

File No. 2000572

Committee Item No. 2

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

# COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

## AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Rules Committee

Date June 8, 2020

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date \_\_\_\_\_

### Cmte Board

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

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

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

Completed by: Victor Young Date June 4, 2020

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



Board of Supervisors  
City and County of San Francisco  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
(415) 554-5184 FAX (415) 554-7714

Application for Boards, Commissions, Committees, & Task Forces

Name of Board, Commission, Committee, or Task Force: Ethics Commission

Seat # or Category (If applicable): Board of Supervisors District: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: Larry Bush

Home Address: [REDACTED] Street Zip: 94114

Home Phone: [REDACTED] Occupation: retired

Work Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Employer: n/a

Business Address: n/a Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Business E-Mail: \_\_\_\_\_ Home E-Mail: [REDACTED]

Pursuant to Charter Section 4.101 (a)2, Boards and Commissions established by the Charter must consist of electors (registered voters) of the City and County of San Francisco. For certain other bodies, the Board of Supervisors can waive the residency requirement.

Check All That Apply:

Registered voter in San Francisco: Yes  No  If No, where registered: \_\_\_\_\_

Resident of San Francisco  Yes  No If No, place of residence: \_\_\_\_\_

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

I am a senior aged 74, disabled with mobility handicap, and a gay man. I am a homeowner and small property owner because my home includes three apartments. I rent two and live in one. I live in the Castro (District 8) and have lived at this home since 1996 (23 years) and in San Francisco since 1984 (36 years). I have been an advocate for LGBTQ community concerns at the national level, including as first NGTF Washington liaison, was the Keynote speaker for the first National Lesbian Gay Leadership conference in Dallas in 1984, and on many San Francisco and California efforts that demonstrate my community involvement. I was a strong and public advocate for district elections to expand participation and leadership from San Francisco's diverse neighborhoods.

**Business and/or professional experience:**

I was Special Assistant to Mayor Art Agnos (1988-92) and earlier when he was an assemblyman (1984-1988). My work included establishing the membership and agenda for the Family Policy Task Force leading to more inclusive definitions of family. I was the Public Policy Committee chair of the California HIV Task Force appointed by Attorney General John VandeKamp that first proposed the Ryan White Care Act. I was the Mayors Appointee to the Steering Committee of the VI International AIDS Conference in San Francisco. I was appointed by HUD Secretary and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid to a three member task force on the foreclosure crisis. I served as HUD Supervisory Public Affairs Officer and Freedom of Information officer for California, Arizona, Hawaii and Nevada. I was a columnist for the SF Examiner, SF Chronicle, owner of CitiReport, and wrote for the New Yorker, Mother Jones, Washington Post, New York Times, LA Times and others. I was a panelist on a local weekly public affairs television program.

**Civic Activities:**

I served on the Citizens General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee from 2015-2019 focusing on housing and city audits. I served on the 2013-14 SF Civil Grand Jury that issued a significant report on ethics including the Ethics Commission. I chaired ballot measure committees that won overwhelmingly to increase transparency and accountability in campaign and lobbying disclosures. I am a cofounder of Friends of Ethics whose members are past Ethics Commissioners, staff and good government advocates. I was the original proponent for creation of the SF Ethics Commission and assisted in drafting the charter language approved by the voters. I also was the original proponent for a campaign finance reform to limit special interest funding. It was passed into law but later repealed when the city was sued.

Have you attended any meetings of the Board/Commission to which you wish appointment? Yes  No

For appointments by the Board of Supervisors, appearance before the RULES COMMITTEE is a requirement before any appointment can be made. (*Applications must be received 10 days before the scheduled hearing.*)

Date: 6/1/2020 Applicant's Signature: (required) Larry Emmett Bush

(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 Seat was Vacated: \_\_\_\_\_

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

Date Initial Filing Received  
Filing Official Use Only

Please type or print in ink.

NAME OF FILER (LAST) (FIRST) (MIDDLE)  
Bush Larry Emmett

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

Agency Name (Do not use acronyms)  
Ethics Commission  
Division, Board, Department, District, if applicable  
San Francisco  
Your Position  
Commissioner  
► If filing for multiple positions, list below or on an attachment. (Do not use acronyms)  
Agency: \_\_\_\_\_ Position: \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

- Annual: The period covered is January 1, 2019, through December 31, 2019.  
-or- The period covered is \_\_\_\_\_ through December 31, 2019.  
 Assuming Office: Date assumed \_\_\_\_\_, 2020  
 Candidate: Date of Election \_\_\_\_\_ and office sought, if different than Part 1: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Leaving Office: Date Left \_\_\_\_\_ (Check one circle.)  
 The period covered is January 1, 2019, through the date of leaving office.  
-or-  The period covered is \_\_\_\_\_ through the date of leaving office.

**4. Schedule Summary (must complete) ► Total number of pages including this cover page: 5**

**Schedules attached**

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

-or-  None - No reportable interests on any schedule

**5. Verification**

MAILING ADDRESS STREET CITY STATE ZIP CODE  
(Business or Agency Address Recommended - Public Document)  
[Redacted] San Francisco CA 94114  
HOME ADDRESS  
[Redacted]

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

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

Date Signed 5/31/2020  
(month, day, year)

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

**SCHEDULE C**  
**Income, Loans, & Business**  
**Positions**  
 (Other than Gifts and Travel Payments)

**CALIFORNIA FORM 700**  
 FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Name

Bush, Larry Emmett

**1. INCOME RECEIVED**

NAME OF SOURCE OF INCOME

Larry E. Bush

ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)

San Francisco, CA 94114

BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE

resale flowers/antiques

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION

owner

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

CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH INCOME WAS RECEIVED

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

(Describe)

