

File No. 230129

Committee Item No. 3

Board Item No. _____

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Rules Committee

Date Feb 13, 2023

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Form 700 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Information/Vacancies (Boards/Commissions) |
| <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 Feb 9, 2023

Completed by: _____ Date _____

Assessment Appeals Board
City and County of San Francisco
(415) 554-6778 Fax (415) 554-6775



City Hall, Room 405
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4697

Complete and return this original Application to the Assessment Appeals Board

Application for Appointment to:
(Please circle one)

Board 1 or **Board 1 Alternate**
Board 2 or **Board 2 Alternate**
Board 3 or **Board 3 Alternate**

Enter your name, mailing address and daytime telephone number in the spaces provided. Because this form is a document available for public review, you may list your business/office address, telephone number and e-mail address in lieu of your home address or other personal contact information.

Do you authorize release of your private/personal information? ☒ yes ☐ no

Name: S. Elizabeth ("Betsy") Miller

Home Address: [REDACTED]

City: San Francisco

State: [REDACTED]

Business Address: 871 Page Street, Suite 5

City: [REDACTED]

Home Phone: (415) 305-6089

Work Phone: (510) 464-8002

Fax #: (510) 464-8003

Pager #: N/A

E-Mail Address: [REDACTED]

Are you a United States citizen, or a resident alien who is eligible for and has applied for citizenship? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Have you ever been convicted of a felony in this state, or convicted of any offense which, if committed in this state, would be a felony? ☐ Yes ☒ No

(If yes, please attach a statement describing the offense(s) for which you have been convicted, the date of the conviction(s), and the court(s) that convicted you.)

Pursuant to Ordinance No. 393-98 the following qualifications are required:

A person shall not be eligible for nomination for membership on an assessment appeals board unless he or she has a minimum of five years' professional experience in this state as one of the following: (1) certified public accountant or public accountant; (2) licensed real estate broker; (3) attorney; or (4) property appraiser accredited by a nationally recognized professional organization, or property appraiser certified by either the Office of Real Estate Appraiser or by the State Board of Equalization. Documentation of qualifying experience must be submitted with this application form. This requirement does not apply to incumbent board members nominated for appointment to their same seats.

Please state your qualifications: California Attorney Bar No. 260180. See attached bar card and print out of LinkedIn profile

Please state your business and/or professional experience: My primary practice is landlord tenant law. I have done real estate transaction work for clients, including filing deeds and assisting with payment of taxes to the assessors office.

Occupation: Lawyer

Education: J.D. from USF, B.S., M.A. from William & Mary

Civic Activities: HOA board member/president; provide pro bono legal advice to local businesses; foster dogs; former youth soccer coach

Ethnicity (optional): white

Sex (optional): ☐ M ☒ F

Other Personal Information (optional) pronouns she/hers

Would you be able to attend Day Meetings? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Evening meetings? ☒ Yes ☐ No

How many days a week would you be available for hearings? 1-2

How many evenings a week? 1-2

Have you attended an Assessment Appeals Board meeting? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Appearance before the RULES COMMITTEE is a requirement before any appointment can be made.

Please Note: Your application will be retained for one year.

Date: 11/17/2022

Applicant's Signature: S. Elizabeth Miller

For Office Use Only: Appointed to Board #: _____

Seat #: _____

Term Expires: _____

Revised July 2019

Assessment Appeals Board
City and County of San Francisco
(415) 554-6778 Fax (415) 554-6775



City Hall, Room 405
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4697

Information About the Assessment Appeals Boards

Purpose: To provide the taxpayers of San Francisco a means to appeal their property tax assessments.

Procedure: After an application is filed a hearing is scheduled to allow both the taxpayer and the Assessor an opportunity to present evidence upholding their opinions of the value of the property. A panel of three Assessment Appeals Board Members or a hearing officer will listen to the testimony, review documents, and question the participants. The panel or hearing officer then evaluates the evidence and decides what the assessment of the property will be.

Differences between Boards:

Board #1 is authorized to hear appeals regardless of value, type, or location.

Board #2 is only authorized to hear property assessed at less than \$50 million, excluding possessory interests and applications concerning real property located all or in part within Assessor's Blocks 1 through 876 and 3701 through 3899, inclusive.

Board #3 is the same as Board #2, however the members primarily serve as hearing officers (see below) for day and evening hearings of residential property comprised of four units or less.

