

File No. 200021

Committee Item No. 3

Board Item No. _____

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Rules Committee

Date January 13, 2020

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date _____

Cmte Board

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

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

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

Completed by: Victor Young Date January 9, 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

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2019 DEC 31 10:51 AM

Application for Boards, Commissions, Committees, & Task Forces

Name of Board, Commission, Committee, or Task Force: Eastern Neighborhoods CAC

Seat # or Category (If applicable): Seat [redacted] 6 District: 9

Name: Kim-Shree Maufas

Home Address: [redacted] Zip: 94110

Home Phone: [redacted] Occupation: Union Field Rep for SFUSD Classified Staff

Work Phone: 415-818-5708 Employer: SEIU Local 1021

Business Address: 350 Rhode Island, Suite 100 South Bldg Zip: 94103

Business E-Mail: kim-shree.maufas@seiu1021.org 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 [checked] No [] If No, where registered: _____

Resident of San Francisco [checked] 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:

San Francisco is my family ' s hometown. Although, I was born and raised in Los Angeles, I have lived in San Francisco since I began my baccalaureate studies at University of San Francisco in 1994. I have either lived in the Bayview and Mission District since 1998, with a multitude of life experiences from my family that color all of our time living in San Francisco ' s Eastern Neighborhoods. To explain my representation qualifications at length, would take up more room than this form allows, so I've added an extended responses page that is attached to my Eastern Neighborhoods CAC, Seat 9 application. Continues on the extended responses page...

Business and/or professional experience:

I've worn many hats in my public service, community, and private sector work. I am widely known as a relationship builder, conversation facilitator, fence mender, and powerful negotiator in building partnerships throughout the San Francisco-Bay Area 's academic, non-profit, and political arenas. And through years working with a broad spectrum of student and staff communities from the San Francisco Unified School District, City College of San Francisco, San Francisco State University, the University of San Francisco partnered with the City and County of San Francisco and the City of Oakland and the research sectors of the Oakland Unified School District, Stanford University, UC Berkeley, UC Davis, UCLA - I 've obtained a deep understanding of what it takes to reach outcomes that change lives for the better to move beyond socio-economic levels, cultural backgrounds, and life 's most challenging circumstances. Continues on the extended responses page....

Civic Activities:

Please find below a list of my Civic Activities:
TESOL Student-Teacher, Canal Alliance for Refugees, Teacher Intern, CCSF - Chinatown TESOL Certified, TESOL Teacher, PRIVATE INSTRUCTION (Single/Grp), Member, Pi Lambda Theta, the National Honor Society for Educators, Member, Phi Delta Kappa, the International Educator Fraternity, Delegate, AD 17 to the California Democratic Party (appointed by SF Democratic Party Chair, David Campos January 2019) , Conservation & Executive Committee Member, Sierra Club - San Francisco-Bay Area Group, Member, National Associate for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) - SF/National Chapter, Member, National Council of Negro Women - Golden Gate/SF Chapter, Member, Black Women Organized for Political Action (BWOPA) SF/Oakland Chapter, Alumna, EMERGE California, Member/Political Action Chr, Harvey Milk Democratic Club, Member, Alice B. Toklas Democratic Club, Member, Jones Memorial United Methodist Church, Certified Level I Coach, USA Track & Field Pacific Region


Education:
UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, B.A., Human Communications
UNIVERSITY OF PHOENIX, SF CAMPUS , M.B.A., Global Management/Marketing
UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, IEd.D., International & Multicultural Ed w/UC Berkeley Ext. TESOL Full Certification

In larger print on the extended responses page

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: 12/26/2019 Applicant's Signature: (required)


(Manually sign or type your complete name.
NOTE: By typing your complete name you are hereby consenting to use of electronic signature.)

Please Note: Your application will be retained for one year. Once Completed, this form, including all attachments, become public record.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:
Appointed to Seat #: _____ Term Expires: _____ Date Seat was Vacated: _____

Kim-Shree Maufas, December 27, 2019 Application

Residence Location [REDACTED]

Workplace Location: 350 Rhode Island Street, Suite 100 Building South, SF 94103

Eastern Neighborhoods CAC Applicant for Seat 9, Appointment to be made by District 9 Supervisor

Extended Responses

First question:

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.