Other resale flowers/antiques  
 (Describe)

**1. INCOME RECEIVED**

NAME OF SOURCE OF INCOME

ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)

BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION

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

CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH INCOME WAS RECEIVED

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

(Describe)

Other \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Describe)

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

\* You are not required to report loans from a commercial lending institution, or any indebtedness created as part of a retail installment or credit card transaction, made in the lender's regular course of business on terms available to members of the public without regard to your official status. Personal loans and loans received not in a lender's regular course of business must be disclosed as follows:

NAME OF LENDER\*

ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)

BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF LENDER

HIGHEST BALANCE DURING REPORTING PERIOD

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

INTEREST RATE

\_\_\_\_\_%  None

TERM (Months/Years)

SECURITY FOR LOAN

 None  Personal residence Real Property \_\_\_\_\_  
 Street address

City

 Guarantor \_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Describe)

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

SCHEDULE B  
Interests in Real Property  
(Including Rental Income)

CALIFORNIA FORM 700  
FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION  
Name  
Bush, Larry Emmett

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER OR STREET ADDRESS  
245-247 Diamond Street  
CITY  
SAN FRANCISCO  
FAIR MARKET VALUE IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:  
 \$2,000 - \$10,000  
 \$10,001 - \$100,000  
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000  
 Over \$1,000,000  
ACQUIRED 18 DISPOSED 18  
NATURE OF INTEREST  
 Ownership/Deed of Trust  Easement  
 Leasehold  Other  
IF RENTAL PROPERTY, GROSS INCOME RECEIVED  
 \$0 - \$499  \$500 - \$1,000  \$1,001 - \$10,000  
 \$10,001 - \$100,000  OVER \$100,000  
SOURCES OF RENTAL INCOME: If you own a 10% or greater interest, list the name of each tenant that is a single source of income of \$10,000 or more.  
 None  
Name (s) redacted

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER OR STREET ADDRESS  
CITY  
FAIR MARKET VALUE IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:  
 \$2,000 - \$10,000  
 \$10,001 - \$100,000  
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000  
 Over \$1,000,000  
ACQUIRED 18 DISPOSED 18  
NATURE OF INTEREST  
 Ownership/Deed of Trust  Easement  
 Leasehold  Other  
IF RENTAL PROPERTY, GROSS INCOME RECEIVED  
 \$0 - \$499  \$500 - \$1,000  \$1,001 - \$10,000  
 \$10,001 - \$100,000  OVER \$100,000  
SOURCES OF RENTAL INCOME: If you own a 10% or greater interest, list the name of each tenant that is a single source of income of \$10,000 or more.  
 None

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

NAME OF LENDER\*  
ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)  
BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF LENDER  
INTEREST RATE TERM (Months/Years)  
%  None  
HIGHEST BALANCE DURING REPORTING PERIOD  
 \$500 - \$1,000  \$1,001 - \$10,000  
 \$10,001 - \$100,000  OVER \$100,000  
 Guarantor, if applicable

NAME OF LENDER\*  
ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)  
BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF LENDER  
INTEREST RATE TERM (Months/Years)  
%  None  
HIGHEST BALANCE DURING REPORTING PERIOD  
 \$500 - \$1,000  \$1,001 - \$10,000  
 \$10,001 - \$100,000  OVER \$100,000  
 Guarantor, if applicable

Comments:

# SCHEDULE A-2

## Investments, Income, and Assets of Business Entities/Trusts

(Ownership Interest is 10% or Greater)

**CALIFORNIA FORM 700**  
FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Bush, Larry Emmett

**1. BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST**

Larry Bush 1996 Revocable Trust (CONTINUATION)  
Name \_\_\_\_\_

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

Check one  
 Trust, go to 2     Business Entity, complete the box, then go to 2

**GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS**

FAIR MARKET VALUE                      IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

<input type="checkbox"/> \$0 - \$1,999	_____ / _____ / <u>18</u>	_____ / _____ / <u>18</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> \$2,000 - \$10,000	ACQUIRED	DISPOSED
<input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000		
<input type="checkbox"/> \$100,001 - \$1,000,000		
<input type="checkbox"/> Over \$1,000,000		

NATURE OF INVESTMENT  
 Partnership     Sole Proprietorship     Other \_\_\_\_\_

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION \_\_\_\_\_

**2. IDENTIFY THE GROSS INCOME RECEIVED (INCLUDE YOUR PRO RATA SHARE OF THE GROSS INCOME TO THE ENTITY/TRUST)**

<input type="checkbox"/> \$0 - \$499	<input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000
<input type="checkbox"/> \$500 - \$1,000	<input type="checkbox"/> OVER \$100,000
<input type="checkbox"/> \$1,001 - \$10,000	

**3. LIST THE NAME OF EACH REPORTABLE SINGLE SOURCE OF INCOME OF \$10,000 OR MORE (Attach a separate sheet if necessary)**

None    or     Names listed below \_\_\_\_\_

**4. INVESTMENTS AND INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY HELD OR LEASED BY THE BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST**

Check one box:  
 INVESTMENT     REAL PROPERTY

Wells Fargo Brokerage  
 Name of Business Entity, if Investment, or Assessor's Parcel Number or Street Address of Real Property \_\_\_\_\_

Investments  
 Description of Business Activity or City or Other Precise Location of Real Property \_\_\_\_\_

FAIR MARKET VALUE                      IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

<input type="checkbox"/> \$2,000 - \$10,000	_____ / _____ / <u>18</u>	_____ / _____ / <u>18</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000	ACQUIRED	DISPOSED
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> \$100,001 - \$1,000,000		
<input type="checkbox"/> Over \$1,000,000		

