	2
Figure 2: 12-Year Comparison of Representation of Women on Policy Bodies	2
Figure 3: Commissions and Boards with Highest Percentages of Women, 2021 Compared to 2017 and 2019	3
Figure 4: Commissions and Boards with Lowest Percentage of Women, 2021 Compared to 2017 and 2019	4
Figure 5: Advisory Bodies with the Highest Percentage of Women, 2021	4
Figure 6: 10-Year Comparison of Representation of People of Color on Policy Bodies	5
Figure 7: Race and Ethnicity of Appointees Compared to San Francisco Population, 2021	6
Figure 8: Commissions and Boards with Highest Percentage of People of Color, 2021 Compared to 2019 and 2017	7
Figure 9: Commissions and Boards with Lowest Percentage of People of Color, 2021 Compared to 2019 and 2017	7
Figure 10: 10-Year Comparison of Representation of Women of Color on Policy Bodies	8
Figure 11: Appointees by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 2021	9
Figure 12: San Francisco Population by Race/Ethnicity, 2019	9
Figure 13: LGBTQIA+ Identity of Appointees, 2021	10
Figure 14: LGBTQIA+ Population of Appointees, 2019	11
Figure 15: Disability Status of Appointees, 2021	11
Figure 16: Appointees with One or More Disabilities by Gender Identity, 2021	12
Figure 17: San Francisco Adult Population with Military Service by Gender, 2019	13
Figure 18: Appointees with Military Service, 2021	13
Figure 19: Appointees with Military Service by Gender, 2021	14
Figure 20: Percent of Women, Women of Color, and People of Color on Commissions and Boards v Largest and Smallest Budgets in Fiscal Year 2020-2021	
Figure 21: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Largest Budgets, 2021	15
Figure 22: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Smallest Budgets, 2021	16
Figure 23: Demographics of Appointees on Commission and Boards and Advisory Bodies, 2021	17
Figure 24: Demographics of Mayoral, Supervisorial, and Total Appointees, 2021	18
Figure 25: Religious Affiliations of Appointees, 2021	19
Figure 26: Policy Body Demographics, 2021	23
Figure 27: San Francisco Population Estimates by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 2017	28

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 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 2021 Gender Analysis of Commissions and Boards Report (2021 Gender Analysis Report) evaluates representation of the following groups across appointments to San Francisco policy bodies:

- Women
- People of color
- LGBTQIA+ individuals
- People with disabilities
- Veterans (or people who have immediate family members that have served)
- Various religious affiliations

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 92 policy bodies and from a total of 349 members, mostly appointed by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. The policy bodies surveyed for the 2021 Gender Analysis Report fall under two categories designated by the San Francisco Office of the City Attorney.² The first category, referred to as "Commissions and Boards," are policy bodies with decision-making authority and whose members are required to submit financial disclosures to the Ethics Commission. The second category, referred to as "Advisory Bodies," are policy bodies with advisory function whose members do not submit financial disclosures to the Ethics Commission. The report examines policy bodies and appointees both comprehensively as a whole and separately by the two categories.

Several changes were made to the survey questions for the 2021 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 also expanded to include individuals with close family members that have served in the military and armed forces. This addition to Veteran Status was adopted based on feedback from previous reports.

While the overall number of policy bodies that submitted data increased compared to 2019, the total number of individual members who participated in the survey was dramatically less than the number who participated in 2019. Due to the pandemic, data collection methods

² "Sec. 3.1-103. Filing Officers." *American Legal Publishing Corporation*, https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/sf_campaign/0-0-0-979.


were limited compared to previous years, including the ability to conduct paper surveys and in-person meetings. Reliance on online surveying significantly reduced the level of participation, despite three to five direct contact efforts with policy bodies via phone and email. Moving forward, in addition to collecting data through paper/in-person surveys, when possible, the Department on the Status of Women recommends that all policy body appointees be required to take a training on the Gender Analysis survey process, alongside the required Ethics training, to guarantee participation.

Similarly, due to census data not being collected during COVID-19, updated demographic information on the general population of San Francisco was not available for years more recent than 2019. In this report, data on the San Francisco population references data from previous years (2015-2019) populations.

Key Findings

Gender


- Women's representation on policy bodies is 55%, above parity with the San Francisco female population of 49%.
- FY 2021 oversaw the largest increase in the representation of women on San Francisco policy bodies since 2009.



Race and Ethnicity


- The representation of people of color on policy bodies is 54%. Comparatively, in San Francisco, 62% of the population identifies with a race other than white.
- While the overall representation of people of color has increased since the 2019 report at 50%, representation has still decreased compared to 57% 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 15% of the population but make up only 9% of appointees. Asian individuals are 36% of the population but make up only 26% of appointees.



Race and Ethnicity by Gender

- On the whole, women of color are 32% of the San Francisco population and 32% of appointees. This 4% increase is the highest representation of women of color appointees to date.
- Meanwhile, men of color are underrepresented at 21% of appointees compared to 31% of the San Francisco population.



- Both white women and men are overrepresented on San Francisco policy bodies. White women are 25% of appointees compared to 17% of the San Francisco population. White men are 21% of appointees compared to 20% of the population.
- Black and African American women and men are well-represented on San Francisco policy bodies. Black women are 8% of appointees compared to 2.4% of the population, and Black men are 4% of appointees compared to 2.5% of the population.
- Latinx women are 7% of the San Francisco population but 4% of appointees, and Latinx men are 7% of the population but 4% of appointees.
- Asian women are 17% of the San Francisco population but 15% of appointees, and Asian men are 15% of the population but 11% of appointees.