Duties of Assessment Appeals Board Members & Alternates: To listen to testimony, review documents, and ask questions of the taxpayer and Assessor in order to determine the correct assessment of property according to the applicable California Revenue and Taxation Codes.

Duties of the Alternates: The same, except that they substitute for regular board members who cannot attend the hearing.

Hearing Officers: All board members and alternates act as hearing officers. Hearing officers perform the same duties as the board panel except that they can only hear applications on single family residences, condominiums, cooperatives, or multiple-family dwellings of four units or less. Hearing officers meet with the taxpayer and the Assessor's representative to evaluate their evidence. Afterwards, the hearing officer makes a recommendation of value that can be accepted or rejected by either the taxpayer or Assessor. If the value is rejected, the appeal will be re-scheduled before a panel of three Assessment Appeals Board members for final disposition.

Dates and Times of Meetings: The Assessment Appeals Board meets Monday through Friday. There are two daily sessions. The first starts at 9:30 A.M. and the second at 1:30 P.M. In addition, there are evening sessions that start at 5:30 P.M. as needed for hearing officers only. Each session lasts until all the calendared items are acted upon.

Composition of the Board: Due to the demanding hearing schedule, there are five regular members and three alternate members on each board. Members are chosen on a rotating basis from the five regular members to create a three-member panel to hear appeal applications.

Compensation: \$125 for each half-day or evening session of service.

TERM: _____



The State Bar of California

S ELIZABETH MILLER

#260180

MCLE GROUP: 2

The highest priority of the State Bar of California is public protection.

ACTIVE

Reah J. Wilson
Executive Director

Only attorneys on active status are eligible to practice law.

Attorney Regulation

888-800-3400

Ethics Hotline800-238-4427

outside California415-538-2150

Lawyer Assistance Program (LAP) 877-LAP-4-HELP


Attorney Complaint Hotline800-843-9053

Commission on Judicial Performance415-557-1200

calbar.ca.gov

Attorney's Signature: _____

This certifies that the person whose name appears on the card has paid the annual fee required by statute.



Betsy Miller

Attorney

San Francisco, California, United States

675 followers · 500+ connections

Sign in to connect



Trinity Law P.C.




University of San Francisco
School of Law

Activity



Today's my last day as executive editor at Sunset magazine. It's been a creative and inspiring ride--one that's ending on an incredible high with...

Liked by Betsy Miller



What do the most innovative General Counsel have in common?

Liked by Betsy Miller

Experience



Attorney At Law

Trinity Law P.C.

Mar 2022 - Present · 9 months

San Francisco, California, United States

Betsy focuses her efforts on helping those in her local community. Betsy's primary practice area is on landlord tenant litigation and counseling in San Francisco and Oakland. She handles a variety of litigation and transactional matters, including employment litigation, contract disputes, restraining orders, business litigation, drafting contracts, business transactions, HOA litigation, real property disputes, and real estate transactions. Betsy also continues to provide patent and trademark counseling for small businesses and inventors on a limited basis.

Show less ^



Jan 2017 - Mar 2022 · 5 years 3 months

Oakland, California

Betsy handles a variety of litigation and transactional matters, with a focus on landlord tenant disputes in San Francisco and Oakland. She also handles employment litigation, partition actions, real estate transactions, contract disputes and business litigation. Betsy provides patent and trademark counseling for small businesses and inventors.



Attorney

LAW OFFICES OF BETSY MILLER

Apr 2014 - Jan 2017 · 2 years 10 months

Oakland, California

In addition to providing legal advice for patent counseling and prosecution, patent opinions, and licensing and confidentiality agreements. In this role, Betsy provides legal advice for a variety of legal matters including landlord tenant counseling and litigation in San Francisco and Oakland, contract disputes, business litigation, contracts, IP counseling for small businesses and inventors, and business formation strategies.



Of Counsel

Digital Law Group

May 2014 - Aug 2016 · 2 years 4 months

Oakland, California

At Digital Law Group, Betsy provides legal advice for patent counseling and prosecution, patent opinions, and licensing and confidentiality agreements.



Attorney

Google

Jul 2011 - Jul 2013 · 2 years 1 month

San Francisco Bay Area



Contract Attorney

Morrison & Foerster LLP

Oct 2009 - May 2011 · 1 year 8 months

San Francisco Bay Area



Cardinal Intellectual Property, Inc.

