

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Board Files #260225 and #260147  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 10, 2026 12:27:46 PM  
**Attachments:** [Letter to Board of Supervisors Opposing Pulling Streamlining Reform From Rules Committee.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see attached, from a member of the public, regarding:

File No. 260225 - Motion calling from the Rules Committee, pursuant to Board Rule 3.38, the Hearing (File No. 260147) to discuss the findings and recommendations of the Proposition E Commission Streamlining Task Force's (Task Force) Final Report, and the draft Charter Amendment, entitled "Boards, Commissions, and Advisory Bodies," which proposes to implement the Task Force's recommendations, pursuant to Charter, Section 4.100.1(e); and scheduling the Board of Supervisors to sit as a Committee of the Whole at the meeting on March 17, 2026, at 3:00 p.m. to hold a public hearing.

File No. 260147 - Hearing to discuss the findings and recommendations of the Proposition E Commission Streamlining Task Force's (Task Force) Final Report, and the draft Charter Amendment, entitled "Boards, Commissions, and Advisory Bodies," which proposes to implement the Task Force's recommendations, pursuant to Charter, Section 4.100.1(e); and requesting the City Administrator's Office to report.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public*

*documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

---

**From:** David Cherry <davenjake@icloud.com>

**Sent:** Monday, March 9, 2026 6:32 PM

**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

**Subject:** Board Files #260225 and #260147

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

The easiest way to rob a bank is to own one

## Patrick Monette-Shaw

---

975 Sutter Street, Apt. 6  
San Francisco, CA 94109  
Phone: (415) 292-6969 • e-mail: pmonette-shaw@earthlink.net

March 6, 2026

Board of Supervisors

The Honorable Raphael Mandelman, President of the Board of Supervisors  
The Honorable Connie Chan, Supervisor, District 1  
The Honorable Stephen Sherrill, Supervisor, District 2  
The Honorable Danny Sauter, Supervisor, District 3  
The Honorable Alan Wong, Supervisor, District 4  
The Honorable Bilal Mahmood, District 5  
The Honorable Matt Dorsey, Supervisor, District 6  
The Honorable Myrna Melgar, District 7  
The Honorable Jackie Fielder, Supervisor, District 9  
The Honorable Shamann Walton, Supervisor, District 10  
The Honorable Chyanne Chen, District 11

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: **Testimony on File #260225 — Motion: Committee of the Whole Hearing Prop. E Streamlining Task Force Final Report Recommendations and Legislation**

---

Dear President Mandelman and Board of Supervisors,

Regarding File #260225 *Calling from Committee - Committee of the Whole - Hearing - Proposition E Commission Streamlining Task Force Recommendations, Final Report, and Charter Amendment - March 17, 2026.*

I urge each District Supervisor to vote “No” on Supervisor Mandelman’s proposed Motion as sponsor of this misguided and premature calling of this matter from the Rules Committee.

Mandelman’s Motion invokes the Board of Supervisors “*Rules of Order*” **Rule §3.38** to permit the full Board of Supervisors to pull an item from a Committee it was assigned to.

Mandelman is invoking the Board of Supervisors “*Rules of Order*” §3.38, which permits the full Board of Supervisors to pull an item from a Committee it was assigned to, if a Motion to do so passes with a six-vote majority during a full Board meeting. Rule §3.38 is typically used to pull an item that has languished in a Committee for some length of time, or had been placed to the *Call of the Chair* in Committee.

But in this case, the matter had barely been assigned to the Rules Committee for just two days, and no hearings have been held on the subject matter, before Mandelman raced to pull it from the 30-day waiting period and hold a hearing on it by the full Board.

San Francisco's Board of Supervisors “*30-Day Rule*” in **Rule §3.22** is designed to ensure major policy legislation is not rushed, allowing time for public review, committee scrutiny, and analysis before a hearing. It prevents immediate action on significant Ordinances — usually introduced by a Supervisor or Mayor — by mandating a 30-day waiting period.