Additional Demographics

- Out of the 74% of appointees who responded to the survey question on LGBTQIA+ identity, 23% identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, nonbinary, queer, or questioning, and 77% of appointees identify as straight/heterosexual.
- Out of the 70% of appointees who responded to the question on Disability Status, 12.6% identify as having one or more disabilities, which is just above parity of the 12% of the adult population with a Disability Status in San Francisco.
- Out of the 67% of appointees who responded to the question on Veteran Status, 22% have served in the military (or have an immediate family member who has served) compared to 3% of the San Francisco population (census data on military service does not include immediate family members who have served).

Proxies for Influence: Budget and Authority

- Although women are half of all appointees, those Commissions and Boards with the largest budgets have fewer women, and especially fewer women of color. Meanwhile, representation of women on Boards and Commissions with the smallest budgets are just below parity with the San Francisco population.
- Although still underrepresented relative to the San Francisco population, there is a larger percentage of people of color on Commissions and Boards with both the largest and smallest budgets compared to overall appointees.
- The percentage of total women is greater on Advisory Bodies than Commissions and Boards. Women are 60% of appointees on Advisory Bodies and 53% of appointees on Commissions and Boards. The percentage of women of color on Advisory Bodies is also higher than on Commissions and Boards.

Appointing Authorities

 Mayoral appointments include 60% women, 59% people of color, and 37% women of color, which is more diverse by gender and race compared to both Supervisorial appointments and total appointments.

Demographics of Appointees Compared to the San Francisco Population

	Women	People of Color	Women of Color	LGBTQIA+	Disability Status	Veteran Status
San Francisco Population**	49%	62%	32%	6%-15%*	12%	2.7%
Total Appointees	55%	54%	32%	23%	13%	22%
10 Largest Budgeted Commissions and Boards	43%	44%	21%	16%	15%	20%
10 Smallest Budgeted Commissions and Boards	48%	43%	29%	17%	9%	12%
Commissions and Boards	53%	53%	30%	18%	11%	21%
Advisory Bodies	60%	53%	33%	31%	15%	20%

San Francisco population estimates come from the 2017 and 2018 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, SF DOSW Data Collection and Analysis Report, 2021.

^{*}Note: Estimates vary by source. See page 16 for a detailed breakdown.

^{**}Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, updated data is unavailable for race/ethnicity, LGBTQIA+ status, Disability Status, and Veteran Status in 2021. Therefore, the data used to represent the San Francisco population is from the 2019 Gender Analysis Report.

I. Introduction

Inspired by the fourth U.N. World Conference on Women in Beijing, San Francisco became the first city in the world to adopt a local ordinance reflecting the principles of the U.N. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), an international bill of rights for women. The CEDAW Ordinance was passed unanimously by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and signed into law by Mayor Willie L. Brown, Jr. on April 13, 1998.³ 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 Race 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. Since 1998, the Department on the Status of Women has employed this tool to analyze the operations of 10 City Departments using a gender lens.

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

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

The 2021 Gender Analysis Report examines the representation of women, people of color, LGBTQIA+ individuals, people with disabilities, Veterans, and religious affiliations of appointees on San Francisco policy bodies. As was the case for the 2019 Gender Analysis Report, this year's analysis involved increased outreach to policy bodies as compared to previous analyses that were 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, referred to as "Commissions and Boards," are policy bodies with decision-making authority and whose members are required to submit financial disclosures to the Ethics Commission. The second category, referred to as "Advisory Bodies," are policy bodies with advisory function whose members do not submit financial disclosures to the Ethics Commission. A detailed description of methodology and limitations can be found on page 27.

³ San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 33.A.

http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/administrative/chapter33alocalimplementationoftheunited?

f=templates\$fn=default.htm\$3.0\$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca\$anc=JD_Chapter33A.

II. Findings

Many aspects of San Francisco's diversity are reflected in the overall population of appointees on San Francisco policy bodies. The analysis includes data from 92 policy bodies, of which 788 of the 979 seats are filled, leaving 20% vacant. As outlined below in Figure 1, slightly more than half of appointees are women and people of color, 32% are women of color, 23% identify as LGBTQIA+, 13% have a disability, and 22% are Veterans.

Figure 1: Summary Data of Policy Body Demographics, 2021


Appointee Demographics	Percentage of Appointees
Women (n=349)	55%
People of Color (n=341)	54%
Women of Color (n=341)	32%
LGBTQIA+ Identifying (n=334)	23%
People with Disabilities (n=349)	13%
Veteran Status (n=349)	22%

However, further analysis reveals underrepresentation of particular groups. Subsequent sections present comprehensive data analysis providing comparison to previous years, detailing the variables of gender, race/ethnicity, LGBTQIA+ identity, Disability Status, Veteran Status, religious affiliations, and policy body characteristics of budget size, decision-making authority, and appointment authority.

A. Gender

On San Francisco policy bodies, 55% of appointees identify as women, which is above parity compared to the San Francisco female population of 49%. The representation of women remained stable at 49% from 2013 until 2017, with a slight increase to 51% in 2019. This increase could be partly due to the larger sample size used in the 2019 analysis compared to previous years. A 12-year comparison shows that the representation of women appointees has gradually increased since 2009 by a total of ten percentage points.

Figure 2: 12-year Comparison of Representation of Women on Policy Bodies



Figures 3 and 4 analyze Commissions and Boards. Figure 3 showcases the five Commissions and Boards with the highest representation of women appointees as compared to 2017 and 2019. 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 Aging and Adult Services Commission, Health Commission, and Library Commission are all at 71%, respectively.

