

File No. 240712

Committee Item No. 8

Board Item No. _____

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Rules Committee

Date July 22, 2024

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date _____

Cmte Board

<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Form 700
XXXX	<input type="checkbox"/>	Information/Vacancies (Boards/Commissions)
<input checked="" 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 July 18, 2024

Completed by: _____

Date _____


1 [Mayoral Appointment, Planning Commission - Amy Campbell]

2
3 **Motion approving/rejecting the Mayoral nomination for the appointment of Amy**
4 **Campbell to the Planning Commission, for a four-year term ending July 1, 2028.**

5
6 WHEREAS, Pursuant to Charter, Section 4.105, the Mayor has submitted a
7 communication notifying the Board of Supervisors of the nomination of Amy Campbell to the
8 Planning Commission, received by the Clerk of the Board on June 21, 2024; and

9 WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors, by Motion No. M02-80 established a process to
10 review the Mayor's nomination to the Planning Commission; now, therefore, be it

11 MOVED, That the Board of Supervisors hereby approves/rejects the Mayor's
12 nomination of Amy Campbell, seat 6, succeeding Susan Diamond (term expired), for
13 appointment to the Planning Commission, for the unexpired portion of a four year-term ending
14 July 1, 2028.



Notice of Nominations for Appointment

June 21, 2024

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

Pursuant to Charter Section 4.105 of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following nominations for appointment to the Planning Commission:

Amy Campbell, for a four-year term ending July 1, 2028. She will fill the seat held by Sue Diamond, whose term is expiring.

Sean McGarry, for a four-year term ending July 1, 2028. He will fill the seat held by Joel Koppel, whose term is expiring.

I am confident that these individuals will serve our community well. Attached are their qualifications to serve, which demonstrate how their appointments will represent the communities of interest, neighborhoods and diverse populations of the City and County of San Francisco.

I encourage your support and am pleased to advise you of these appointment nominations. Should you have any questions, please contact my Director of Boards and Commissions, Jesse Mainardi, at 415.554.6588.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "London N. Breed".

London N. Breed
Mayor, City and County of San Francisco



Amy Campbell, AIA
Senior Associate

Studio Director + Northwest Practice Leader for Building Transformation and Adaptive Reuse

Amy is a “big picture” thinker that draws on her wide range of professional experience from architecture and interior design to theater set design and the fine arts.

Amy’s leadership and versatility as a professional energize those that she collaborates with to collectively bring their innovative ideas forward and synthesize them into achievable results – all while seamlessly helping her clients achieve their goals.

Amy’s community involvement includes her mayoral appointment to San Francisco’s Historic Preservation Commission and Urban Land Institutes Local Product Council. Her commitment to cities and the practice of building transformation and adaptive reuse can be seen and heard in her various writings, quotes and interviews ranging from the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Business Times, SF Standard, The Mercury News, KCBS, NBC Bay Area News, KQED Forum as well as her award winning project work.

17 Years of Experience

Joined Gensler 2012

Background

Master of Architecture, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA
Bachelor of Arts, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN

Affiliations

American Institute of Architects (AIA)
Urban Land Institute (ULI) Local Product Council
Commissioner, San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission
National Trust for Historic Preservation

Selected Project Experience	Size (sq ft)
Building Transformation	
2 + 48 Stockton, Repositioning, San Francisco, CA	173,00
45 Fremont, Lobby Repositioning, San Francisco, CA	18,000
70 North Second Facade Renovation, San Jose, CA	10,000
88 Kearny, Lobby Repositioning, San Francisco, CA	2,500
945 Market Street, San Francisco, CA	256,000
201 California, Feasibility Study, San Francisco, CA	8,000
400-430 California, Repositioning, San Francisco, CA	220,000
550 Seventh, Repositioning, San Francisco, CA	18,300
3100 San Pablo Avenue, Parking & Signage, Berkeley, CA	120,600
BioMed Realty (BMR), Campus Amenity, Emeryville, CA	25,000
Foundry 31, Repositioning, Berkeley, CA	120,600
Hudson Pacific Properties, Metro Tower, Foster City, CA	8,000
The Merchants Exchange, San Francisco, CA	
30 th Street Post Office, Philadelphia, PA*	

Workplace: Media & Consumer Goods

Confidential Warehouse Distribution Center, Berkeley, CA	24,550
Roblox Building 970, San Mateo, CA	33,810