Specifically, **Rule §3.22** states that measures introduced to the Board of Supervisors that would create or *revise major City policy*, the committee to which the measure is assigned **shall not consider the measure until at least 30 days after the day of introduction of the legislation**. In addition, Board Rule §3.33 requires that a proposed amendment to the Municipal Code or Administrative Code be available to the public for seven days prior to receiving a recommendation by a Board committee.

Clearly, the Streamlining Task Force’s recommendations to drastically alter San Francisco’s board and commissions functions and responsibilities involves a “*major policy*” matter for both the Board of Supervisors, and all San Franciscans, writ large.

March 6, 2026

**Testimony on File #260225 — Motion: Committee of the Whole Hearing Prop. E Streamlining Task Force Final Report Recommendations and Legislation**

---

Page 2

On Thursday March 5, the Board of Supervisors meeting agenda for Tuesday March 10 was published on line, showing at agenda item 31 in Board File #260225 that Supervisor Mandelman has suddenly introduced a motion to pull the Commission Streamlining Task Force’s findings and recommendations from the Rules Committee back to the full Board of Supervisors for a “*Committee of the Whole Hearing*” on the report and legislation seven days later at the Board’s meeting on St. Patrick’s Day, March 17.

According to Mandelman's timeline, San Franciscans would be reduced to a 7-day to 10-day window before the Board of Supervisors hears the matter on March 17 and adopts the recommended Charter Amendment and Ordinance language, all of which would become a done deal.

The materials include the Task Force’s 134-page “*Final Report*” containing recommendations on streamlining reform of San Francisco’s boards, commissions, and policy advisory bodies, and two pieces of related legislation — the proposed 166-page Charter Amendment language for the November 2026 election, and an initial 308-page City Ordinance that would go into effect 90 days later, if it is passed rapidly on March 17.

One problem is, the legislation was quietly “*Assigned*” to the Rules Committee in Board File #260147 only on February 10 in Version 1, containing only the “*Final Report*” transmitted to the Board of Supervisors on January 27. Version 2 of the Assignment was “*Substituted and Assigned*” to the Rules Committee on Tuesday March 3, after the Board of Supervisors received the two pieces of legislation transmitted to it a month later on February 27.

Another problem is, there has been no mention of, or any notice to the public, on any of the Board of Supervisors or the Rules Committee meeting agendas that the matter had even been assigned to Rules. The Rules Committee has held no hearings on the matter, and it hasn’t been listed in the “*Legislation Under the 30-Day Rule*” pending section of the Rules Committee’s agendas.

Then on March 5, Supervisor Mandelman’s Motion to pull the matter from the Rules Committee to the full board magically appeared, just four working days *after* the Board of Supervisors received the two pieces of legislation transmitted on February 27.

This leaves no time for meaningful public participation on a thoughtful, advanced basis.

This smacks of the actions under President Trump and Elon Musk to do so-called government reform and efficiency measures under the failed DOGE *scam*. San Franciscans want “San Francisco Values” upheld, and subverting our City’s participatory governance system of board and commission checks-and-balances deserves better than the subterfuge of bypassing Rules Committee review of major policy decisions protected by Board Rule §3.22.

Vote “**No**”! Reject Mandelman’s sole-sponsor Motion in File #260225 to pull this item from the Rules Committee without proper 30-day review of a major policy decision! Allow the Rules Committee to conduct thoughtful review of the 800-plus recommendations in the Streamlining Task Force’s 134-page “*Final Report*”, and the 475 pages of its proposed legislation. Conducting review of 608 pages of recommendations from the Streamlining Task Force during a single “*Committee of the Whole*” hearing does not do justice to massively overhauling participatory democratic governance of our City.