Figure 3: Commissions and Boards with the Highest Percentages of Women, 2021 Compared to 2017 and 2019

Policy Body	Percent of Women	Response Rate	2019 Percent	2017 Percent
Commission on the Status of Women	100%	100%	100%	100%
Arts Commission	79%	100%	67%	60%
Children and Families (First 5) Commission	75%	75%	100%	100%
Aging and Adult Services Commission	71%	86%	57%	40%
Health Commission	71%	100%	43%	29%
Library Commission	71%	100%	71%	80%

Out of the Commissions and Boards in this section, 6 have 40% or less women. The Commissions and Boards with the lowest representation of women are displayed in Figure 4. The lowest percentage is found on the Board of Examiners, which has 90% of responses from the Board, but 0 members identifying as women. Unfortunately, demographic data is unavailable for the Board of Examiners for 2017, however there was 0% of female representation in 2019 as well. The Police Commission, Human Services Commission, and Access Appeals Commission all have entirely completed the demographics survey at 100%, yet still have some of the lowest percentages of women at 20%. It should be noted that policy bodies with a small number of members, such as the Residential Users Appeal Board (which currently has two members), means that minimal changes in its demographic composition greatly impacts percentages. Additionally, several policy bodies had low response rates to the demographics survey, ultimately impacting the representation for their respective policy body accordingly.

Figure 4: Commissions and Boards with Lowest Percentage of Women, 2021 Compared to 2017 and 2019

Policy Body	Percent of Women	Response Rate	2019 Percent	2017 Percent
Residential Users Appeal Board	0%	50%	0%	N/A
Board of Examiners	0%	90%	0%	N/A
Assessment Appeals Board No. 3	0%	67%	50%	N/A
Assessment Appeals Board No. 2	0%	100%	50%	N/A
Rent Board Commission	10%	60%	44%	30%
Small Business Commission	14%	43%	43%	43%
Retirement System Board	14%	57%	43%	43%
Health Service Board	14%	43%	33%	29%
Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee	14%	14%	50%	N/A
Treasure Island Development Authority	17%	50%	50%	43%
Public Utilities Commission	20%	60%	67%	40%
Police Commission	20%	100%	43%	29%

Figure 4: Commissions and Boards with Lowest Percentage of Women, 2021 Compared to 2017 and 2019, Continued

Policy Body	Percent of Women	Response Rate	2019 Percent	2017 Percent
Human Services Commission	20%	100%	40%	20%
Access Appeals Commission	20%	100%	N/A	N/A
Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board	25%	75%	33%	33%
Ethics Commission	25%	25%	100%	33%

^{*}Commission and Boards with 70% response rates or higher are highlighted in grey.

In addition to Commissions and Boards, Advisory Bodies were examined for the highest and lowest percentages of women. This is the second year such bodies have been included, thus comparison to previous years before 2019 is unavailable. Figure 5 below displays the five Advisory Bodies with the highest representations of women. Due to a lack of survey responses from several Advisory Bodies, analysis on the five lowest representations of women is unavailable. The Office of Early Care and Education Citizens' Advisory Committee has the greatest representation of women at 67%, followed closely by the Citizen's Committee on Community Development at 63%.

Figure 5: Advisory Bodies with the Highest Percentage of Women, 2021

Policy Body	Percent of Women	Response Rate	2019 Percent	
Office of Early Care and Education Citizens' Advisory Committee	67%	78%	89%	
Citizens' Committee on Community Development	63%	63%	75%	
Ballot Simplification Committee	50%	75%	75%	
Immigrant Rights Commission	43%	57%	54%	
Municipal Green Building Task Force	43%	67%	50%	

B. Race and Ethnicity

Data on racial and ethnic identity was collected from 341 participants, or 98% of the surveyed appointees. Although half of appointees identify as a race or ethnicity other than white or Caucasian, people of color are still underrepresented compared to the San Francisco population of 62%. The representation of people of color has increased since 2009 but has decreased following 2015. The number of appointees analyzed increased substantially in 2017 and 2019, as compared to 2015. These larger data samples have coincided with smaller percentages of people of color.




Figure 6: 12-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 7. This analysis reveals underrepresentation and overrepresentation in San Francisco policy bodies for certain racial and ethnic groups. Nearly half of all appointees are white, an overrepresentation by 6 percentage points. The Black community is represented on appointed policy bodies at 11% compared to 6% of the population of San Francisco.⁴ This is a decrease of representation compared to the 14% representation in 2019. 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 San Francisco population has declined over the same period.⁵

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

⁵ Samir Gambhir and Stephen Menendian, "Racial Segregation in the Bay Area, Part 2," Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society (2018).

Considerably underrepresented racial and ethnic groups on San Francisco policy bodies compared to the San Francisco population are individuals who identify as Asian or Latinx. While the Asian population is 36% of the San Francisco population, they make up 26% of appointees. While the Latinx population of San Francisco is 15%, 9% of appointees are Latinx. Although there is a small population of Native Americans and Alaska Natives in San Francisco of 0.4%, only one (0.3%) surveyed appointee identified themselves as such. The San Francisco population of Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders is 0.3%, which slightly less than the 0.6% of identifying appointees.




Figure 7: Race and Ethnicity of Appointees Compared to San Francisco Population, 2021

Note: Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, updated data is unavailable for race/ethnicity in 2021. Therefore, the data used to represent the San Francisco population is from the 2019 Gender Analysis Report.