Sep 2008 - Dec 2009 · 1 year 4 months

Law Clerk



Public Advocates

Sep 2007 - Dec 2007 · 4 months

San Francisco Bay Area



Legal Intern

USF Center for Law and Global Justice

May 2007 - Jul 2007 · 3 months

Hanoi, Vietnam

Legal Intern in Hanoi

Kenyon

Patent Paralegal/Patent Agent

Kenyon & Kenyon

Sep 2003 - Aug 2005 · 2 years

New York, New York

Handled complex patent prosecution -- US, International and Foreign. Point of contact for clients



Patent and Trademark Docket Clerk

Hale and Dorr LLP

Mar 2003 - Sep 2003 · 7 months

New York, New York

Patent and trademark docket clerk



Emisphere Technologies

2 years 6 months

Patent Paralegal

May 2001 - Sep 2002 · 1 year 5 months

Greater New York City Area

Handled simple patent and trademark prosecution.



Synthesized Organic Molecules

Education



University of San Francisco School of Law

JD · Law

2005 - 2008



The College of William and Mary

Masters · Chemistry

1998 - 2000




William & Mary

BS · Chemistry, Biochem

1994 - 1998

View Betsy's full profile

 See who you know in common

 Get introduced

 Contact Betsy directly

Sign in to view full profile

People also viewed

Ying Yu

Student at Temple University

Jersey City, NJ

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)
Miller Susan ("Betsy") Elizabeth

1. Office, Agency, or Court

Agency Name (Do not use acronyms)

Assessment Appeals Board

Board #3

Division, Board, Department, District, if applicable

Your Position

► 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 San Francisco

☒ City of San Francisco

☐ Other

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

☐ Annual: The period covered is January 1, 2021, through December 31, 2021.

☐ Leaving Office: Date Left / /
(Check one circle.)

-or-

The period covered is / / through December 31, 2021.

☐ The period covered is January 1, 2021, through the date of leaving office.

-or-

☐ Assuming Office: Date assumed / /

☐ The period covered is / / through the date of leaving office.

☐ Candidate: Date of Election and office sought, if different than Part 1:

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

Schedules attached

☒ Schedule A-1 - Investments - schedule attached

☒ Schedule C - Income, Loans, & Business Positions - schedule attached

☒ Schedule A-2 - Investments - schedule attached

☐ Schedule D - Income - Gifts - schedule attached

☐ Schedule B - Real Property - schedule attached

☐ Schedule E - Income - Gifts - Travel Payments - schedule attached


-or- ☐ None - No reportable interests on any schedule

5. Verification

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 12/28/2022
(month, day, year)

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

Print

Clear

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

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Northwest Mutual

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

IRA Investment

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 See attached statement
(Describe)
☐ Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499
☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

____/____/21 ____/____/21
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:

____/____/21 ____/____/21
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:

____/____/21 ____/____/21
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:

____/____/21 ____/____/21
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:

____/____/21 ____/____/21
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:

____/____/21 ____/____/21
ACQUIRED DISPOSED

Comments:

Print

Clear

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
Susan "Betsy" Miller

▶ 1. BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST

Trinity Law P.C.

Name
871 Page Street, Suite 5, San Francisco, CA 94117

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 _____/_____/21 _____/_____/21
☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000 ACQUIRED DISPOSED
☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000
☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000
☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
☐ Partnership ☐ Sole Proprietorship ☒ Professional Corp ☐ Other

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION President

▶ 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 _____/_____/21 _____/_____/21
☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000 ACQUIRED DISPOSED
☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000
☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INTEREST
☐ Property Ownership/Deed of Trust ☐ Stock ☐ Partnership

☐ Leasehold _____ ☐ Other _____
Yrs. remaining

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

▶ 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 _____/_____/21 _____/_____/21
☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000 ACQUIRED DISPOSED
☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000
☐ \$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 _____/_____/21 _____/_____/21
☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000 ACQUIRED DISPOSED
☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000
☐ Over \$1,000,000

NATURE OF INTEREST
☐ Property Ownership/Deed of Trust ☐ Stock ☐ Partnership

☐ Leasehold _____ ☐ Other _____
Yrs. remaining

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

Comments: _____

Print

Clear

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

CALIFORNIA FORM 700 FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION Name _____