NATURE OF INTEREST  
 Property Ownership/Deed of Trust     Stock     Partnership

Leasehold    Yes, remaining \_\_\_\_\_     Other \_\_\_\_\_

Check box if additional schedules reporting investments or real property are attached

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

**1. BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST**

Name \_\_\_\_\_

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

Check one  
 Trust, go to 2     Business Entity, complete the box, then go to 2

**GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS**

FAIR MARKET VALUE                      IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

<input type="checkbox"/> \$0 - \$1,999	_____ / _____ / <u>18</u>	_____ / _____ / <u>18</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> \$2,000 - \$10,000	ACQUIRED	DISPOSED
<input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000		
<input type="checkbox"/> \$100,001 - \$1,000,000		
<input type="checkbox"/> Over \$1,000,000		

NATURE OF INVESTMENT  
 Partnership     Sole Proprietorship     Other \_\_\_\_\_

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION \_\_\_\_\_

**2. IDENTIFY THE GROSS INCOME RECEIVED (INCLUDE YOUR PRO RATA SHARE OF THE GROSS INCOME TO THE ENTITY/TRUST)**

<input type="checkbox"/> \$0 - \$499	<input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000
<input type="checkbox"/> \$500 - \$1,000	<input type="checkbox"/> OVER \$100,000
<input type="checkbox"/> \$1,001 - \$10,000	

**3. LIST THE NAME OF EACH REPORTABLE SINGLE SOURCE OF INCOME OF \$10,000 OR MORE (Attach a separate sheet if necessary)**

None    or     Names listed below \_\_\_\_\_

**4. INVESTMENTS AND INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY HELD OR LEASED BY THE BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST**

Check one box:  
 INVESTMENT     REAL PROPERTY

Name of Business Entity, if Investment, or Assessor's Parcel Number or Street Address of Real Property \_\_\_\_\_

Description of Business Activity or City or Other Precise Location of Real Property \_\_\_\_\_

FAIR MARKET VALUE                      IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

<input type="checkbox"/> \$2,000 - \$10,000	_____ / _____ / <u>18</u>	_____ / _____ / <u>18</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000	ACQUIRED	DISPOSED
<input type="checkbox"/> \$100,001 - \$1,000,000		
<input type="checkbox"/> Over \$1,000,000		

NATURE OF INTEREST  
 Property Ownership/Deed of Trust     Stock     Partnership

Leasehold    Yes, remaining \_\_\_\_\_     Other \_\_\_\_\_

Check box if additional schedules reporting investments or real property are attached

# SCHEDULE A-2

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

**CALIFORNIA FORM 700**  
FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Name  
Bush, Larry Emmett

**1. BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST**

Larry Bush 1995 Revocable Trust (CONTINUATION)  
Name

Address (Business Address Acceptable)

Check one  
 Trust, go to 2     Business Entity, complete the box, then go to 2

**GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS**

FAIR MARKET VALUE                      IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:  
 \$0 - \$1,999  
 \$2,000 - \$10,000                           /      / 18                           /      / 18  
 \$10,001 - \$100,000                      ACQUIRED                      DISPOSED  
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000  
 Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT  
 Partnership     Sole Proprietorship     Other

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION \_\_\_\_\_

**2. IDENTIFY THE GROSS INCOME RECEIVED (INCLUDE YOUR PRO RATA SHARE OF THE GROSS INCOME TO THE ENTITY/TRUST)**

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

**3. LIST THE NAME OF EACH REPORTABLE SINGLE SOURCE OF INCOME OF \$10,000 OR MORE (attach a separate sheet if necessary)**

None    or     Names listed below

**4. INVESTMENTS AND INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY HELD OR LEASED BY THE BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST**

Check one box:  
 INVESTMENT                       REAL PROPERTY

Boj Inland Oyster Company  
 Name of Business Entity, if Investment, or  
 Assessor's Parcel Number or Street Address of Real Property

restaurant  
 Description of Business Activity or  
 City or Other Precise Location of Real Property

FAIR MARKET VALUE                      IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:  
 \$2,000 - \$10,000  
 \$10,001 - \$100,000                           /      / 18                           /      / 18  
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000                      ACQUIRED                      DISPOSED  
 Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INTEREST  
 Property Ownership/Deed of Trust     Stock     Partnership

Leasehold \_\_\_\_\_     Other \_\_\_\_\_  
Yes, remaining

Check box if additional schedules reporting investments or real property are attached

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

**1. BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST**

Name

Address (Business Address Acceptable)

Check one  
 Trust, go to 2     Business Entity, complete the box, then go to 2

**GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS**

FAIR MARKET VALUE                      IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:  
 \$0 - \$1,999  
 \$2,000 - \$10,000                           /      / 18                           /      / 18  
 \$10,001 - \$100,000                      ACQUIRED                      DISPOSED  
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000  
 Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT  
 Partnership     Sole Proprietorship     Other

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION \_\_\_\_\_

**2. IDENTIFY THE GROSS INCOME RECEIVED (INCLUDE YOUR PRO RATA SHARE OF THE GROSS INCOME TO THE ENTITY/TRUST)**

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

**3. LIST THE NAME OF EACH REPORTABLE SINGLE SOURCE OF INCOME OF \$10,000 OR MORE (attach a separate sheet if necessary)**

None    or     Names listed below

**4. INVESTMENTS AND INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY HELD OR LEASED BY THE BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST**

Check one box:  
 INVESTMENT                       REAL PROPERTY

Name of Business Entity, if Investment, or  
 Assessor's Parcel Number or Street Address of Real Property