Workplace: Technology

Airbnb, San Francisco, CA	72,000
IBM, 425 Market Street, San Francisco, CA	50,000
RocketSpace Co-Working	
123 Mission, San Francisco, CA	36,000
150 9 th Avenue, Calgary, Canada	66,500
Global Design Standards, San Francisco, CA	
Samsung 837 Marketing Center of Excellence, New York, NY	24,000
Symantec Union 82 Gastropub, Mountain View, CA	4,600

Workplace: Professional Services

Balfour Beatty Construction, Oakland, CA	14,000
Lendlease, San Francisco, CA	140,000

Education, Civic & Culture

National LGBTQ Center for the Arts, Accessibility Upgrades,
San Francisco, CA
The House of Arts and Culture, The Lebanese-Omani Centre
Beirut, Lebanon*
City Hall, Førde Municipality, Førde, Norway*
National Presidential Library, Astana, Kazakhstan*

Office Buildings: Developer

Shenzhen Crystal Island Landmark and Plaza, Shenzhen, China*

Retail

Apple Store Renovation - SoHo, New York, NY*

** Experience prior to Gensler*

Awards

45 Fremont Lobby Renovation, San Francisco, CA
Metamorphosis Awards, Retrofit Magazine, 2023
88 Kearny, San Francisco, CA
IIDA Chapter Awards: Northern California, 2021
Interior Design Magazine Best of Year Awards, Commercial Lobby +
Amenity Space, Honoree, 202
Metamorphosis Awards, Retrofit Magazine, 2021
National LGBTQ Center for the Arts, San Francisco, CA
Gensler Community Impact Award (GCIA), 2020
888 Brannan, San Francisco, CA
IIDA Chapter Awards: Northern California, 2015
ASLA Northern California Chapter, ASLA Merit Award, 2014
Interior Design Magazine, Best of Year Awards, 2014
Gensler, GDEA, Work - Large Built, Grand Prize, 2014
Airbnb, San Francisco, CA
California Home + Design Awards, 2014

Speaking Engagements

Guest Lecturer, College of Architecture, Planning, and Design,
Kansas State University, April 2024
Moderator, Design Forecast Live, April 2024
Presenter, Honor Awards Virtual, IIDA Northern California, October 2021

Publications

"After Closure Announcement, a Look at Macy's Heyday...and Union Square's
Future " KQED, March 2024
"San Francisco's coolest office lobbies: Get an inside look at the city's history,"
San Francisco Chronicle, December 2023
"Did car-free Market Street kill San Francisco's most important boulevard?"
The San Francisco Standard, December 2023
"These Downtown S.F. Office Buildings Could Yield Thousands of Housing
Units," San Francisco Chronicle, February 2023
"From Vacancy to Vibrancy: Reimagining the Future of Downtown San
Francisco," Gensler.com, February 2023
Airbnb, San Francisco, CA
"Five Amazing International Offices," House and Leisure, June 2016

CALIFORNIA FORM 700
 FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

STATEMENT OF ECONOMIC INTERESTS
COVER PAGE
A Public Document

 Date Initial Filing Received
Filing Official Use Only

 E-Filed
 11/18/2023
 14:23:11

 Filing ID:
 208779480

Please type or print in ink.

NAME OF FILER (LAST) (FIRST) (MIDDLE)

Campbell, Amy

1. Office, Agency, or Court

Agency Name (Do not use acronyms)

City and County of San Francisco

Division, Board, Department, District, if applicable

Your Position

Historic Preservation Commission

Commissioner

► If filing for multiple positions, list below or on an attachment. (Do not use acronyms)

Agency: _____

Position: _____

2. Jurisdiction of Office (Check at least one box)☒ State☐ Judge, Retired Judge, Pro Tem Judge, or Court Commissioner
(Statewide Jurisdiction)☒ Multi-County CA☒ 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, 2022 through December 31, 2022.☐ Leaving Office: Date Left ____/____/____
(Check one circle)

-or-

The period covered is ____/____/____, through December 31, 2022.