▶ 1. INCOME RECEIVED	▶ 1. INCOME RECEIVED
NAME OF SOURCE OF INCOME _____ ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable) _____ BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE _____ YOUR BUSINESS POSITION _____	NAME OF SOURCE OF INCOME _____ ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable) _____ BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE _____ YOUR BUSINESS POSITION _____
GROSS INCOME RECEIVED <input type="checkbox"/> No Income - Business Position Only <input type="checkbox"/> \$500 - \$1,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$1,001 - \$10,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000 <input type="checkbox"/> OVER \$100,000	GROSS INCOME RECEIVED <input type="checkbox"/> No Income - Business Position Only <input type="checkbox"/> \$500 - \$1,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$1,001 - \$10,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000 <input type="checkbox"/> OVER \$100,000
CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH INCOME WAS RECEIVED <input type="checkbox"/> Salary <input type="checkbox"/> Spouse's or registered domestic partner's income (For self-employed use Schedule A-2.) <input type="checkbox"/> Partnership (Less than 10% ownership. For 10% or greater use Schedule A-2.) <input type="checkbox"/> Sale of _____ (Real property, car, boat, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Loan repayment <input type="checkbox"/> Commission or <input type="checkbox"/> Rental Income, list each source of \$10,000 or more _____ (Describe) <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ (Describe)	CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH INCOME WAS RECEIVED <input type="checkbox"/> Salary <input type="checkbox"/> Spouse's or registered domestic partner's income (For self-employed use Schedule A-2.) <input type="checkbox"/> Partnership (Less than 10% ownership. For 10% or greater use Schedule A-2.) <input type="checkbox"/> Sale of _____ (Real property, car, boat, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Loan repayment <input type="checkbox"/> Commission or <input type="checkbox"/> Rental Income, list each source of \$10,000 or more _____ (Describe) <input type="checkbox"/> 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* SF Fire Credit Union ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable) 3201 California St, San Francisco, CA 94118 BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF LENDER _____ HIGHEST BALANCE DURING REPORTING PERIOD <input type="checkbox"/> \$500 - \$1,000 <input type="checkbox"/> \$1,001 - \$10,000 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> \$10,001 - \$100,000 <input type="checkbox"/> OVER \$100,000	INTEREST RATE 8.175 % <input type="checkbox"/> None TERM (Months/Years) HELOC - 25 years SECURITY FOR LOAN <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Personal residence <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Real Property 438 W. Grand Ave, Unit 509 Street address Oakland, CA 94612 City <input type="checkbox"/> Guarantor _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ (Describe)
---	--

Comments: _____

Print

Clear

Variable Annuity Summary Statement

For the Period: 07/01/2022 through 09/30/2022

Contract No: Redacted - Privacy

Annuitant: **Susan E Miller**

Owner Email: Redacted - Privacy

Contract Date: **06/02/2014**

Account: **B - RR Series front end design**

Market: **Roth IRA**

Risk Tolerance: **Aggressive**

Susan E Miller

Redacted - Privacy

Page 1 of 2

Activity	Current Period 07/01/2022 through 09/30/2022	Year to Date 01/01/2022 through 09/30/2022
Beginning Contract Value	\$72,426.63	\$82,135.85
Contributions	0.00	+ 4,500.00
Sales load	0.00	- 202.50
Investment Return	- 4,614.31	- 18,621.03
Ending Contract Value	\$67,812.32	\$67,812.32

Variable Fund Information

Mason Street Advisors, LLC (MSA) is the principal investment adviser for all the Portfolios in the Northwestern Mutual Series Fund (Series Fund). (Portfolios in the Series Fund are identified by the parenthetical next to the portfolio name.) MSA has engaged and oversees sub-advisers who provide day-to-day management for certain of the Series Fund Portfolios. Each sub-adviser may be replaced without the approval of shareholders. Please see the prospectus for more information. Additional fund options are advised by Russell Investments, Fidelity Investments® and Neuberger Berman Investment Advisers, LLC., and Credit Suisse Asset Management, LLC.