Continued from Application form

.....I credit my ability to obtain and strategically use this acquired knowledge to help others, from growing up in a very non-traditional UNION household. My mother was an Industrial Mechanic and a powerful Union Member throughout her post-vocational education career. She was one of a handful of women to graduate from a government-sponsored "Getting Women into the Trades" pilot program at Los Angeles Trade Tech College, in the early 1970s. It also inspired my commitment to public service.

With that said, I'd like to highlight some of my public service history in San Francisco (see *Civic Activities*), denoting my wide variety of skills and policy work needed to support the work of folks working in education environments trying to better their lives. Beginning as a San Francisco Bayview Hunter's Point resident, I learned years ago how to partner with a broad grassroots coalition of Bayview-Hunters Point Community Members around health issues to demand "a temporary stoppage and an independent health and safety assessment to protect our students and their families" from bearing the brunt of the health issues during the Lennar Corps' Hunters Point Naval Shipyard Development. By co-authoring BoE Resolution #79-25A1 and passing it unanimously (September 2007), we resolved that SFUSD to adopt the City of San Francisco's Precautionary Principle Ordinance (Section 101, August 2003) for "San Francisco public schools such as Malcolm X Academy, George Washington Carver, Bret Harte, and Dr. Charles Drew College Prep Academy, other schools [the Muslim University], childcare centers, and playgrounds in the immediate vicinity of the Lennar development site" thus spotlighting the environmental racism and injustices that have existed in Southeast sector of San Francisco for decades.

Early in 2008, it was my research that shed enough light on the inequitable nature of the District's Northwest sector High Schools' Graduates, e.g. Lowell, Lincoln, Washington, and School of the Arts, completing the A-G Course Sequence for their diplomas while the other District High Schools' Graduates, predominately in the Southeast sector of the City, e.g. Thurgood Marshal, Burton, and Mission, obtained a diploma unaware that they had not completed the course sequence. I shared the data and its effects on SFUSD students, thus convincing then Superintendent of Schools Carlos Garcia to collaborate with me in mandating and implementing the California UC/CSU "A-G" Course Sequence as requirement for all SFUSD students beginning with the graduating class of 2014 (<http://www.sfusd.edu/en/assets/sfusd-staff/curriculum-and-standards/files/a-g-implementationfaq.pdf>).

As the initiating lead author of the groundbreaking SFUSD Restorative Justice Resolution and Initiative approved in 2009, I ushered it from A) the Research & Community conversations to B) written resolution with unanimous approval by the Board of Education to C) the Consultant contracting and Union negotiations to D) the Restorative Practices' Infrastructure template for SFUSD, and to the designation of E) the Pilot Implementation Sites and future District-wide implementation. Please view the SFUSD RJ/RP program's expansive attributes, as they are today, on the district's website at

<http://www.healthiersf.org/RestorativePractices/>.

Kim-Shree Maufas, December 27, 2019 Application

Residence Location: [REDACTED]

Workplace Location: 350 Rhode Island Street, Suite 100 Building South, SF 94103

Eastern Neighborhoods CAC Applicant for Seat 9, Appointment to be made by District 9 Supervisor

Since moving to San Francisco (*my family's hometown*) from Los Angeles in 1994 (*where I was born & raised*), I worked at several law firms and was an instrumental community member that helped create and then campaigned for the passage of the 2003 Prop H: Police Commission Reform Ballot Measure. The measure was brought forward by the ACLU, Police Accountability Advocates, and School Communities after the 2002 SFUSD Thurgood Marshall Academic High/Police Melee & San Francisco Fajita-gate Scandals. In 2005, I worked for the San Francisco Department on the Status of Women (DOSW) – helping to create the Commission's Girl's Committee and Services' Directory to advise the Commission regarding issues affecting girls and young women in the City. Two years later, I transitioned to direct programs for the UCSF National Center of Excellence in Women's Health (a DOSW partner). There I was able to focus on expanding the pipeline for the next generation of young women into the healthcare industry via the Center's nationally renowned "Getting Women In" Internship Programs. This program was designed for Young Women to have hands-on experiential learning opportunities with San Francisco's leading Healthcare Professionals, Practitioners, and Partners, as well as California's Legislative Health Policy Advocates. With funding from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, in 2008, I successfully partnered with UCSF Vice Deans and Staff to reinvigorate the program which has expanded and sustains itself today.