Description of Business Activity or  
 City or Other Precise Location of Real Property

FAIR MARKET VALUE                      IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:  
 \$2,000 - \$10,000  
 \$10,001 - \$100,000                           /      / 18                           /      / 18  
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000                      ACQUIRED                      DISPOSED  
 Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INTEREST  
 Property Ownership/Deed of Trust     Stock     Partnership

Leasehold \_\_\_\_\_     Other \_\_\_\_\_  
Yes, remaining

Check box if additional schedules reporting investments or real property are attached



003

## SCHEDULE A-2

### Investments, Income, and Assets of Business Entities/Trusts

(Ownership Interest is 10% or Greater)

**CALIFORNIA FORM 700**

FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Bush, Larry Emmett

**1. BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST**

Larry Bush 1996 Revocable Trust  
Name \_\_\_\_\_

San Francisco, CA 94114  
Address (Business Address Acceptable) \_\_\_\_\_

Check one  
 Trust, go to 2     Business Entity, complete the box, then go to 2

---

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

FAIR MARKET VALUE                      IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

<input type="checkbox"/> \$0 - \$1,999	____/____/18	____/____/18
<input type="checkbox"/> \$2,000 - \$10,000	ACQUIRED	DISPOSED
<input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000		
<input type="checkbox"/> \$100,001 - \$1,000,000		
<input type="checkbox"/> Over \$1,000,000		

NATURE OF INVESTMENT  
 Partnership     Sole Proprietorship     \_\_\_\_\_ Other

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION \_\_\_\_\_

**1. BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST**

Larry Bush gifts/flowers  
Name \_\_\_\_\_

San Francisco, CA 94114  
Address (Business Address Acceptable) \_\_\_\_\_

Check one  
 Trust, go to 2     Business Entity, complete the box, then go to 2

---

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

resale flowers and antiques

FAIR MARKET VALUE                      IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

<input type="checkbox"/> \$0 - \$1,999	____/____/18	____/____/18
<input type="checkbox"/> \$2,000 - \$10,000	ACQUIRED	DISPOSED
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000		
<input type="checkbox"/> \$100,001 - \$1,000,000		
<input type="checkbox"/> Over \$1,000,000		

NATURE OF INVESTMENT  
 Partnership     Sole Proprietorship     \_\_\_\_\_ Other

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION \_\_\_\_\_

**2. IDENTIFY THE GROSS INCOME RECEIVED (INCLUDE YOUR PRO RATA SHARE OF THE GROSS INCOME TO THE ENTITY/TRUST)**

<input type="checkbox"/> \$0 - \$499	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000
<input type="checkbox"/> \$500 - \$1,000	<input type="checkbox"/> OVER \$100,000
<input type="checkbox"/> \$1,001 - \$10,000	

**3. LIST THE NAME OF EACH REPORTABLE SINGLE SOURCE OF INCOME OF \$10,000 OR MORE (attach a separate sheet if necessary)**

None    or     Names listed below

Matthew Wolden

Spencer Shimata

Ryan Starke

**2. IDENTIFY THE GROSS INCOME RECEIVED (INCLUDE YOUR PRO RATA SHARE OF THE GROSS INCOME TO THE ENTITY/TRUST)**

<input type="checkbox"/> \$0 - \$499	<input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000
<input type="checkbox"/> \$500 - \$1,000	<input type="checkbox"/> OVER \$100,000
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> \$1,001 - \$10,000	

**3. LIST THE NAME OF EACH REPORTABLE SINGLE SOURCE OF INCOME OF \$10,000 OR MORE (attach a separate sheet if necessary)**

None    or     Names listed below

**4. INVESTMENTS AND INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY HELD OR LEASED BY THE BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST**

Check one box:  
 INVESTMENT     REAL PROPERTY

Name of Business Entity, if Investment, or Assessor's Parcel Number or Street Address of Real Property  
rental property

Description of Business Activity or City or Other Precise Location of Real Property  
 \_\_\_\_\_

FAIR MARKET VALUE                      IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

<input type="checkbox"/> \$2,000 - \$10,000	____/____/18	____/____/18
<input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000	ACQUIRED	DISPOSED
<input type="checkbox"/> \$100,001 - \$1,000,000		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Over \$1,000,000		

NATURE OF INTEREST  
 Property Ownership/Deed of Trust     Stock     Partnership

Leasehold \_\_\_\_\_     Other \_\_\_\_\_  
Yes, remaining

Check box if additional schedules reporting investments or real property are attached

**4. INVESTMENTS AND INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY HELD OR LEASED BY THE BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST**

Check one box:  
 INVESTMENT     REAL PROPERTY

Name of Business Entity, if Investment, or Assessor's Parcel Number or Street Address of Real Property  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Description of Business Activity or City or Other Precise Location of Real Property  
 \_\_\_\_\_

FAIR MARKET VALUE                      IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

<input type="checkbox"/> \$2,000 - \$10,000	____/____/18	____/____/18
<input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000	ACQUIRED	DISPOSED
<input type="checkbox"/> \$100,001 - \$1,000,000		
<input type="checkbox"/> Over \$1,000,000		

NATURE OF INTEREST  
 Property Ownership/Deed of Trust     Stock     Partnership

Leasehold \_\_\_\_\_     Other \_\_\_\_\_  
Yes, remaining

Check box if additional schedules reporting investments or real property are attached

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

# SCHEDULE A-2

## Investments, Income, and Assets of Business Entities/Trusts

(Ownership Interest is 10% or Greater)

Name  
Bush, Larry Emmett

**▶ 1. BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST**

CitiReport  
Name  
San Francisco, CA 94114  
Address (Business Address Acceptable)  
Check one  
 Trust, go to 2  Business Entity, complete the box, then go to 2