Contract Value by Fund

Variable Funds	Percent of Contract Value	Units	Unit Value	Contract Value	Current Period Investment Return
Equity Income (MSA/T Rowe Price)	10%	1,694.33	\$4.00	\$6,785.22	-\$479.05
Neuberger Berman Sustainable Equity	6%	1,581.57	2.57	4,069.38	-212.95
Fidelity VIP Contrafund	6%	1,410.09	2.92	4,123.59	-170.83
Focused Appreciation (MSA/Loomis Sayles)	10%	1,005.24	6.71	6,747.05	-328.11
Mid Cap Value (MSA/Amer Century)	4%	558.05	4.87	2,718.13	-161.58
Fidelity VIP Mid Cap	4%	452.50	6.22	2,816.28	-54.02
Small Cap Value (MSA/T Rowe Price)	3%	425.00	4.85	2,065.07	-77.86
Research International Core (MSA/MFS)	8%	4,425.75	1.19	5,272.34	-596.23
International Equity (MSA/Dodge Cox)	7%	2,667.92	1.72	4,588.95	-561.60
International Growth (MSA/FIAM LLC)	7%	1,974.35	2.37	4,680.47	-434.78
Emerging Markets Equity (MSA/Aberdeen)	7%	4,624.29	0.97	4,525.88	-584.96
Select Bond (MSA/Allspring Global Inv)	8%	2,466.04	2.21	5,466.82	-271.60
Strategic Bond (RIF)	4%	1,277.31	2.14	2,734.94	-133.31
Inflation Protection (MSA/Amer Century)	2%	937.30	1.44	1,354.08	-78.48
Multi Sector Bond (MSA/PIMCO)	4%	1,678.01	1.66	2,794.15	-90.60
High Yield Bond (MSA/Federated Inv.)	2%	451.23	3.15	1,423.57	-22.92
Global Real Estate Securities (RIF)	2%	274.96	4.60	1,267.21	-180.30
Credit Suisse Commodity Strategy	6%	678.47	6.45	4,379.19	-175.13
Totals	100%			\$67,812.32	-\$4,614.31

**Variable Annuity
Summary Statement**

For the Period: 07/01/2022 through 09/30/2022

Annuitant: **Susan E Miller**

Contract No: **20791998**

Page 2 of 2

Other Contract Information

Cash surrender value at the beginning of the current period on 07/01/2022 was \$72,426.63. The cash surrender value at the end of the current period on 09/30/2022 was \$67,812.32.

Total Contributions Since Inception:	\$58,385.19
Total Withdrawals Since Inception:	\$0.00
Total Death Benefit on 09/30/2022:	\$67,812.32

Your contract can be converted into an income plan that cannot be outlived. Assuming the current value as of 9/30/2022, current rates, and an age of 65, you could receive monthly payments of \$364.83 for your lifetime under single life income plan with a period certain of 10 years. Actual income may vary. Contact your financial representative to learn more.

Thank you for choosing Northwestern Mutual. If we can be of service, please contact your

Financial Representative: David C Walther, CLU

Network Office: SFBAG Ins Services Inc
Ste 1600
600 Montgomery St
San Francisco CA 94111-2718

Redacted - Privacy

or call us at **888-455-2232**, or visit us at **NorthwesternMutual.com**.

Northwestern Mutual is the marketing name for The Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company, Milwaukee, WI (NM) (life, disability insurance, annuities) and its subsidiaries.

Includes all transactions processed through 09/30/2022

Variable Annuity Statement

IMPORTANT: PLEASE REFER TO YOUR CONTRACT AND/OR MOST RECENT PROSPECTUS FOR DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED ON THIS STATEMENT. PLEASE REFER TO YOUR CONTRACT FOR ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS. CONSULT YOUR OWN TAX ADVISOR FOR ADDITIONAL TAX INFORMATION AND TAX ADVICE.

CUSTOMER SERVICE

Who to Contact:

Your Northwestern Mutual Financial Representative

Your financial representative is your primary contact with our company the person who knows you and your financial situation best. Your representative can help you evaluate your overall financial situation and the impact certain life events may have on your investment program. Likewise, changes in the economy may require reevaluations. Consider checking with your representative to review your investment objectives, risk tolerance, and investment time horizon before making any necessary adjustments in your fund choices/allocation.

www.northwesternmutual.com

On the Northwestern Mutual secured website you can:

- Review your contract value
- Request a transfer of funds or allocation change
- Review fund performance or unit values
- View/print copies of your statements
- Sign up to receive your statements electronically

Visit our website to register for a User ID and password.