☐ The period covered is January 1, 2022 through the date of leaving office.☒ Assuming Office: Date assumed 11 / 01 / 2023☐ 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 (required)**

► Total number of pages including this cover page: 5

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

-or-

☐ None - No reportable interests on any schedule**5. Verification**MAILING ADDRESS STREET
(Business or Agency Address Recommended - Public Document)

CITY

STATE

ZIP CODE

San Francisco

CA

94104

DAYTIME TELEPHONE NUMBER

E-MAIL ADDRESS

()

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 11/18/2023

(month, day, year)

Signature Amy Campbell

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

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 <u>Campbell, Amy</u>

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY
Vertex Pharmaceuticals

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS
Pharmaceuticals

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:
 / / 22 / / 22
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY
Apple Inc

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS
Technology

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:
 / / 22 / / 22
 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:
 / / 22 / / 22
 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:
 / / 22 / / 22
 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:
 / / 22 / / 22
 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:
 / / 22 / / 22
 ACQUIRED DISPOSED

Comments: _____

SCHEDULE A-2

Investments, Income, and Assets of Business Entities/Trusts

(Ownership Interest is 10% or Greater)

CALIFORNIA FORM 700
FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION
Name Campbell, Amy

1. BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST

Parcel Projects

Name

San Francisco, CA 94114

Address (Business Address Acceptable)

Check one

☐ Trust, go to 2 ☒ Business Entity, complete the box, then go to 2
GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Architectural Services

FAIR MARKET VALUE

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

☐ \$0 - \$1,999☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☐ Over \$1,000,000

____/____/22

ACQUIRED

____/____/22

DISPOSED

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☒ Partnership☐ Sole Proprietorship☐

Other

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION Owner

1. BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST

Parcel 2301 LLC

Name

San Francisco, CA 94114

Address (Business Address Acceptable)

Check one

☐ Trust, go to 2 ☒ Business Entity, complete the box, then go to 2
GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Real Estate holding

FAIR MARKET VALUE

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

☐ \$0 - \$1,999☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☒ Over \$1,000,000

____/____/22

ACQUIRED

____/____/22

DISPOSED

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☒ Partnership☐ Sole Proprietorship☐

Other

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION Partner

2. IDENTIFY THE GROSS INCOME RECEIVED (INCLUDE YOUR PRO RATA SHARE OF THE GROSS INCOME TO THE ENTITY/TRUST)☐ \$0 - \$499☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$500 - \$1,000☐ OVER \$100,000☐ \$1,001 - \$10,000**3. LIST THE NAME OF EACH REPORTABLE SINGLE SOURCE OF INCOME OF \$10,000 OR MORE (Attach a separate sheet if necessary.)**☒ None or ☐ Names listed below**4. INVESTMENTS AND INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY HELD OR LEASED BY THE BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST**

Check one box:

☐ INVESTMENT☐ REAL PROPERTY

Name of Business Entity, if Investment, or

Assessor's Parcel Number or Street Address of Real Property

Description of Business Activity or

City or Other Precise Location of Real Property

FAIR MARKET VALUE

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☐ Over \$1,000,000

____/____/22

ACQUIRED

____/____/22

DISPOSED

NATURE OF INTEREST

☐ Property Ownership/Deed of Trust☐ Stock☐ Partnership☐ Leasehold

Yrs. remaining

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

2301 Telegraph Avenue, Oakland, CA 94612

Description of Business Activity or

City or Other Precise Location of Real Property

FAIR MARKET VALUE

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☒ Over \$1,000,000

____/____/22

ACQUIRED

____/____/22

DISPOSED

NATURE OF INTEREST

☒ Property Ownership/Deed of Trust☐ Stock☐ Partnership☐ Leasehold

Yrs. remaining

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

Comments:

SCHEDULE C

Income, Loans, & Business Positions

(Other than Gifts and Travel Payments)

CALIFORNIA FORM 700
FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION
Name Campbell, Amy

1. INCOME RECEIVED

NAME OF SOURCE OF INCOME

Gensler

ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)

San Francisco, CA 94104

BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE

Architectural Services

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION

Architect and Studio Director

GROSS INCOME RECEIVED

☐ \$500 - \$1,000☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ No Income - Business Position Only☐ \$1,001 - \$10,000☒ OVER \$100,000

CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH INCOME WAS RECEIVED

☒ Salary ☐ Spouse's or registered domestic partner's income
(For self-employed use Schedule A-2.)☐ Partnership (Less than 10% ownership. For 10% or greater use
Schedule A-2.)☐ Sale of _____
(Real property, car, boat, etc.)☐ Loan repayment☐ Commission or ☐ Rental Income, list each source of \$10,000 or more☐ Other _____
(Describe)☐ Other _____
(Describe)**1. INCOME RECEIVED**