My work has consistently sought collaboration and cooperation, along with open communication strategies for successful outcomes whether I was overseeing, monitoring, and approving complex high-dollar contracts for SFUSD involving consultants' services, advocating with labor partners for fair wages and contract stipulations, reviewing facilities and land-use agreements, and instruction products/materials; conducting enhanced program development for UCSF; or creating shared learning spaces, analyzing qualitative and quantitative data, and guiding Doctoral colleagues at USF to make use of hard/soft information systems transforming into strategic change agents in academia, politics, and other areas of workforce & economic development. I have participated at all levels in the aforementioned areas.

During my Doctoral program, I worked as an Executive Assistant to the former U.S. Technology Practice Leader (*the first female in the position*), the U.S. Risk+Crisis Communications Practice Leader for Hill+Knowlton and the CEO of Blanc&Otus – Global communications/Public Relations/Branding firms with my focus on overall office management, all facilities operations, relocations activities and cubicle/conference room rebuilds ran smoothly. The company also accessed my expertise in political strategy, education policies, and vast government public affairs knowledge to use with global clients that were engaged for finding how to place a local footprint here the SF-Bay Area.

I hold an AA Degree in Radio & Television Production, a BA in Human Communication, and an MBA in Global Management (M.B.A.) with an emphasis on Marketing. And as previously mentioned, I've added an Ed.D. in International and Multicultural Education (IME) with an emphasis in Second Language Acquisition, supported by full TESOL Certification from UC Berkeley Extension. I am also a longstanding member of several community organizations and political groups, like the Harvey Milk LGBT Democratic Club, the Alice B. Toklas Democratic Club, the SF Chapter of the NAACP, Black Women Organized for Political Action (BWOPA), The SF Bay Chapter of the Sierra Club, and several others. Alongside all of that, I've continuously grown my personal network of SF-Bay Area and Los Angeles Area (public and private) influencers to support students, families, and supportive staff as they strive for success in the right workplace environments.

Second question:

Business and/or professional experience

Kim-Shree Maufas, December 27, 2019 Application

Residence Location: [REDACTED]

Workplace Location: 350 Rhode Island Street, Suite 100 Building South, SF 94103

Eastern Neighborhoods CAC Applicant for Seat 9, Appointment to be made by District 9 Supervisor

Continued from Application form....

Professional Experience

SERVICE EMPLOYEE INTERNATIONAL UNION (SEIU), LOCAL 1021 San Francisco, CA

Field Representative for SFUSD's Classified Members [<https://www.seiu1021.org/>]

Jun 2018 – present

As the Field Rep for the SFUSD's Custodians, Cafeteria Workers (SNS), School Secretaries/Department Clerks, Transportation Schedulers, Warehouse Workers, Early Education Houseparents, Library Technicians, and On-Air Announcers at KALW, the primary responsibilities are developing and coach worksite/member leadership structures into handling grievances, partnering on arbitrations, contract negotiations, and disciplinary hearings. Provide guidance in exercising political power; organize for political campaigns and facilitate opportunities interactions with elected officials with decision making power. Advocate at SF Civil Service Commission Meetings on behalf of SFUSD Members. Prepare work plans, calendars, files, reports.

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

San Francisco, CA

Post-Doctoral Research Associate [<https://www.usfca.edu/education>]

Mar 2018 – Mar 2019

Challenging Punishment & Control: A Qualitative Study of School Discipline Reform Efforts in California project. Sponsored by the California Endowment, the project is an 18-month, qualitative comparative case-study of school discipline efforts in California's K-12 Public Schools with Principal Investigators from UCLA, UC Davis, and USF. Conduct extensive data collection through literature review, online research, qualitative in-person & video conference interviews followed with extensive written documentation. Paid collaboration with scholars based on my expertise in K-12 policy creation for underserved student communities, as well as depth of knowledge in School Discipline, Restorative Justice, and ability to take Restorative Practices infrastructure from creation through to practical implementation, district-wide.

CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO

San Francisco, CA

Administrative Analyst (CCSF Pilot Partnership w/RH Int'l) [<https://www.ccsf.edu/>]

Mar 2018–Jun 2018

Provided analytical support to CCSF Student Development Division. Create new CCSF Graduation Program format that complimented 2018 Inaugural One-Stop Gala Graduation Certification, Cap & Gown & Ticket Pick-up. Support Associate and Deans in Admissions & Records, Registration & Tuition, as well as absorbed portion Dean of Student Affairs' workload, such as correcting Department inefficiencies and procedures to assure timely reporting between Associate Registrar, Financial Aid Manager, Dean of Admissions, Dean of Student Affairs, and Vice Chancellor of Student Development.

HILL + KNOWLTON STRATEGIES (H+K)/BLANC & OTUS (B&O), WPP COMPANIES

San Francisco, CA

C-Suite Support/Gov't Relations to San Francisco Office [<http://www.hkstrategies.com/us/>]

Nov 2014–Aug 2017

Collaborated with highest level of corporate, public policy executives, and political strategists to ensure government/client/community partnerships run smoothly on behalf of clients, community partners, and industry leaders. Specifically, supported Executives for Tech Practice /Tech Enterprise Leaders. Ownership over multiple Global/ U.S. Practice Executives' calendars, travel, expense reports, HR college recruitment and staff onboarding, SF office/facilities, created structure from chaos for their global and local clients, while keeping staff accountable. Known to have an aptitude for tact, diplomacy, and a keen sense of humor with superior communication skills.

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

San Francisco, CA

Commissioner [<http://www.sfusd.edu/>]

Jan 2007–Jan 2015

Recruited/hired Superintendent of Schools; approved/hired all Executive Central office staff and District Administrators; Co-created & chaired Personnel Committee to oversee staff/personnel issues with HR; chaired Budget, Curriculum, Rules, and City College Committees; supervision over SFUSD's \$700+ Million budget and ancillary funds from City, 10yr Strategic Plan to disrupt the "predictive power of demographics" for 58,000+ SFUSD students and 7,000 staff in preparation of Vision 2025. Review and approved complex high-dollar contracts for SFUSD's consultant services, construction/land-use agreements, and instruction products/materials; oversee and guide program development; focused on Student, Family & Community Support Services (School Health, Student Discipline, and Grants). Supported Building Trades' Council lens for Project Labor Agreement and LOCAL HIRE ordinance.

UCSF NATIONAL CENTER OF EXCELLENCE IN WOMEN'S HEALTH

San Francisco, CA

Program Director [<http://coe.ucsf.edu/coe/>]

Nov 2007 – Apr 2009

Expanded & strengthened local, state, and national level partnerships. Strategically partnered with the San Francisco Unified School District, the City of San Francisco, and CBOs to connect University to Community; served as lead for agency in sponsoring grant opportunities, collaborations with Safe Work Places, Living in Non-Violent Communities (LINC) for our city's youngest residents, and with Pediatricians in the Community Initiatives. Full ownership of the Annual Young Women's Health Conference and national-renowned "Getting Women In" Internship (partnering

Kim-Shree Maufas, December 27, 2019 Application

Residence Location: [REDACTED]

Workplace Location: 350 Rhode Island Street, Suite 100 Building South, SF 94103

Eastern Neighborhoods CAC Applicant for Seat 9, Appointment to be made by District 9 Supervisor

w/UC Berkeley, SFSU, CSUEB, and CCSF); created paid partnership for a Young Men's Internship Program – focused on Adult Learning. Educate UCSF Hosts and support all Program Interns.

SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT/COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

San Francisco, CA

CEDAW Policy Analyst [<http://www.sfgov3.org/index.aspx?page=78>]

Oct 2005–Nov 2007

Ensured that City Departments incorporated policies of the United Nations & San Francisco City Ordinance CEDAW Principles. Spearheaded participation in SF Health Access Task Force, UCSF Universal Healthcare Committees, and Healthy SF to support state-wide Universal Healthcare Legislation; created/monitored RFPs & RFQs. Served as liaison to San Francisco's immigrant and underserved women's communities, city agencies, and an interagency council of young women; created "The San Francisco Girls' Committee," a liaising body to the Commission and created stipend pay structure for participating students.