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS  
online publication

FAIR MARKET VALUE IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:  
 \$0 - \$1,999  
 \$2,000 - \$10,000  
 \$10,001 - \$100,000  
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000  
 Over \$1,000,000

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:  
 ACQUIRED    /   /18      DISPOSED    /   /18

NATURE OF INVESTMENT  
 Partnership  Sole Proprietorship  Other

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION president

**▶ 1. BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST**

Name  
Address (Business Address Acceptable)  
Check one  
 Trust, go to 2  Business Entity, complete the box, then go to 2

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

FAIR MARKET VALUE IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:  
 \$0 - \$1,999  
 \$2,000 - \$10,000  
 \$10,001 - \$100,000  
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000  
 Over \$1,000,000

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:  
 ACQUIRED    /   /18      DISPOSED    /   /18

NATURE OF INVESTMENT  
 Partnership  Sole Proprietorship  Other

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION

**▶ 2. IDENTIFY THE GROSS INCOME RECEIVED (INCLUDE YOUR PRO RATA SHARE OF THE GROSS INCOME TO THE ENTITY/TRUST)**

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

**▶ 3. LIST THE NAME OF EACH REPORTABLE SINGLE SOURCE OF INCOME OF \$10,000 OR MORE (Attach a separate sheet if necessary)**

None or  Names listed below

**▶ 2. IDENTIFY THE GROSS INCOME RECEIVED (INCLUDE YOUR PRO RATA SHARE OF THE GROSS INCOME TO THE ENTITY/TRUST)**

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

**▶ 3. LIST THE NAME OF EACH REPORTABLE SINGLE SOURCE OF INCOME OF \$10,000 OR MORE (Attach a separate sheet if necessary)**

None or  Names listed below

**▶ 4. INVESTMENTS AND INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY HELD OR LEASED BY THE BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST**

Check one box:  
 INVESTMENT  REAL PROPERTY

Name of Business Entity, if Investment, or Assessor's Parcel Number or Street Address of Real Property  
245 Diamond Street San Francisco CA  
 Description of Business Activity or City or Other Precise Location of Real Property

FAIR MARKET VALUE IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:  
 \$2,000 - \$10,000  
 \$10,001 - \$100,000  
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000  
 Over \$1,000,000

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:  
 ACQUIRED    /   /18      DISPOSED    /   /18

NATURE OF INTEREST  
 Property Ownership/Deed of Trust  Stock  Partnership  
 Leasehold      Other      
via remaining  
 Check box if additional schedules reporting investments or real property are attached

**▶ 4. INVESTMENTS AND INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY HELD OR LEASED BY THE BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST**

Check one box:  
 INVESTMENT  REAL PROPERTY

Name of Business Entity, if Investment, or Assessor's Parcel Number or Street Address of Real Property  
 Description of Business Activity or City or Other Precise Location of Real Property

FAIR MARKET VALUE IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:  
 \$2,000 - \$10,000  
 \$10,001 - \$100,000  
 \$100,001 - \$1,000,000  
 Over \$1,000,000

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:  
 ACQUIRED    /   /18      DISPOSED    /   /18

NATURE OF INTEREST  
 Property Ownership/Deed of Trust  Stock  Partnership  
 Leasehold      Other      
via remaining  
 Check box if additional schedules reporting investments or real property are attached

Comments:

## 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

Rush, Larry Emmett

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY  
Wells Fargo Brokerage Investment Account

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS  
diversified investments chosen by my broker

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:  
 \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/18      \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/18  
 ACQUIRED                      DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY  
Big Island Oyster Farm

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS  
Oyster farm and oyster sales

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:  
 \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/18      \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/18  
 ACQUIRED                      DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY  
\_\_\_\_\_

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS  
\_\_\_\_\_

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:  
 \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/18      \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/18  
 ACQUIRED                      DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY  
\_\_\_\_\_

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS  
\_\_\_\_\_

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:  
 \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/18      \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/18  
 ACQUIRED                      DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY  
\_\_\_\_\_

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS  
\_\_\_\_\_

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:  
 \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/18      \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/18  
 ACQUIRED                      DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY  
\_\_\_\_\_

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS  
\_\_\_\_\_


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:  
 \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/18      \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/18  
 ACQUIRED                      DISPOSED

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

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

## VACANCY NOTICE

### ETHICS COMMISSION

#### Replaces All Previous Notices

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN of the following seat information and term expiration, appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

**Vacant Seat 1**, succeeding Lateef H. Gray, resigned, shall be broadly representative of the general public, for the unexpired portion of a six-year term ending February 1, 2023.

Reports: Statistical reports.

Sunset Date: None.


Additional information relating to the Elections Commission may be obtained by reviewing San Francisco Charter, Section 13.103.5, available at <http://www.sfbos.org/sfmunicodes>, or by visiting the Commission website at <http://sfgov.org/electionscommission/>.

Interested persons may obtain an application from the Board of Supervisors website at [http://www.sfbos.org/vacancy\\_application](http://www.sfbos.org/vacancy_application) or from the Rules Committee Clerk, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102-4689. Completed applications should be submitted to the Clerk of the Board. All applicants must be residents of San Francisco, unless otherwise stated.