NAME OF SOURCE OF INCOME

ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)

BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION

GROSS INCOME RECEIVED

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

CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH INCOME WAS RECEIVED

☐ Salary ☐ Spouse's or registered domestic partner's income
(For self-employed use Schedule A-2.)☐ Partnership (Less than 10% ownership. For 10% or greater use
Schedule A-2.)☐ Sale of _____
(Real property, car, boat, etc.)☐ Loan repayment☐ Commission or ☐ Rental Income, list each source of \$10,000 or more☐ Other _____
(Describe)☐ Other _____
(Describe)**2. LOANS RECEIVED OR OUTSTANDING DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD**

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

NAME OF LENDER*

ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)

BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF LENDER

HIGHEST BALANCE DURING REPORTING PERIOD

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

INTEREST RATE

_____% ☐ None

TERM (Months/Years)

SECURITY FOR LOAN

☐ None☐ Personal residence☐ Real Property

Street address

City

☐ Guarantor☐ Other

(Describe)

Comments:

CALIFORNIA FORM 700 FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION Name Campbell, Amy
--

SCHEDULE D

Income – Gifts

<p>► NAME OF SOURCE (Not an Acronym)</p> <p><u>Dome Construction</u></p> <p>ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)</p> <p><u>San Francisco, CA 94105</u></p> <p>BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE</p> <p><u>Construction Services</u></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 20%;">DATE (mm/dd/yy)</th> <th style="width: 15%;">VALUE</th> <th style="width: 65%;">DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>07 / 23 / 23</u></td> <td><u>\$ 150.00</u></td> <td><u>Team Dinner</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u> / / </u></td> <td><u>\$</u></td> <td><u> </u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u> / / </u></td> <td><u>\$</u></td> <td><u> </u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DATE (mm/dd/yy)	VALUE	DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)	<u>07 / 23 / 23</u>	<u>\$ 150.00</u>	<u>Team Dinner</u>	<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>	<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>	<p>► NAME OF SOURCE (Not an Acronym)</p> <p><u>BioMed Realty</u></p> <p>ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)</p> <p><u>San Francisco, CA 94103</u></p> <p>BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE</p> <p><u>Real Estate developer</u></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 20%;">DATE (mm/dd/yy)</th> <th style="width: 15%;">VALUE</th> <th style="width: 65%;">DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>05 / 15 / 23</u></td> <td><u>\$ 150.00</u></td> <td><u>Client Dinner</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u> / / </u></td> <td><u>\$</u></td> <td><u> </u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u> / / </u></td> <td><u>\$</u></td> <td><u> </u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DATE (mm/dd/yy)	VALUE	DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)	<u>05 / 15 / 23</u>	<u>\$ 150.00</u>	<u>Client Dinner</u>	<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>	<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>
DATE (mm/dd/yy)	VALUE	DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)																							
<u>07 / 23 / 23</u>	<u>\$ 150.00</u>	<u>Team Dinner</u>																							
<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>																							
<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>																							
DATE (mm/dd/yy)	VALUE	DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)																							
<u>05 / 15 / 23</u>	<u>\$ 150.00</u>	<u>Client Dinner</u>																							
<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>																							
<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>																							
<p>► NAME OF SOURCE (Not an Acronym)</p> <p> </p> <p>ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)</p> <p> </p> <p>BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE</p> <p> </p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 20%;">DATE (mm/dd/yy)</th> <th style="width: 15%;">VALUE</th> <th style="width: 65%;">DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u> / / </u></td> <td><u>\$</u></td> <td><u> </u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u> / / </u></td> <td><u>\$</u></td> <td><u> </u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u> / / </u></td> <td><u>\$</u></td> <td><u> </u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DATE (mm/dd/yy)	VALUE	DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)	<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>	<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>	<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>	<p>► NAME OF SOURCE (Not an Acronym)</p> <p> </p> <p>ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)</p> <p> </p> <p>BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE</p> <p> </p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 20%;">DATE (mm/dd/yy)</th> <th style="width: 15%;">VALUE</th> <th style="width: 65%;">DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u> / / </u></td> <td><u>\$</u></td> <td><u> </u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u> / / </u></td> <td><u>\$</u></td> <td><u> </u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u> / / </u></td> <td><u>\$</u></td> <td><u> </u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DATE (mm/dd/yy)	VALUE	DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)	<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>	<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>	<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>
DATE (mm/dd/yy)	VALUE	DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)																							
<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>																							
<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>																							
<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>																							
DATE (mm/dd/yy)	VALUE	DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)																							
<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>																							
<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>																							
<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>																							
<p>► NAME OF SOURCE (Not an Acronym)</p> <p> </p> <p>ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)</p> <p> </p> <p>BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE</p> <p> </p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 20%;">DATE (mm/dd/yy)</th> <th style="width: 15%;">VALUE</th> <th style="width: 65%;">DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u> / / </u></td> <td><u>\$</u></td> <td><u> </u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u> / / </u></td> <td><u>\$</u></td> <td><u> </u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u> / / </u></td> <td><u>\$</u></td> <td><u> </u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DATE (mm/dd/yy)	VALUE	DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)	<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>	<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>	<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>	<p>► NAME OF SOURCE (Not an Acronym)</p> <p> </p> <p>ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)</p> <p> </p> <p>BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE</p> <p> </p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 20%;">DATE (mm/dd/yy)</th> <th style="width: 15%;">VALUE</th> <th style="width: 65%;">DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u> / / </u></td> <td><u>\$</u></td> <td><u> </u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u> / / </u></td> <td><u>\$</u></td> <td><u> </u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u> / / </u></td> <td><u>\$</u></td> <td><u> </u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DATE (mm/dd/yy)	VALUE	DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)	<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>	<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>	<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>
DATE (mm/dd/yy)	VALUE	DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)																							
<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>																							
<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>																							
<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>																							
DATE (mm/dd/yy)	VALUE	DESCRIPTION OF GIFT(S)																							
<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>																							
<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>																							
<u> / / </u>	<u>\$</u>	<u> </u>																							