The next two figures illustrate Commissions and Boards with the highest and lowest percentages of people of color. As shown in Figure 8, the Commission on the Status of Women holds the highest representation of people of color at 86%, with a 100% response rate. Both the Health Commission and Juvenile Probation Commission have decreased their percentages of people of color since 2019 and 2017.

Figure 8: Commission and Boards with Highest Percentage of People of Color, 2021 Compared to 2019 and 2017

Policy Body	Percent of POC	Response Rate	2019 Percent	2017 Percent
Commission on the Status of Women	86%	100%	71%	71%
Police Commission	80%	100%	71%	71%
Arts Commission	71%	100%	60%	53%
Health Commission	71%	100%	86%	86%
Library Commission	71%	100%	57%	60%
Juvenile Probation Commission	67%	83%	100%	86%
Board of Appeals	60%	100%	40%	40%
Fire Commission	60%	100%	40%	60%
Human Services Commission	60%	100%	40%	60%
Asian Art Commission	54%	81%	59%	59%
Assessment Appeals Board No.2	50%	100%	63%	N/A
Children and Families (First 5) Commission	50%	75%	75%	63%

There are 28 Commissions and Boards that have 40% or less appointees who identified a racial and ethnic category other than white. None of the current appointees of the Access Appeals Commission identified as people of color. Additionally, the Historic Preservation Commission remains at 14% representation since 2019. The Citizens General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee and Assessment Appeals Board No.1 are both at 17% representation for people of color. Lastly, the Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board had a large drop in representation of people of color going from 67% in 2019 to 25% this year.

Figure 9: Commissions and Boards with Lowest Percentage of People of Color, 2021 Compared to 2019 and 2017

Policy Body	Percent of POC	Response Rate*	2019 Percent	2017 Percent
Residential Users Appeal Board	0%	50%	50%	N/A
Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee	0%	14%	75%	N/A
Building Inspection Commission	0%	50%	14%	14%
Access Appeals Commission	0%	100%	N/A	N/A
Small Business Commission	14%	43%	43%	50%
Historic Preservation Commission	14%	71%	14%	17%
Health Service Board	14%	43%	50%	29%
Citizens General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee	17%	100%	N/A	N/A
Assessment Appeals Board No.1	17%	100%	20%	N/A
War Memorial Board of Trustees	18%	45%	18%	18%
Public Utilities Commission	20%	60%	0%	33%
Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board	25%	75%	67%	67%

Figure 9: Commissions and Boards with Lowest Percentage of People of Color, 2021 Compared to 2019 and 2017, Continued


Policy Body	Percent of POC	Response Rate*	2019 Percent	2017 Percent
Ethics Commission	25%	25%	50%	67%
Retirement System Board	29%	57%	29%	29%
Recreation and Park Commission	29%	43%	43%	43%
Rent Board Commission	30%	60%	33%	50%

Commission and Boards with 70% response rates or higher are highlighted in grey.

C. Race and Ethnicity by Gender

Both white men and women are overrepresented on San Francisco policy bodies, while Asian and Latinx men and women are underrepresented. The representation of women of color at 32% is equal to the San Francisco population of 32%, which is a notable increase compared to the 2019 percentage of 28%. Meanwhile, men of color are 21% of appointees compared to 31% of the San Francisco population.

Figure 10: 12-Year Comparison of Representation of Women of Color on Policy Bodies



The following figures present the breakdown for appointees and the San Francisco population by race, ethnicity, and gender. Both white men and women are overrepresented, holding 24% and 20% of appointments, respectively, compared to 20% and 17% of the population. Asian men and women are slightly underrepresented with Asian women making up 15% of appointees compared to 17% of the population, while Asian men comprise 11% of appointees and 15% of the population. Latinx men and women are also slightly underrepresented, with Latinx men and women comprising 4% of appointees each and 7% of the population each. Black men and women are well-represented with Black women comprising 8% of appointees, compared to 2.4% of the general San Francisco population, and Black men comprising 4% of appointees,

compared to 2.5% of the general San Francisco population. Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander men and women, and multiracial women are below parity with the population. Similarly, although Native American and Alaska Native men and women make up only 0.4% of San Francisco's population, only one (0.3%) of the surveyed appointees identified as such.





Figure 11: Appointees by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 2021





D. LGBTQIA+ Identity

LGBTQIA+ identity data was collected from 334 participants, or 96% of the surveyed appointees. This is a notable increase in data on LGBTQIA+ identity compared to previous reports. Due to limited and outdated information on the population of the LGBTQIA+ community in San Francisco, it is difficult to adequately assess the representation of the LGBTQIA+ community. However, compared to available San Francisco, greater Bay Area, and national data, the LGBTQIA+ community is well represented on San Francisco policy bodies. Recent research estimates the California LGBTQIA+ population is 5.3%. The LGBTQIA+ population of the San Francisco and greater Bay Area is estimated to rank the highest of U.S. cities at 6.2%,7 while a 2006 survey found that 15.4% of adults in San Francisco identify as LGBTQIA+8.

Of the appointees who responded to this question, 23% identify as LGBTQIA+ and 77% identify as straight or heterosexual. Of the LGBTQIA+ appointees, 56% identify as gay/lesbian, 20% as bisexual, 9% as queer, 9% as transgender, 2% as questioning, and 4% as other LGBTQIA+ identities. Data on LGBTQIA+ identity by race was not captured. Efforts to capture data on LGBTQIA+ identity by race for future reports would enable more intersectional analysis.