Northwestern Mutual Home Office

The Annuity Customer Service Center:

1 888 455 2232

PO Box 2099

Milwaukee, WI 53201

To Make Additional Payments (if available)

Regular Mail: If you have an Additional Investment Reminder and a postage paid envelope from a quarterly summary statement or a transaction confirmation, use this address to send your contribution via regular mail:

Payment Processing Center
PO Box 3247
Milwaukee, WI 53201 9554

Express Mail: If you do not have an Additional Investment Reminder or if you wish to invest via express or overnight mail, send your contribution and investment instructions to:

Northwestern Mutual
Attn: Investment Client Services Dept.
720 East Wisconsin Ave.
Milwaukee, WI 53202

Electronic Funds Transfer Plan: The Electronic Funds Transfer (EFT) plan enables you to automatically contribute a fixed dollar payment on a regular basis directly from your checking account. Since EFT is convenient, regular and automatic, this plan is an ideal vehicle for a dollar cost averaging investment program. If you are interested in participating in this program, contact your Northwestern Mutual Financial Representative or the Annuity Customer Service Center.

All Other Service Requests

Please contact your Northwestern Mutual Financial Representative or the Annuity Customer Service Center (Monday - Friday, 7:30 a.m. - 5 p.m. CST).

Northwestern Mutual is the marketing name for The Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company, Milwaukee WI (NM) (Life & Disability Insurance, Annuities) and its subsidiaries. Variable annuities offered through **Northwestern Mutual Investment Services, LLC** (NMIS, subsidiary of NM.) member FINRA and SIPC. For a variable annuity, a prospectus precedes this information. For an additional copy of the contract and fund prospectus, please contact the registered representative copied on this communication. The statement is being sent on behalf of NMIS, which is the broker dealer through which the transactions were executed. NMIS acted in an agency capacity.

All investments carry risk, including potential loss of principal.



ASSESSMENT APPEALS BOARD NO. 3

The below listed summary of seats, term expirations and membership information shall serve as notice of **vacancies, upcoming term expirations** and information on currently held seats, appointed by the Board of Supervisors. Appointments by other bodies are listed, if available. Seat numbers listed in **bold** are open for immediate appointment. However, you are able to submit applications for all seats and your application will be maintained for one year, in the event that an unexpected vacancy or opening occurs.

Membership and Seat Qualifications

Seat #	Appointing Authority	Seat Holder	Term Ending	Qualification
1	BOS	Shawn Ridgell	9/1/25	Must have a minimum of five years professional experience in the State of California as one of the following: Certified Public Accountant or Public Accountant; licensed Real Estate Broker; Attorney; or a Property Appraiser accredited by a nationally recognized professional organization, certified by the Office of Real Estate Appraisers, or certified by the State Board of Equalization.
2	BOS	VACANT	9/2/24	Must have a minimum of five years professional experience in the State of California as one of the following: Certified Public Accountant or Public Accountant; licensed Real Estate Broker; Attorney; or a Property Appraiser accredited by a nationally recognized professional organization, certified by the Office of Real Estate Appraisers, or certified by the State Board of Equalization.
3	BOS	Jeffrey Lee	9/4/23	Must have a minimum of five years professional experience in the State of California as one of the following: Certified Public

				Accountant or Public Accountant; licensed Real Estate Broker; Attorney; or a Property Appraiser accredited by a nationally recognized professional organization, certified by the Office of Real Estate Appraisers, or certified by the State Board of Equalization.
4	BOS	James Reynolds	9/1/25	Must have a minimum of five years professional experience in the State of California as one of the following: Certified Public Accountant or Public Accountant; licensed Real Estate Broker; Attorney; or a Property Appraiser accredited by a nationally recognized professional organization, certified by the Office of Real Estate Appraisers, or certified by the State Board of Equalization.
5	BOS	VACANT	9/2/24	Must have a minimum of five years professional experience in the State of California as one of the following: Certified Public Accountant or Public Accountant; licensed Real Estate Broker; Attorney; or a Property Appraiser accredited by a nationally recognized professional organization, certified by the Office of Real Estate Appraisers, or certified by the State Board of Equalization.
6	BOS	VACANT	9/1/25	Must have a minimum of five years professional experience in the State of California as one of the following: Certified Public Accountant or Public Accountant; licensed Real Estate Broker; Attorney; or a Property Appraiser accredited by a nationally recognized professional

				organization, certified by the Office of Real Estate Appraisers, or certified by the State Board of Equalization. (ALTERNATE MEMBER)
7	BOS	VACANT	9/2/24	Must have a minimum of five years professional experience in the State of California as one of the following: Certified Public Accountant or Public Accountant; licensed Real Estate Broker; Attorney; or a Property Appraiser accredited by a nationally recognized professional organization, certified by the Office of Real Estate Appraisers, or certified by the State Board of Equalization. (ALTERNATE MEMBER)
8	BOS	VACANT	9/4/23	Must have a minimum of five years professional experience in the State of California as one of the following: Certified Public Accountant or Public Accountant; licensed Real Estate Broker; Attorney; or a Property Appraiser accredited by a nationally recognized professional organization, certified by the Office of Real Estate Appraisers, or certified by the State Board of Equalization. (ALTERNATE MEMBER)

Prohibition: No member shall, within the three years immediately preceding his/her appointment to the Board, have been an employee of an assessor's office.