Comments: _____

CALIFORNIA FORM 700
 FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION
AMENDMENT
STATEMENT OF ECONOMIC INTERESTS
COVER PAGE

 E-Filed
 06/21/2024
 08:52:23
 Filing ID:
 211653453

Please type or print in ink.

NAME OF FILER (LAST) (FIRST) (MIDDLE)

Campbell, Amy

1. Office, Agency, or Court

Agency Name (Do not use acronyms)

City and County of San Francisco

Division, Board, Department, District, if applicable

Historic Preservation Commission

Your Position

Commissioner

► If filing for multiple positions, list below or on an attachment. (Do not use acronyms)

Agency: _____

Position: _____

2. Jurisdiction of Office (Check at least one box)☒ State☒ Multi-County CA _____☒ City of San Francisco☐ Judge, Retired Judge, Pro Tem Judge, or Court Commissioner
(Statewide Jurisdiction)☒ County of San Francisco☐ Other _____**3. Type of Statement (Check at least one box)**☐ Annual: The period covered is January 1, 2022, through
December 31, 2022.

-or-

The period covered is ____/____/____, through
December 31, 2022.☒ Assuming Office: Date assumed 11 / 01 / 2023☐ Leaving Office: Date Left ____/____/____
(Check one circle.)☐ The period covered is January 1, 2022, through
the date of leaving office.☐ 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 (required)**

► Total number of pages including this cover page: 2

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

-or-

☐ None - No reportable interests on any schedule**5. Verification**MAILING ADDRESS STREET
(Business or Agency Address Recommended - Public Document)

CITY

STATE

ZIP CODE

San Francisco

CA

94104

DAYTIME TELEPHONE NUMBER

()

E-MAIL ADDRESS

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 06/21/2024
 (month, day, year)

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

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

AMENDMENT

NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY
Gensler Employee Stock Ownership Plan

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS
Design Services

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 Vanguard Fed Money Market
(Describe)
☐ Partnership ☐ Income Received of \$0 - \$499
 ☐ Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
 / / 22 / / 22
ACQUIRED DISPOSED

► NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

Gensler Profit Sharing Plan

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Design Services

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 Profit Sharing Plan Portfolio
(Describe)

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

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

 / / 22 / / 22
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:

____/____/22 ____/____/22

ACQUIRED DISPOSED

► NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

FAIR MARKET VALUE

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

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

<input type="checkbox"/> Stock	<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ (Describe)
<input type="checkbox"/> Partnership	<input type="radio"/> Income Received of \$0 - \$499
	<input type="radio"/> Income Received of \$500 or More (Report on Schedule C)