Professional & Volunteer (Education-focused)

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Commissioner

[Board of Education]

Jan 2007 – Jan 2015

Monthly stipend (taxed and health coverage responsibility). The Board of Education is responsible for establishing educational goals and standards; approving curriculum; setting the district budget, which is independent of the city's budget; confirming appointment of all personnel; and approving purchases of equipment, supplies, services, leases, renovation, construction, and union contracts. In order to manage the day-to-day administration of the district, the Board of Education appoints a superintendent of schools.

PAC Member

[Parent Advisory Council to the Board of Education]

Aug 2003 – Jun 2005

Nominated and selected to serve on an inaugural advisory panel to guide the San Francisco School Board; also advise SF Office of Citizens Complaints, assist & monitor the "Revised" MOU between the SFUSD's BOE & District and the Police Department/ Commission; participating in discussions on school policy issues, particularly around school and student safety and educational equity.

President, PTSA

[Thurgood Marshall Academic High School]

Jun 2002 – Jun 2003

Developed alliances with and support from SFPD, SFFD, District 10 Supervisor Maxwell, SFUSD Board Members; facilitated associations with other San Francisco High schools to established clear channels of communication; developed proposals for academic support services; received and administered self-awareness grant for SFUSD "student-athletes".

Parent Liaison (Paid P/T)

[Thurgood Marshall Academic High School]

Jan 2002 – Jun 2002

Participated in the design and implementation the SFUSD *PILOT* program to connect families to their school community, bridge built with educators and communities where they taught; facilitated supportive wrap-around service conversations to better serve students at risk of failing; conducted outreach to recruit parents to participate in school programs and encouraged parent-teacher partnership visibility at school.

SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY ADVOCATE

San Francisco, CA

San Francisco Citizen

2005-Present

- Facilitated Public Freedom of Information & Brown Act Forum featuring Tim Redmond (Editor, SF Bay Guardian) and Human Right Commissioners;
- Appeared in "Leave My Child Alone," a National Public Service Announcement regarding the United States Military's recruitment efforts in American Public High Schools. Successfully lobbied California Legislator to require that California schools must present Parents/Guardians with an "Opt-Out" Option from US Military Recruitment efforts via student name submission on the commonly used through accessing the "Yellow Emergency Card". Forms initially were provided by the "Leave my Child Alone" collective of activists, featured on the website as well as on the California Department of Education site. They have since been a staple within California public schools;
- Work with Former Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy & Associates to provide extensive community education and outreach re: BVHP Shipyard Redevelopment efforts through San Francisco Mayor's Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC).

HOLLYGROVE CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY

Los Angeles, CA

Residential Counselor/Infirmary, LAUSD Instructional Assistant and Academic Lead

Oct 1986 – Feb 1998

Whole Facility & Infirmary staff on "3on/4off-4on/3off Weekly schedule w/ Residents of orphanage and group home settings for sexually, physically, mentally, and emotionally abused children ages 0-4, 5-12, 13-17 years; serve as a Los Angeles Unified School District Onsite "Lead" Instructor on Special Assignment for Student-residents enrolled in LAUSD at Hollygrove.

Third Question

Civic Activities:

Continued from Application form.....

TESOL Student-Teacher, Canal Alliance for Refugees Teacher Intern,

Kim-Shree Maufas, December 27, 2019 Application

Residence Location: [REDACTED]

Workplace Location: 350 Rhode Island Street, Suite 100 Building South, SF 94103

Eastern Neighborhoods CAC Applicant for Seat 9, Appointment to be made by District 9 Supervisor

CCSF – Chinatown TESOL Certified TESOL Teacher,

PRIVATE INSTRUCTION (Single/Grp) Member,

Pi Lambda Theta, the National Honor Society for Educators Member,

Phi Delta Kappa, the International Educator Fraternity Delegate,

AD 17 to the California Democratic Party (appointed by SF Democratic Party Chair, David Campos January 2019)