**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.

*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.*

*Further Note: Additional seats on this body may be available through other appointing authorities, including the Mayor's Office, City Attorney, Public Defender, District Attorney, and Treasurer, and the Board of Education.*

  
Angela Calvillo  
Clerk of the Board

DATED/POSTED: February 25, 2020

San Francisco  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Date Printed: February 17, 2017

Date Established: November 6, 2001

Active

**ETHICS COMMISSION 2002**

**Contact and Address:**

LeeAnn Pelham Executive Director  
Ethics Commission  
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: (415) 252-3100

Fax: (415) 252-3112

Email: [leeann.pelham@sfgov.org](mailto:leeann.pelham@sfgov.org)

**Authority:**

Charter Section 15.100. (Proposition E – Elections, Ethics & Outside Counsel approved by the voters on November 6, 2001)

**Board Qualifications:**

The Ethics Commission shall consist of five members, one member of whom is appointed by the Board of Supervisors. The member appointed by the Board of Supervisors shall be broadly representative of the general public.

The Mayor, the City Attorney, the District Attorney and the Assessor each shall appoint one member of the Commission that comprise the other four members. The member appointed by the Mayor shall have a background in public information and public meetings. The member appointed by the City Attorney shall have a background in law as it relates to government ethics. The member appointed by the Assessor shall have a background in campaign finance. The member appointed by the District Attorney shall be broadly representative of the general public.

The members shall serve six-year terms, provided that the first five commissioners to be appointed to take office on the first day of February 2002 shall by lot classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 noon on each of the second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth anniversaries of such date, and on the expiration of these and successive terms of office, the appointments shall be made for six-year terms. In the event of a vacancy, the officer who appointed the member vacating the office shall appoint a qualified person to complete the remainder of the term.

San Francisco  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Members of the Commission shall be officers of the City and County, and may be removed by the appointing authority only pursuant to Section 15.105. No person may serve more than one six-year term as a member of the Commission, provided that persons appointed to fill a vacancy for an unexpired term with less than three years remaining or appointed to an initial term of three or fewer years shall be eligible to be appointed to one additional six-year term. Any term served before the effective date of this Section shall not count toward a member's term limit. Any person who completes a term as a Commissioner shall be eligible for reappointment six years after the expiration of his or her term.

During his or her tenure, a member of the Commission may not: hold any other City or County office or be an officer of a political party. No member or employee of the Ethics Commission may be a registered lobbyist or campaign consultant, or be employed by or receive gifts or other compensation from a registered lobbyist or campaign consultant. No member or employee of the Ethics Commission may participate in any campaign supporting or opposing a candidate for City elective office, a City ballot measure, or a City officer running for any elective office. Participation in a campaign includes but is not limited to making contributions or soliciting contributions to any committee within the Ethics Commission's jurisdiction, publicly endorsing or urging endorsement of a candidate or ballot measure, or participating in decisions by organizations to participate in a campaign.

The Commission may subpoena witnesses, compel their attendance and testimony, administer oaths and affirmations, take evidence and require by subpoena the production of any books, papers, records or other items material to the performance of the Commission's duties or exercise of its powers.

The Commission serves the public, city employees and officials and candidates for public office through education and enforcement of ethics laws. The Commission provides open access to public records in ethics-related matters. The Commission acts as filing officer for, and auditor of, financial disclosure statements filed by political candidates and committees and designated City and County employees. The Commission assesses fees and penalties for failure to adhere to deadlines and requirements, audits statements to ensure compliance with contribution limits, administers an education program, and produces educational materials. It also oversees registration and regulation of lobbyists, investigates ethics complaints, provides advice on ethical matters and publishes statistical reports.

Its duties include: filing and auditing of campaign finance disclosure statements; campaign consultant registration and regulation; lobbyist registration and regulation; filing officer for statements of economic interest; administration of the Whistleblower program; investigations of ethics complaints; enforcement education and training; and providing advice and statistical reporting.

San Francisco  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Reports: Statistical reports

Sunset Date: None



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

---



City and County of San Francisco  
London N. Breed  
Mayor

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



## Acknowledgements

---

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

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

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

President Debbie Mesloh

Vice President Breanna Zwart

Commissioner Shokooh Miry

Commissioner Carrie Schwab-Pomerantz

Commissioner Andrea Shorter

Commissioner Julie D. Soo

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

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

# Contents

---

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

## Table of Figures

---

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

## Executive Summary

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

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

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

### Key Findings

#### Gender

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

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



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

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

## Race and Ethnicity

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

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



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

## Race and Ethnicity by Gender

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

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



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

### Additional Demographics

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

### Proxies for Influence: Budget & Authority

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

### Appointing Authorities

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

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

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

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

## I. Introduction

---

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

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

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

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

---

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



## II. Gender Analysis Findings

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

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

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

Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

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

### A. Gender

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

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



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

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

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



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

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

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



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

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

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



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

## B. Race and Ethnicity

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

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



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

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

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



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

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

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



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

### C. Race and Ethnicity by Gender

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

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



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

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

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



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

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



Source: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.



## D. LGBTQ Identity

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

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

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

(N=548)



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

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

(N=104)



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

## E. Disability Status

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

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

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

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

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

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

(N=744,243)



Source: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

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

(N=516)



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

## F. Veteran Status

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

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

(N=747,896)



Source: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

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

(N=494)




Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

## G. Policy Bodies by Budget

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

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

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



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

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

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

Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

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

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

Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

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

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

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



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

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

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

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



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

### III. Conclusion

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## IV. Methodology and Limitations

---

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

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

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

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

---

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



## Appendix

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

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

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

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

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

Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis, 2019.

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

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

Source: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

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

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

Source: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

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

**From:** [victor.makras](#)  
**To:** [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#)  
**Subject:** Ethic Commission Nominee  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 2, 2020 2:50:53 PM

---

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

Good Afternoon Supervisor Hillary Ronen and Victor Young:

I wish to extend my support for appointment of Larry Bush

to the Ethics Commission seat appointed by the

San Francisco Board of Supervisors.