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

____/____/22	____/____/22
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:

_____/_____/22 ____/____/22

ACQUIRED DISPOSED

Filer's Verification

Print Name Campbell, Amy

Office, Agency
or Court City and County of San Francisco

Statement Type ☐ 2022/2023 Annual ☒ Assuming ☐ Leaving
 ☐ _____ Annual ☐ Candidate
 (*yr*)

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

Date Signed 06/21/2024
(month, day, year)

Filer's Signature Amy Campbell

Comments:



PLANNING COMMISSION

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	Maria Theresa Imperial	7/1/24	Nominated by the President of the Board of Supervisors; subject to the approval of the Board of Supervisors, for a four-year term
2	BOS	Kathrin Moore	7/1/26	
3	BOS	Gilbert Williams	7/1/26	
4	Mayor	Joel Koppel	7/1/24	Nominated by the Mayor; subject to the approval of the Board of Supervisors, for a four-year term
5	Mayor	Lydia So	6/30/26	
6	Mayor	Susan Diamond	7/1/24	
7	Mayor	Derek Braun	6/30/26	

Each nomination made by the President of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor is subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors and subject to a public hearing and vote within 60 days. If the Board fails to act on the nomination within 60 days of the date the nomination is transmitted to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, the nominee shall be deemed approved.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS (BOS) APPLICATION FORMS AVAILABLE HERE

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

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

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.

Applications and other documents may be submitted to BOS-Appointments@sfgov.org

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 Planning Commission consists of seven (7) voting members.

The President of the Board of Supervisors shall nominate three (3) members to the commission.

The Mayor shall nominate four (4) members to the commission.

Each nomination of the President of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor is subject to the approval of the Board of Supervisors, and shall be the subject of a public hearing and vote within 60 days. If the Board fails to act on the nomination within 60 days of the date the nomination is transmitted to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisor the nominee shall be deemed approved.

The mission of the City Planning Department is to guide the orderly and prudent use of land, in both the natural and built environment, with the purpose of improving the quality of life and embracing the diverse perspectives of those who live in, work in, and visit San Francisco. The Commission shall periodically recommend to the Board of Supervisors for approval or rejection proposed amendments to the General Plan.

Report: The Commission shall periodically recommend to the Board of Supervisors for approval or rejection proposed amendments to the General Plan.

Authority: Charter Section 4.105 (Prop D; March 5, 2002 Election)

Sunset Date: None

Contact: Jonas Ionin, Secretary
Planning Commission
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 558-6309
jonas.ionin@sfgov.org

Updated: May 31, 2024



Gender Analysis
San Francisco Commissions and Boards
FY 2020-2021



London N. Breed
Mayor

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



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

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

Overall, policy bodies have a larger percentage of women, members of the LGBTQIA+ community, and Veterans¹ than the general San Francisco population. The percentage of women of color and people with disabilities appointed to policy bodies is near equal to the general population. Fiscal year 2020-2021 saw the largest increase in representation of women on policy bodies since the Department on the Status of Women started collecting data in 2009. Women of color have the highest representation of appointees to date.

Black and African American women and men are notably well-represented on San Francisco policy bodies. Black women are 8 percent of appointees compared to 2.4 percent of the general San Francisco population, and Black men are 4 percent of appointees compared to 2.5 percent of the general San Francisco population. Additionally, almost 1-in-4 appointees who responded to the survey question identify as a member of the LGBTQIA+ community.

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

While San Francisco continues to make strides in diversity, there is still work to do in achieving parity of representation for Latinx and Asian groups in appointed positions overall, as well as women, people of color, and women of color on Commissions overseeing the largest budgets. The Department applauds Mayor Breed for remaining committed to diversifying policy body appointments across all diversity categories, including for positions of influence and authority.

Thank you to Department staff who worked on this report and to members of the Commission on the Status of Women for their ongoing advocacy for intersectional gender equity efforts.

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kim Ellis".

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

Table of Contents

I. Introduction.....	1
II. Findings	2
A. Gender.....	2
B. Race and Ethnicity.....	5
C. Race and Ethnicity by Gender	8
D. LGBTQIA+ Identity	10
E. Disability Status	11
F. Veteran Status	12
G. Policy Bodies by Budget.....	14
H. Comparison of Advisory Body, Commission, and Board Demographics	16
I. Demographics of Mayoral, Supervisorial, and Total Appointees.....	17
J. Religious Affiliations	18
III. Methodology and Limitations.....	19
IV. Conclusion	21
V. Appendix.....	23
VI. Acknowledgements.....	29

Table of Figures

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

Executive Summary

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

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

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

The report includes policy bodies such as task forces, committees, and Advisory Bodies, in addition to Commissions and Boards.