Interested persons may obtain an application from the Assessment Appeals Board website at http://www.sfbos.org/aab_app and should be submitted to: 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102-4689. All applicants must be residents of San Francisco, unless otherwise stated.

Pursuant to Board of Supervisors Rules of Order 2.19 (Motion No. 05-92) all applicants applying for this body must complete and submit, with their application, a copy (**not original**) of Form 700, Statement of Economic Interests. Applications will not be considered if a copy of Form 700 is not received.

FORM 700 AVAILABLE HERE (Required)

<https://www.fppc.ca.gov/Form700.html>

Please Note: Depending upon the posting date, a vacancy may have already been filled. To determine if a vacancy for this Commission is still available, or if you require additional information, please call the Rules Committee Clerk at (415) 554-5184.

- **Next Steps:** Applicants who meet minimum qualifications will be contacted by the Rules Committee Clerk once the Rules Committee Chair determines the date of the hearing. Members of the Rules Committee will consider the appointment(s) at the meeting and applicant(s) may be asked to state their qualifications. The appointment of the individual(s) who is recommended by the Rules Committee will be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for final approval.

The Assessment Appeals Board No. 3 consists of eight (8) members (five (5) regular members, and three (3) alternate members) all appointed by the Board of Supervisors. No person may concurrently hold a seat on more than one of the three Assessment Appeals Boards.

The Board members' term of office is three years, beginning on the first Monday in September. In the event of a vacancy, the newly appointed member shall serve for the remainder of the unexpired term.

The Board shall have the following qualifications as stated in the eligibility criteria set forth in California Revenue and Taxation Code, Section 1624.05, as follows: Must have a minimum of five years professional experience in the State of California as one of the following:

Certified Public Accountant or Public Accountant; licensed Real Estate Broker; Attorney; or a Property Appraiser accredited by a nationally recognized professional organization, certified by the Office of Real Estate Appraisers, or certified by the State Board of Equalization.

Hearing Officers: The regular and alternate members of the Board shall also serve as hearing officers. The Clerk shall designate members to act as hearing officers for particular applications using a rotating system designed to assure that all members with the same priority level have an equal opportunity over time to participate as hearing officers. The Clerk shall designate hearing officers in the following priority order: (1) the regular member of Assessment Appeals Board No. 3; (2) the alternate members of Assessment Appeals Board No. 3; (3) the alternate members of Assessment Appeals Board No. 2; (4) the alternate members of Assessment Appeals Board No. 1; (5) the regular members of Assessment Appeals Board No. 2; and (6) the regular members of Assessment Appeals Board No. 1. In their capacity as assessment hearing officers, the officers shall serve at the pleasure of and by contract with the Board of Supervisors.

It shall be the duty of each Assessment Appeals Board to equalize the valuation of the taxable property within the City and County for the purposes of taxation in the manner and subject to the limitations contained in Article XIII of the California State Constitution. Assessment Appeals Board No. 3 shall have jurisdiction to hear applications for reductions only for property assessed at less than \$50,000,000, excluding applications involving possessory interests or real property located all or in part within Assessor's Block Nos. 1-876 or 3701-3899.

Compensation: \$125 for each one-half day of service.

Report: Pursuant to California Revenue and Taxation Code, Section 1639, the hearing officer shall prepare a summary report of the proceedings together with a recommendation on the application and shall transmit this report and recommendation to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

Authority: Administrative Code, Chapter 2B et seq. (Added by Ordinance No. 37-67; Amended by Ordinances Nos. 110-68, 82-94, 86-96, 393-98, 273-99, and 128-13) and California Revenue and Taxation Code, Section 1620-1630

Sunset: None

Contact: Alistair Gibson
Assessment Appeals Board
City Hall, Room 405
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-6776
alistair.gibson@sfgov.org

Updated: November 10, 2022

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
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\\$sanc=JD_Chapter33A](http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/administrative/chapter33alocalimplementationoftheunited?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca$sanc=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.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 LGBT⁷.

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 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.

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


(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%
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