Figure 13: LGBTQIA+ Identity of Appointees, 2021

⁷ Gary J. Gates and Frank Newport, "San Francisco Metro Area Ranks Highest in LBGT Percentage," GALLUP (March 20, 2015) https://news.gallup.com/poll/182051/san-francisco-metro-area-ranks-highest-

⁶ https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/publications/adult-lgbt-pop-us/

 $lgbtpercentage. as px? utm_source=Social \% 20 Issues \& utm_medium=news feed \& utm_campaign=tiles.$

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 14: LGBTQIA+ Population of Appointees, 2021

E. Disability Status

Overall, more than one in twenty adults in San Francisco live with one or more disabilities. Data on Disability Status was obtained from nearly 100% of the appointees who participated in the survey. 12.6% of participating appointees reported to have one or more disabilities. Of these appointees with one or more disabilities, 56% are women, 30% are men, 2% are trans women, 5% are trans men, and 7% are nonbinary individuals.




Figure 15: Disability Status of Appointees, 2021




Figure 16: Appointees with One or More Disabilities by Gender Identity, 2021

F. Veteran Status

Overall, 2.7% of the adult population in San Francisco have served in the military. Data on Veteran status was obtained from 334 appointees who participated in the survey. Of the 334 appointees who responded to this question, 22% served in the military. Men comprise 47.2% and women make up 51.4% of the total number of Veteran appointees. Of participating appointees, 1.4% are nonbinary individuals. Veteran status data on transgender and gender-nonconforming individuals in San Francisco is currently unavailable. The vast increase of appointees with military service compared to 2019's 7.1% of appointees is likely due to the change in wording in the 2021 Gender Analysis Report from previous years, which defines an appointee with Veteran status as someone with a spouse or direct family member who has served, as opposed to only oneself or their spouse. This change was implemented based on feedback from prior reports. Future analyses may want to ask separate questions regarding one's personal experience with military service and one's familial ties to military service, in order to distinguish the most accurate and aggregated data results.




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

*This graph is from the 2019 Gender Analysis Report. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, updated data on the gendered population of Veterans in San Francisco is unavailable. This graph fails to identify nonbinary individuals with military experience. However, this graph highlights the gender disparity amongst male and female Veterans, with only 0.2% identifying as women.




Figure 18: Appointees with Military Service, 2021




Figure 19: Appointees with Military Service by Gender, 2021

G. Policy Bodies by Budget

This 2021 Gender Analysis Report examines the demographic representativeness of policy bodies by budget size. Budget size is used as a proxy for influence. Although this report has expanded the scope of analysis to include more policy bodies compared to previous reports, this section of analysis was limited to Commissions and Boards with decision-making authority and whose members file financial disclosures with the Ethics Commission.

Overall, appointees from the 10 **largest** budgeted Commissions and Boards are 44% people of color, 43% women, and 21% women of color. Appointees from the 10 **smallest** budgeted Commissions and Boards are 43% people of color, 48% women, and 29% women of color.

Representation for women, women of color, and overall people of color is below parity with the population on both the 10 smallest and 10 largest budgeted bodies. The representation of women and women of color is greater on smaller budgeted policy bodies by 5% and 8%, respectively. The representation of people of color is 1% higher on Commissions and Boards with the largest budgets.






Figure 21: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Largest Budgets, 2021

Policy Body	FY20-21 Budget	Total Seats	Filled Seats	Response Rate	Women	Women of Color	People of Color
Health Commission	\$2.7B	7	7	100%	71%	43%	71%
Public Utilities Commission	\$1.43B	5	5	60%	20%	20%	20%
Airport Commission	\$1.37B	5	5	100%	40%	0%	40%
MTA Board of Directors and Parking Authority Commission	\$1.26B	7	6	50%	33%	33%	50%
Human Services Commission	\$604M	5	5	100%	20%	0%	60%
Aging and Adult Services Commission	\$435M	7	7	86%	71%	29%	43%
Fire Commission	\$414M	5	5	100%	40%	20%	60%
Library Commission	\$341B	7	7	100%	71%	43%	71%
Recreation and Park Commission	\$231.6M	7	7	43%	29%	14%	29%
Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee	\$171.5M	11	7	14%	14%	0%	0%
Total	\$8.9B	66	61	74%	58%	29%	60%

Figure 22: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Smallest Budgets, 2021

Policy Body	FY20-21 Budget	Total Seats	Filled Seats	Response Rate	Women	Women of Color	People of Color
Commission on the Status of Women	\$9M	7	7	100%	100%	86%	86%
Ethics Commission	\$6.5M	5	4	25%	25%	25%	25%
Small Business Commission	\$3.5M	7	7	43%	14%	0%	14%
Film Commission	\$1.5M	11	11	100%	45%	27%	45%
Civil Service Commission	\$1.3M	5	5	100%	60%	20%	40%
Entertainment Commission	\$1.2M	7	7	100%	29%	14%	43%
Board of Appeals	\$1.2M	5	5	100%	40%	20%	60%
Assessment Appeals Board No.1	\$701,348	8	6	100%	50%	0%	17%
Local Agency Formation Commission	\$427,685	7	4	50%	50%	50%	50%
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	\$172,373	11	9	89%	56%	44%	44%
Total	\$25.5M	73	65	86%	56%	35%	51%

H. Comparison of Advisory Body and Commission and Board Demographics

The comparison of the two policy body categories in this section provides another proxy for influence. Commissions and Boards whose members file disclosures of economic interest have greater decision-making authority in San Francisco than Advisory Bodies whose members do not file economic interest disclosures. The percentages of total women, LGBTQIA+ people, people with disabilities, and women of color are larger for total appointees on Advisory Bodies. However, the percentages of Veterans on Commissions and Boards slightly exceeds the percentage on Advisory Bodies, and both Commissions and Boards and Advisory Bodies have 53% people of color.