**Vote “No”!** Allow the Rules Committee review process to play out.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

**Patrick Monette-Shaw**

*Columnist/Reporter*

*Westside Observer* Newspaper

cc: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Alisa Somera, Legislative Deputy Director, Clerk of the Board’s Office

**From:** [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)  
**Cc:** [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Board file 260225 — opposition to recommendations on Sunshine Ordinance Task Force  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 10, 2026 12:25:06 PM  
**Attachments:** [SPJNorCal-letter-SOTF.pdf](#)

---

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below and attached, from the Society of Professional Journalists, Northern California Chapter, regarding:

File No. 260225 - Motion calling from the Rules Committee, pursuant to Board Rule 3.38, the Hearing (File No. 260147) to discuss the findings and recommendations of the Proposition E Commission Streamlining Task Force's (Task Force) Final Report, and the draft Charter Amendment, entitled "Boards, Commissions, and Advisory Bodies," which proposes to implement the Task Force's recommendations, pursuant to Charter, Section 4.100.1(e); and scheduling the Board of Supervisors to sit as a Committee of the Whole at the meeting on March 17, 2026, at 3:00 p.m. to hold a public hearing.

Regards,

**Richard Lagunte**  
**Office of the Clerk of the Board**  
**San Francisco Board of Supervisors**  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163  
[bos@sfgov.org](mailto:bos@sfgov.org) | [www.sfbos.org](http://www.sfbos.org)

Pronouns: he, him, his

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

---

**From:** SPJ NorCal Freedom of Information Committee <spjnorcalfoi@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 10, 2026 8:00 AM

**To:** Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>

**Subject:** Board file 260225 — opposition to recommendations on Sunshine Ordinance Task Force

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

Dear Supervisors:

Attached please find a letter from the Society of Professional Journalists, Northern California Chapter, opposing certain recommendations of the Commission Streamlining Task Force that would weaken the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force.

Regards,

SPJ NorCal Board and Freedom of Information Committee

**Society of Professional Journalists  
Northern California Chapter**

44 Page St. Suite 504  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
www.spjnorcal.org



To the San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
Via Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Re: Opposing streamlining recommendations that weaken transparency

Dear Supervisors:

Of the five city and state entities empowered to act on violations of local and state open-meeting and public-records (“sunshine”) laws, only one – the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force – has been consistently willing to do so. The Task Force provides an avenue for members of the public and journalists to exercise their First Amendment rights and demand the government transparency that is enshrined in local, state and federal law. The Task Force provides this service free of charge, saving citizens from having to sue for remedy of such violations by city agencies or personnel, and in turn saving the city potentially millions of dollars a year in legal expense.

A set of streamlining proposals awaiting your consideration threaten to weaken this institution.

The Commission Streamlining Task Force, created by Proposition E that voters approved in November 2024, has published recommendations to include in a city Charter amendment possibly to be on the municipal ballot in November 2026. These include (1) that qualifications to serve on the SOTF as set forth in Article IV, Section 67.30(a), of the Sunshine Ordinance (Administrative Code Chapter 67) be reduced from mandatory to merely “desirable,” and be made body-level rather than seat-specific; and (2) that the authority of the Society of Professional Journalists, Northern California Chapter (SPJ NorCal) and the League of Women Voters to nominate members to specific Task Force seats be ended.

Those recommendations would, if followed, remove assurance that at least four of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force’s eleven voting members are knowledgeable on local and state sunshine laws and favor government-transparency principles, thereby reducing the ability and willingness of the Task Force to hold sunshine scofflaws accountable. This would in turn significantly increase certain costs to city government by forcing members of the public to sue for remedy of sunshine-law violations. Worse, it would weaken or remove

disincentives to city agencies and officials to make backroom deals, eroding trust in government and undermining the public's right to know.

SPJ NorCal, for whose members this transparency mechanism is essential to thorough and accurate reporting, strongly urges rejection of the Commission Streamlining Task Force's recommendations enumerated above. Further, inclusion of either or both of those recommendations in said Charter amendment proposal will constitute sufficient reason for SPJ NorCal to publicly oppose said Charter amendment.

Sincerely,

Joe Fitzgerald Rodriguez, Ida Mojada, Victor Patton, and Laura Wenus  
SPJ NorCal executive board