Thank you.

Victor Makras

**From:** [Ann Ravel](#)  
**To:** [LARRY BUSH](#)  
**Cc:** [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Ann Ravel](#)  
**Subject:** Re: larry Bush ethics app revised  
**Date:** Monday, June 1, 2020 5:29:19 PM

---

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

Hello Larry -

Of course. I support you wholeheartedly.

On Mon, Jun 1, 2020 at 3:22 PM LARRY BUSH <[sfwtrail@mac.com](mailto:sfwtrail@mac.com)> wrote:

The Ethics Commission seat appointed by the Board of Supervisors is open and I have decided to apply.

I am contacting you because of our work together and to respectfully seek your support.

This comes before Rules but is not yet on the calendar. The chair is Supervisor Hillary Ronen and the clerk is Victor Young.

My appointment is supported in the first hours by former Mayor Art Agnos, past Ethics Chair Peter Keane and former Ethics Commissioner and retired Judge Quentin Kopp.

I would be honored to have your support. Last year I withdrew out of deference to a candidate who had begun the process.

At this point, there are no other candidates for this appointment.

Should you decide to offer your support, please copy Victor Young ([victor.young@sfgov.org](mailto:victor.young@sfgov.org)) Supervisor Ronen ([Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org](mailto:Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org)) and me.

I appreciate the contribution you have made to a more transparent and accountable government which is why your support is meaningful to me.

With best regards,


Larry Bush  
[Sfwtrail@mac.com](mailto:Sfwtrail@mac.com)

This is my application for appointment to the Ethics Commission that i want to formally submit.

Thank you!

Larry Bush  
[sfwtrail@mac.com](mailto:sfwtrail@mac.com)

Save Form

 Board of Supervisors  
City and County of San Francisco  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
(415) 554-5184 FAX (415) 554-7714

---

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

Name of Board, Commission, Committee, or Task Force: Ethics Commission

Seat # or Category (If applicable): Board of Supervisors District: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: Larry Bush

Home Address: [REDACTED] Street Zip: 94114

Home Phone: [REDACTED] Occupation: retired

Work Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Employer: n/a

Business Address: n/a

Business E-Mail: \_\_\_\_\_ Home E-Mail: [REDACTED]

Pursuant to Charter Section 4.101 (a)2, Boards and Commissions established by the Charter must consist of electors (registered voters) of the City and County of San Francisco. For certain other bodies, the Board of Supervisors can waive the residency requirement.

Check All That Apply:

Registered voter in San Francisco: Yes  No  If No, where registered: \_\_\_\_\_

Resident of San Francisco  Yes  No If No, place of residence: \_\_\_\_\_

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

I am a senior aged 74, disabled with mobility handicap, and a gay man. I am a homeowner and small property owner because my home includes three apartments. I rent two and live in one. I live in the Castro (District 8) and have lived at this home since 1996 (23 years) and in San Francisco since 1984 (36 years). I have been an advocate for LGBTQ community concerns at the national level, including as first NGTF Washington liaison, was the Keynote speaker for the first National Lesbian Gay Leadership conference in Dallas in 1984, and on many San Francisco and California efforts that demonstrate my community involvement. I was a strong and public advocate for district elections to expand participation and leadership from San Francisco's diverse neighborhoods.

**Business and/or professional experience:**

I was Special Assistant to Mayor Art Agnos (1988-92) and earlier when he was an assemblyman (1984-1988). My work included establishing the membership and agenda for the Family Policy Task Force leading to more inclusive definitions of family. I was the Public Policy Committee chair of the California HIV Task Force appointed by Attorney General John VandeKamp that first proposed the Ryan White Care Act. I was the Mayors Appointee to the Steering Committee of the VI International AIDS Conference in San Francisco. I was appointed by HUD Secretary and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid to a three member task force on the foreclosure crisis. I served as HUD Supervisory Public Affairs Officer and Freedom of Information officer for California, Arizona, Hawaii and Nevada. I was a columnist for the SF Examiner, SF Chronicle, owner of CitiReport, and wrote for the New Yorker, Mother Jones, Washington Post, New York Times, LA Times and others. I was a panelist on a local weekly public affairs television program.

**Civic Activities:**

I served on the Citizens General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee from 2015-2019 focusing on housing and city audits. I served on the 2013-14 SF Civil Grand Jury that issued a significant report on ethics including the Ethics Commission. I chaired ballot measure committees that won overwhelmingly to increase transparency and accountability in campaign and lobbying disclosures. I am a cofounder of Friends of Ethics whose members are past Ethics Commissioners, staff and good government advocates. I was the original proponent for creation of the SF Ethics Commission and assisted in drafting the charter language approved by the voters. I also was the original proponent for a campaign finance reform to limit special interest funding. It was passed into law but later repealed when the city was sued.

Have you attended any meetings of the Board/Commission to which you wish appointment? Yes  No

For appointments by the Board of Supervisors, appearance before the RULES COMMITTEE is a requirement before any appointment can be made. (Applications must be received 10 days before the scheduled hearing.)

Date: 6/1/2020 Applicant's Signature: (required) Larry Emmett Bush

(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 Seat was Vacated: \_\_\_\_\_

01/20/12

Sent from my iPhone

--  
Sincerely,

**Ann Ravel**  
For State Senate

E: [ann@ravelforca.com](mailto:ann@ravelforca.com)



**P:** 408-459-9076

**W:** [www.ravelforca.com](http://www.ravelforca.com)

**From:** [Morgan Aitken-Young](#)  
**To:** [LARRY BUSH](#)  
**Cc:** [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: larry Bush ethics app revised  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 2, 2020 8:25:15 AM

---

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

Good to hear from you! I would be happy to support you.