Figure 23: Demographics of Appointees on Commission and Boards and Advisory Bodies. 2021

I. Demographics of Mayoral, Supervisorial, and Total Appointees

Figure 24 compares the representation of women, women of color, and people of color for appointments made by the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and by the total of all approving authorities combined. Mayoral appointments are more diverse, and consist of more women, women of color, and people of color compared to Supervisorial appointments. Mayoral appointments include 60% women, 37% women of color, and 59% people of color, while Supervisorial appointments are 56% women, 36% women of color, and 58% people of color. The total of all approving authorities combined average out at 55% women, 32% women of color, and 54% people of color. This disparity in diversity between Mayoral and Supervisorial appointments may be due in part 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"), whereas the Mayor typically has the ability to take total appointments into account during selections, and can therefore better address gaps in diversity.




Figure 24: Demographics of Mayoral, Supervisorial, and Total Appointees, 2021

J. Religious Affiliations

The 2021 Gender Analysis Report collected data on religious affiliations to fully examine the demographics and representation of appointees. This is the first-year religious affiliations have been examined. Figure 25 illustrates the religious demographics of appointees, with the largest number of appointees identifying as Christian (30%), and the smallest number of appointees identifying as Hindu (1%) or Muslim (1%).




Figure 25: Religious Affiliations of Appointees, 2021

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 2021 Gender Analysis Report reflects data from the policy bodies that provided information to the Department on the Status of Women through digital survey. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the normal outreach method of paper surveys and in-person meetings was unavailable, ultimately leaving all survey outreach and correspondence to be conducted online. Unfortunately, obtaining the data strictly online had a significant negative impact on participation rates. Following initial email outreach, policy bodies were contacted three to five times via email and phone, including two emails to Department Heads from Department on the Status of Women Director, Kimberly Ellis. All possible measures were taken to obtain accurate and complete data. While participation rates are lower than the 2019 Gender Analysis Report, this report features the most diverse individual responses, as well as participation of the largest number of Commission and Boards and Advisory Bodies to date.

Data was requested from 109 policy bodies and acquired from 92 of those bodies, a total of 349 appointees. Comparatively, the 2019 Gender Analysis Report received data from 84 policy bodies (380 Commission and Boards and 389 Advisory Bodies), a total of 741 total appointees. A Commissioner or Board member's gender identity, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, Disability Status, Veteran Status, or religious affiliations were among data elements collected on a *voluntary* basis. Therefore, responses were incomplete or unavailable for some appointees but are included to the extent possible.

As the fundamental objective of this report is to surface patterns of underrepresentation, every attempt has been made to reflect accurate and complete information in this report. Data for some policy bodies was incomplete, and all appointees who responded were included in the total demographic categories. Only policy bodies with full data on gender and race for all appointees were included in sections comparing demographics of individual bodies. It should be noted that for policy bodies with a small number of members, the change of a single individual greatly impacts the percentages of demographic categories. This should be kept in mind when interpreting these percentages.

Several changes were made to the survey questions since the 2019 Gender Analysis Report with the goal of distinguishing all possible areas of underrepresentation. In addition to updating SOGI (sexual orientation and gender identity) categories to align with the latest classifications used by the Office of Transgender Initiatives, the 2021 Gender Analysis Report expanded its classification of Veteran Status to include individuals with close family members that have served, as opposed to only oneself or their spouse. This addition to Veteran Status was adopted based on feedback from previous reports.

As acquiring data was the biggest limitation of this report, 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 paper/in-person survey outreach for future reports.

The surveyed policy bodies fall under two categories designated by the San Francisco Office of the City Attorney document entitled List of City Boards, Commissions, and Advisory Bodies Created by Charter, Ordinance, or Statute.⁹ This document separates San Francisco policy bodies into two different categories. The first category includes Commissions and Boards with decision-making authority and whose members are required to submit financial disclosures with the Ethics Commission. 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. Due to census data not being collected during COVID-19, updated demographic information on the general population of San Francisco was not available for years more recent than 2019. Comparisons of 2021 demographic data to data on the San Francisco population reference population data from previous years (2015-2019) and will be noted as such. Figures 26 and 27 in the Appendix display these population estimates by race/ethnicity and gender.

20

[&]quot;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).

Since the first Gender Analysis of Commissions and Boards in 2007, the representation of women appointees on San Francisco policy bodies has gradually increased. The 2021 Gender Analysis Report finds the percentage of women appointees is 55%, which exceeds the population of women in San Francisco.

When appointee demographics are analyzed by gender and race, the representation of women of color has increased to 32%, which is 4% higher than 2019 representation, matching the San Francisco population. Most notably, underrepresented are individuals identifying as Asian, making up 36% of the San Francisco population but only 26% of appointees, and Latinx-identifying individuals who make up 15% of the population but only 9% of appointees. Additionally, men of color are underrepresented at 21% of appointees relative to their San Francisco population, 31%.

Furthermore, when analyzing the demographic composition of larger and smaller budgeted Commissions and Boards, women of color are underrepresented on Commission and Boards with both the largest and smallest budgets. Women comprise 43% of total appointees on the largest budgeted policy bodies compared to the population of 49%, and women of color comprise 21% of total appointees on the largest budgeted policy bodies, with the San Francisco population at 32%. Comparatively, women are 48% of total appointees on the smallest budgeted policy bodies, and women of color are 29% of appointees. However, the representation of people of color is higher on larger budgeted policy bodies by 1%. People of color make up 44% of appointees on the largest budgeted policy bodies and 43% of appointees on the smallest budgeted policy bodies compared to 54% of total appointees. The San Francisco population of people of color exceeds these percentages at 62%.