Conservation, Executive & Nominations Committee Member, Sierra Club – San Francisco-Bay Area Group Member,

National Associate for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) – SF/National Chapter Member,

National Council of Negro Women – Golden Gate/SF Chapter Member,

Black Women Organized for Political Action (BWOPA) SF/Oakland Chapter Alumna,

EMERGE California

Member/Political Action Chr, Harvey Milk Democratic Club

Member, Alice B. Toklas Democratic Club

Member, Jones Memorial United Methodist Church

Certified Level I Coach, USA Track & Field Pacific Region

Education:

Los Angeles City College, A.A., Radio Broadcast and Television Production

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, B.A., Human Communications

UNIVERSITY OF PHOENIX, SF CAMPUS, M.B.A., Global Management/Marketing

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, Ed.D., International & Multicultural Ed

University of California, Berkeley Extension, Post-graduate TESOL Full Certification


MEMORANDUM

TO: Rules Committee Clerk
FROM: Amy Beinart
DATE: January 7, 2020
SUBJECT: Appointment by Supervisor Hillary Ronen

Please be advised that Supervisor Hillary Ronen has selected Kim-Shree Maufas to be appointed to the Eastern Neighborhoods Community Advisory Committee.

This appointment will fill seat 5, replacing Chirag Bhakta.

Kim-Shree Maufas's address is:




Attachment: application

For Clerk's office use only:

Seat #: _____ Term expiration date: _____ Seat Vacated: _____

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

EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Replaces All Previous Notices

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN of the following vacancies (**in bold**) and term expirations, appointed by the Board of Supervisors:

J. R. Eppler, seat 1, term expires October 19, 2021, must be nominated by the District 10 Supervisor, and shall live, work or own a business in the "Plan Area" they are appointed to represent, for the unexpired portion of a two-year term.

Irma Lewis, seat 2, term expires October 19, 2021, must be nominated by the District 10 Supervisor, and shall live, work or own a business in the "Plan Area" they are appointed to represent, for the unexpired portion of a two-year.

Jolene Yee, seat 3, term expires October 19, 2021, must be nominated by the District 10 Supervisor, and shall live, work or own a business in the "Plan Area" they are appointed to represent, for the unexpired portion of a two-year term.

Keith Goldstein, seat 4, term expires October 19, 2021, must be nominated by the District 10 Supervisor, and shall live, work or own a business in the "Plan Area" they are appointed to represent, for the unexpired portion of a two-year term.

Seat 5, succeeding Sara Fenske Bahat, term expired, must be nominated by the District 8 Supervisor, and shall live, work or own a business in the "Plan Area" they are appointed to represent, for the unexpired portion of a two-year term ending October 19, 2021.

Vacant Seat 6, succeeding Chirag Bhakta, must be nominated by the District 9 Supervisor, and shall live, work or own a business in the "Plan Area" they are appointed to represent, for the unexpired portion of a two-year term ending October 19, 2021.

Seat 7, succeeding Sarah Souza, term expired, must be nominated by the District 9 Supervisor, and shall live, work or own a business in the "Plan Area" they are appointed to represent, for the unexpired portion of a two-year term ending October 19, 2021.

The three designated "**Plan Areas**" of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, include: 1) Showplace Square/Potrero Hill, 2) Mission, and 3) Central Waterfront.

Additional Qualifications: All members shall represent the diversity of the Eastern Neighborhoods, including resident renters, resident homeowners, low-income residents, local merchants, established neighborhood groups within the Plan Area, and other groups identified through refinement of the process.

Reports: Provide written recommendations to the Planning Commission regarding the approval of In-Kind Agreements, monitor compliance with the requirements of In-Kind Agreements, report non-compliance to appropriate City agencies, and request appropriate enforcement of compliance by appropriate City agencies.

Sunset Date: The Committee will automatically terminate on January 1, 2024, unless the Board of Supervisors extends the Eastern Neighborhoods Citizens Advisory Committee's term by Ordinance.