Best,  
Morgan

[morganay28@gmail.com](mailto:morganay28@gmail.com)  
510.862.7008



“To remain indifferent to the challenges we face is indefensible. If the goal is noble, whether or not it is realized within our lifetime is largely irrelevant. What we must do therefore is to strive and persevere and never give up.”

— Dalai Lama XIV

On Mon, Jun 1, 2020 at 3:22 PM LARRY BUSH <[sfwtrail@mac.com](mailto:sfwtrail@mac.com)> wrote:

The Ethics Commission seat appointed by the Board of Supervisors is open and I have decided to apply.

I am contacting you because of our work together and to respectfully seek your support.

This comes before Rules but is not yet on the calendar. The chair is Supervisor Hillary Ronen and the clerk is Victor Young.

My appointment is supported in the first hours by former Mayor Art Agnos, past Ethics Chair Peter Keane and former Ethics Commissioner and retired Judge Quentin Kopp.

I would be honored to have your support. Last year I withdrew out of deference to a candidate who had begun the process.

At this point, there are no other candidates for this appointment.

Should you decide to offer your support, please copy Victor Young ([victor.young@sfgov.org](mailto:victor.young@sfgov.org)) Supervisor Ronen ([Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org](mailto:Hillary.Ronen@sfgov.org)) and me.

I appreciate the contribution you have made to a more transparent and accountable government which is why your support is meaningful to me.

With best regards,

Larry Bush  
[Sfwtrail@mac.com](mailto:Sfwtrail@mac.com)

This is my application for appointment to the Ethics Commission that i want to formally submit.

Thank you!

Larry Bush  
[sfwtrail@mac.com](mailto:sfwtrail@mac.com)

June 2, 2020

Supervisor Hillary Ronen

re: Larry Bush's application for the vacant seat at the San Francisco Ethics Commission

Ms. Ronen:

I first met Larry Bush when I was the Foreperson of the San Francisco Civil Grand jury during the 2013-14 jury year. From the first days of the jury process, I was impressed with Larry's breath of knowledge of the City and the myriad ways the political world can affect city decisions.

That's what the Ethics Commission is charged with — to shed light on how the private money flows throughout the City and to provide transparency and accountability for city decisions and city decision makers.

Another aspect of Larry is his ability to work with others. At no point did he not listen to what others said, to reach beyond the words of the person to understand what the person was really working through. He was always a team player and worked with the whole jury to understand, to clarify, their concerns, their issues.

There is no better person to serve on the Ethics Commission.

With respect,

/s/

Elena Schmid  
130 Laidley Street  
San Francisco, CA 94131

cc: Victor Young  
Larry Bush

**From:** [Sharyn Saslafsky](#)  
**To:** [Ronen, Hillary](#)  
**Cc:** [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Larry Bush](#)  
**Subject:** Letter in support of Larry Bush's nomination to the Ethics Commission  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 2, 2020 2:11:08 PM

---

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

Supervisor Hillary Ronen  
Chair, San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
Rules Committee

Dear Supervisor Ronen:

I write this letter in support of Larry Bush's nomination to the San Francisco Ethics Commission.

As a former Ethics Commissioner, I understand what it takes to make the Ethics commission function at its best. Larry Bush will bring his insight, intelligence and historical knowledge to the Commission.

Larry believes in Ethics reform and has worked on behalf of Ethics reform in order to create a more meaningful, just and ethical environment for all of us in San Francisco and beyond.

I sincerely hope you will vote to put Larry on the Ethics Commission. I believe Mr. Bush will make an excellent Ethics Commissioner.

Should you have any questions, please contact me at [sasplanner@gmail.com](mailto:sasplanner@gmail.com) or by cell, 415-254-5282.

Best regards,  
Sharyn Saslafsky

**From:** [Tom Ammiano](#)  
**To:** [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Hilary.Ronin@sfgov.org](mailto:Hilary.Ronin@sfgov.org)  
**Subject:** Ethics Commission  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 2, 2020 7:51:27 AM

---

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

I enthusiastically endorse Larry Bush for an appointment to the San Francisco Ethics Commission. He is a proven champion of ethical reform and policy . In this age of corruption Nuru et al he embodies a commitment to integrity sorely needed. Tom Ammiano former Assemblymember

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Arthur Bruzzone](#)  
**To:** [Ronen, Hillary](#)  
**Cc:** [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); "<mailto:Sfwtrail@mac.com>"; [Bruzzone Backup](#); [Bruzzone Backup](#)  
**Subject:** Regarding the Nomination of Larry Bush to the Ethics Commission  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 2, 2020 2:20:01 PM

---

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

Dear Supervisor --

I strongly endorse the nomination of Larry Bush to the San Francisco Ethics Commission.

I have witnessed for years Larry's dedication to the purposes of the commission. His newsletter uncovered irregularities and outright ethical missteps, and I believe his newsletter pre dates the actual formation of the commission. So I say it's long overdue. You will have enlisted a perfect member for the commission. He will be fair and thorough, and he will protect the public's interest.

Best

**ARTHUR BRUZZONE**

CA DRE License: 00678352  
ACQUISITIONS | ASSET MANAGEMENT | EXCHANGES

**BRUZZONE STRATEGIC INVESTMENTS**

MOBILE | DIRECT (415) 810-4345  
OFFICE (415) 441-4499  
TELEFAX (415) 946-3458  
ONLINE [BruzzoneInvestments.com](http://BruzzoneInvestments.com)  
WEBBLOG: [BruzzoneStrategics.com](http://BruzzoneStrategics.com)