In addition to using budget size as a proxy for influence, this report analyzed demographic characteristics of appointees on Commissions and Boards who file disclosures of economic interest and have decision-making authority and appointees on Advisory Bodies who do not file economic interest disclosures. Over half (60%) of appointees on Advisory Bodies are women, while 53% of appointees on Commissions and Boards are women. Ultimately, women comprise a higher percentage of appointees on Advisory Bodies compared to Commissions and Boards.

The 2021 Gender Analysis Report found a relatively high representation of LGBTQIA+ individuals on San Francisco policy bodies. For the appointees that provided LGBTQIA+ identity information, 23% identify as LGBTQIA+ with the largest subset identifying as gay or lesbian (56%), 16% of appointees from the largest budgeted policy bodies identify as LGBTQIA+, and 17% from the smallest budgeted bodies. However, there is a significant difference of LGBTQIA+ representation when comparing Commissions and Boards (18%) and Advisory Bodies (31%). The representation of appointees with disabilities is 13%, slightly exceeding the 12% population. Veterans are highly represented on San Francisco policy bodies at 22% compared to the Veteran population of 2.7%, which could be due to differences in each source's classification of Veteran Status.

Additionally, this report evaluates and compares the representation of women, women of color, and people of color appointees by the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and by the total of

all approving authorities combined. Mayoral appointees include 60% women, 37% women of color, and 59% people of color, which overall is more diverse by gender and race compared to both Supervisorial appointees and total appointees.

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

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 Department Interns Charly De Nocker and Brooklynn McPherson for the data collection and analysis of this report.

San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women

President Breanna Zwart Vice President Dr. Shokooh Miry Commissioner Sophia Andary Commissioner Sharon Chung Commissioner Dr. Anne Moses Commissioner Dr. Raveena Rihal Commissioner Ani Rivera

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

Appendix

Figure 26: Policy Body Demographics, 2021

Policy Body*	Total Seats	Filled Seats	FY20-21 Budget	Women	Women of Color	People of Color	Survey Response Rate
Access Appeals Commission	5	5	\$0	20%	0%	0%	100%
Advisory Committee of Street Artists and Craft Examiners	5	5	\$0	20%	20%	20%	20%
African American Reparations Committee	15	15	\$0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Aging and Adult Services Commission	7	7	\$ 435,011,663	71%	29%	43%	86%
Airport Commission	5	5	\$ 1,370,000,000	40%	0%	40%	100%
Animal Control and Welfare Commission	7	7	\$0	29%	14%	29%	43%
Arts Commission	15	14	\$ 23,762,015	79%	57%	71%	100%
Asian Art Commission	27	26	\$ 10,200,000	50%	35%	54%	81%
Assessment Appeals Board No.1	8	6	\$ -	50%	0%	17%	100%
Assessment Appeals Board No.2	8	4	\$ -	0%	0%	50%	100%
Assessment Appeals Board No.3	8	3	\$ -	0%	0%	33%	67%
Ballot Simplification Committee	5	4	\$0	50%	0%	0%	75%
Bayview Hunters Point Citizens Advisory Committee	12	8	\$0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Board of Appeals	5	5	\$ 1,177,452	40%	20%	60%	100%
Board Of Examiners	13	10	\$0	0%	0%	40%	90%
Building Inspection Commission	7	6	\$ 89,600,000	33%	0%	0%	50%
Cannabis Oversight Committee	16	16	\$0	19%	31%	38%	25%

Figure 26: Policy Body Demographics, 2021, Continued

	200,72	omog.	apriics, 2021, C	ontinaoa			
Policy Body*	Total Seats	Filled Seats	FY20-21 Budget	Women	Women of Color	People of Color	Survey Response Rate
Central Subway Community Advisory Group	21	14	\$0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Children and Families Commission (First 5)	9	8	\$ 31,019,003	75%	50%	50%	75%
Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee	11	7	\$ 171,481,507	14%	0%	0%	14%
Citizen's Advisory Committee for the Central Market Street and Tenderloin Area	9	8	\$0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Citizen's Committee on Community Development	9	8	\$ 27,755,465	63%	50%	50%	63%
Citizens General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee	9	6	\$0	50%	0%	17%	100%
City Hall Preservation Advisory Commission	5	5	\$0	0%	0%	0%	20%
Civil Service Commission	5	5	\$ 1,286,033	60%	20%	40%	100%
Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure	7	6	\$0	17%	17%	33%	50%
Commission on the Aging Advisory Council	22	14	\$0	21%	0%	0%	21%
Commission on the Environment	7	7	\$0	57%	29%	43%	86%
Commission on the Status of Women	7	7	\$ 9,089,928	100%	86%	86%	100%
Committee on Information Technology	17	17	\$ 22,934,703	12%	0%	6%	18%