Additional information relating to the Eastern Neighborhoods Community Advisory Committee, or other seats on this body that are appointed by another authority, may be obtained by reviewing Administrative Code Article XXXII of Chapter 5 available at <http://www.sfbos.org/sfmunicodes> or by visiting the Committee's website at <http://sf-planning.org/eastern-neighborhoods-citizens-advisory-committee>.

Interested persons may obtain an application from the Board of Supervisors website at http://www.sfbos.org/vacancy_application or from the Rules Committee Clerk at 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 are nominated by a District Supervisor and 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 the applicant(s) may be asked to state their qualifications. The appointment(s) of the individual(s) who are 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 any vacancy for this Committee 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.

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

UPDATED: December 31, 2019
UPDATED: January 8, 2020

Administrative Code Article XXXII of Chapter 5 (Ordinance No. 242-19) (formerly Administrative Code, Section 10E.2(d) (Ordinance Nos. 58-09, 230-09, 197-11, 44-13, and 71-14) (formerly Administrative Code, Section 10E.2 (Ordinance Nos. 500-85, 263-99, 199-06, and 300-08))

The **Eastern Neighborhoods Community Advisory Committee** was established to be the advisory body charged with providing input to City agencies and decision makers on all activities related to the implementation of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans: 1) Mission, 2) Showplace Square/Potrero Hill, and 3) Central Waterfront (Plan Areas). The CAC shall provide input on the prioritization of public benefits funded with revenues collected from development projects within the Mission, 2) Showplace Square/Potrero Hill, and 3) Central Waterfront, updating the public benefits program, relaying information to community members in each of the three neighborhoods regarding the status of development proposals in the three Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Areas, and providing input to Plan Area monitoring efforts.

The CAC shall consist of eleven (11) members that represent the diversity of the Eastern Neighborhoods (key stakeholders), including resident renters, resident homeowners, low-income residents, local merchants, established neighborhoods groups within the Plan Area, and other groups identified through refinement of the CAC process:

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPOINTMENTS (7 Total)

- > Four (4) members nominated by the District 10 Supervisor
- > Two (2) members nominated by the District 9 Supervisor
- > One (1) member nominated by the District 8 Supervisor

MAYORAL APPOINTMENTS (4 Total)

- > Three (3) members, with one (1) member representing each of the three neighborhoods
- > One (1) at-large member from any of the three neighborhoods

Additional Qualifications: All members shall live, work or own a business in the Plan Area they are appointed to represent.


Term: Members shall serve for two-year terms.

Administration: The Planning Department or the Interagency Plan Implementation Committee shall designate necessary staffing from relevant agencies to the Committee.

Reports: The Committee shall provide written recommendations to the Planning Department and the Interagency Planning and Implementation Committee on prioritizing the community improvement projects and identifying implementation details as part of the annual expenditure program that is adopted by the Board of Supervisors. In addition, the Committee shall provide written recommendations to the Planning Commission regarding the approval of In-Kind Agreements, monitor compliance with the requirements of In-Kind Agreements, report non-compliance to appropriate City agencies, and request appropriate enforcement of compliance by appropriate City agencies.

Sunset Date: The CAC will automatically terminate on January 1, 2024, unless the Board of Supervisors extends the Committee's term by Ordinance.

GENDER ANALYSIS OF COMMISSIONS AND BOARDS



2019



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
.....	
Figure 4: Commissions and Boards with Lowest Percentage of Women, 2019 Compared to 2017, 2015..	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.¹ 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.

¹ "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, 1998.² 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.

² 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 2017. 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.³ 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.⁴


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

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

⁴ 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%.⁵ The LGBT population of the San Francisco and greater Bay Area is estimated to rank the highest of U.S. cities at 6.2%,⁶ while a 2006 survey found that 15.4% of adults in San Francisco identify as LGBT.⁷

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


⁵ 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>.

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

⁷ 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



Source: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

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




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



Source: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Figure 19: Appointees with Military Service, 2019




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%
Total	\$9,060,061,763	72	66	41%	23%	55%

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%
Total	\$33,899,680	99	87	52%	32%	54%

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*.⁸ 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.

⁸ "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, 2019⁹

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%

⁹ 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
San Francisco County California	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
dosw@sfgov.org
415.252.2570