Figure 26: Policy Body Demographics, 2021, Continued

Policy Body*	Total Seats	Filled Seats	FY20-21 Budget	Women	Women of Color	People of Color	Survey Response Rate
Elections Commission	7	5	\$ 69,000	60%	20%	40%	100%
Entertainment Commission	7	7	\$0	29%	14%	43%	100%
Ethics Commission	5	4	\$ 6,500,000	25%	25%	25%	25%
Film Commission	11	11	\$0	45%	27%	45%	100%
Fire Commission	5	5	\$ 414,360,096	40%	20%	60%	100%
Health Commission	7	7	\$ 2,700,000,000	71%	43%	71%	100%
Health Service Board	7	7	\$ 16,500,000	14%	14%	14%	43%
Historic Preservation Commission	7	7	\$0	29%	14%	14%	71%
Historic Preservation Fund Committee	7	7	\$0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Housing Authority Commission	7	5	\$ 55,800,000	20%	20%	20%	20%
Human Rights Commission	11	9	\$ 13,618,732	0%	0%	0%	0%
Human Services Commission	5	5	\$ 604,412,630	20%	0%	60%	100%
Immigrant Rights Commission	15	14	\$0	43%	36%	50%	57%
Juvenile Probation Commission	7	6	\$0	50%	33%	67%	83%
Library Commission	7	7	\$ 341,000,000	71%	43%	71%	100%
Local Agency Formation Commission	7	4	\$ 427,685	50%	50%	50%	50%
Local Homeless Coordinating Board	9	7	\$ 54,000,000	0%	0%	0%	0%
Long Term Care Coordinating Council	40	35	\$0	9%	3%	6%	14%
Mental Health Board	17	9	\$0	0%	0%	0%	0%
MTA Board of Directors and Parking Authority Commission	7	6	\$ 1,258,700,000	33%	33%	50%	50%

Figure 26: Policy Body Demographics, 2021, Continued

Policy Body*	Total Seats	Filled Seats	FY20-21 Budget	Women	Women of Color	People of Color	Survey Response Rate
Municipal Green Building Task Force	21	21	\$0	43%	24%	29%	67%
Municipal Transportation Agency Citizens' Advisory Council	15	13	\$0	15%	8%	8%	15%
Office of Early Care and Education Citizens' Advisory Committee	9	9	\$0	67%	33%	44%	78%
Paratransit Coordinating Council	40	25	\$0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Park, Recreation, and Open Space Advisory Committee	23	19	\$0	26%	11%	11%	53%
Planning Commission	7	7	\$ 62,194,821	57%	29%	43%	71%
Police Commission	7	5	\$0	20%	20%	80%	100%
Port Commission	5	5	\$ 125,700,000	60%	40%	40%	60%
Public Utilities Citizen's Advisory Committee	17	14	\$0	21%	0%	14%	43%
Public Utilities Commission	5	5	\$ 1,433,954,907	20%	20%	20%	60%
Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board	7	4	\$0	25%	0%	25%	75%
Recreation and Park Commission	7	7	\$ 231,600,000	29%	14%	29%	43%
Reentry Council	7	5	\$0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Rent Board Commission	10	10	\$ 9,381,302	10%	0%	30%	60%
Residential Users Appeal Board	3	2	\$ 900	0%	0%	0%	50%
Retire Health Care Trust Fund Board	5	5	\$ 70,000	0%	0%	0%	0%
Retirement System Board	7	7	\$ 90,000,000	14%	14%	29%	57%
Small Business Commission	7	7	\$ 3,505,244	14%	0%	14%	43%
SoMa Community Planning Advisory Committee	11	7	\$0	0%	0%	0%	0%

Figure 26: Policy Body Demographics, 2021, Continued

Policy Body*	Total Seats	Filled Seats	FY20-21 Budget	Women	Women of Color	People of Color	Survey Response Rate
SoMa Community Stabilization Fund Community Advisory Committee	14	10	\$0	0%	0%	10%	10%
Southeast Community Facility Commission	7	7	\$0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	11	9	\$0	56%	44%	44%	89%
Sweatfree Procurement Advisory Group	11	6	\$0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Transgender Advisory Committee	14	14	\$0	0%	0%	21%	36%
Treasure Island Development Authority	7	6	\$0	17%	17%	33%	50%
Urban Forestry Council	15	14	\$0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Veterans Affairs Commission	17	16	\$ 150,000	0%	0%	0%	0%
War Memorial Board of Trustees	11	11	\$ 18,500,000	27%	18%	18%	45%
Workforce Investment Board	30	27	\$0	0%	0%	0%	0%
Youth Commission	17	17	\$0	41%	35%	71%	88%

^{*}Policy Bodies in bold are Commission and Boards, while unbolded bodies are Advisory Bodies.

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

	То	tal	Fen	nale	Male	
Race/Ethnicity	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent
San Francisco County, California	864,263	-	423,630	49%	440,633	51%
White, non-Hispanic or Latino	353,000	38%	161,381	17%	191,619	20%
Asian	295,347	31%	158,762	17%	136,585	15%
Hispanic or Latinx	131,949	14%	62,646	7%	69,303	7%
Some Other Race	64,800	7%	30,174	3%	34,626	4%
Black or African American	45,654	5%	22,311	2.4%	23,343	2.5%
Two or More Races	43,664	5%	21,110	2.2%	22,554	2.4%
Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	3,226	0.3%	1,576	0.2%	1,650	0.2%
Native American and Alaska Native	3,306	0.4%	1,589	0.2%	1,717	0.2%

San Francisco Population estimates come from the 2017 and 2018 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. *Due to unavailable updated data on San Francisco population, the data used to represent the San Francisco population is from the 2019 Gender Analysis Report.



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



Acknowledgments

The San Francisco Department on the Status of Women would like to thank the various policy body members, commission secretaries, and city staff who graciously assisted in collecting demographic data and providing information about their respective policy bodies. In particular, the Department would like to thank interns Charly De Nocker and Brooklynn McPherson for the data collection and analysis of this report.

San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women

President Breanna Zwart Vice President Dr. Shokooh Miry Commissioner Sophia Andary Commissioner Sharon Chung Commissioner Dr. Anne Moses Commissioner Dr. Raveena Rihal Commissioner Ani Rivera

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