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

Several changes were made to the survey questions for the 2021 Gender Analysis Report. Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity (SOGI) categories were aligned with the latest classifications used by the Office of Transgender Initiatives. The classification of Veteran Status was also expanded to include individuals with close family members that have served in the military and armed forces. This addition to Veteran Status was adopted based on feedback from previous reports.

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

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


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

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

Key Findings


Gender

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




Race and Ethnicity

- The representation of people of color on policy bodies is 54%. Comparatively, in San Francisco, 62% of the population identifies with a race other than white.
- While the overall representation of people of color has increased since the 2019 report at 50%, representation has still decreased compared to 57% in 2015.
- As found in previous reports, Latinx and Asian groups are underrepresented on San Francisco policy bodies as compared to the population. Latinx individuals are 15% of the population but make up only 9% of appointees. Asian individuals are 36% of the population but make up only 26% of appointees.



Race and Ethnicity by Gender

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



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

Additional Demographics

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

Proxies for Influence: Budget and Authority

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

Appointing Authorities

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

Demographics of Appointees Compared to the San Francisco Population

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

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

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

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

I. Introduction

Inspired by the fourth U.N. World Conference on Women in Beijing, San Francisco became the first city in the world to adopt a local ordinance reflecting the principles of the U.N. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), an international bill of rights for women. The CEDAW Ordinance was passed unanimously by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and signed into law by Mayor Willie L. Brown, Jr. on April 13, 1998.³ In 2002, the CEDAW Ordinance was revised to address the intersection of race and gender and incorporate reference to the U.N. Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Race Discrimination. The Ordinance requires the City to take proactive steps to ensure gender equity and specifies "gender analysis" as a preventive tool to identify and address discrimination. Since 1998, the Department on the Status of Women has employed this tool to analyze the operations of 10 City Departments using a gender lens.

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

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

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

³ San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 33.A.
[http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/administrative/chapter33alocalimplementationoftheunited?
f=templates\\$fn=default.htm\\$3.0\\$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca\\$anc=JD_Chapter33A](http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/administrative/chapter33alocalimplementationoftheunited?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca$anc=JD_Chapter33A).

II. Findings

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

Figure 1: Summary Data of Policy Body Demographics, 2021


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

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

A. Gender

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

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



Figures 3 and 4 analyze Commissions and Boards. Figure 3 showcases the five Commissions and Boards with the highest representation of women appointees as compared to 2017 and 2019. The Commission on the Status of Women is currently comprised of all women appointees. This finding has been consistent for the Commission on the Status of Women since 2015. The Aging and Adult Services Commission, Health Commission, and Library Commission are all at 71%, respectively.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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


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

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

B. Race and Ethnicity

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

Figure 6: 12-year Comparison of Representation of People of Color on Policy Bodies




The racial and ethnic breakdown of policy body members compared to the San Francisco population is shown in Figure 7. This analysis reveals underrepresentation and overrepresentation in San Francisco policy bodies for certain racial and ethnic groups. Nearly half of all appointees are white, an overrepresentation by 6 percentage points. The Black community is represented on appointed policy bodies at 11% compared to 6% of the population of San Francisco.⁴ This is a decrease of representation compared to the 14% representation in 2019. Characterizing these as overrepresentations is inaccurate given the representation of Black or African American people on policy bodies has been consistent over the years, while the San Francisco population has declined over the same period.⁵

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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


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

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

C. Race and Ethnicity by Gender

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

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



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

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

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





Figure 12: San Francisco Population by Race/Ethnicity




D. LGBTQIA+ Identity

LGBTQIA+ identity data was collected from 334 participants, or 96% of the surveyed appointees. This is a notable increase in data on LGBTQIA+ identity compared to previous reports. Due to limited and outdated information on the population of the LGBTQIA+ community in San Francisco, it is difficult to adequately assess the representation of the LGBTQIA+ community. However, compared to available San Francisco, greater Bay Area, and national data, the LGBTQIA+ community is well represented on San Francisco policy bodies. Recent research estimates the California LGBTQIA+ population is 5.3%⁶. The LGBTQIA+ population of the San Francisco and greater Bay Area is estimated to rank the highest of U.S. cities at 6.2%,⁷ while a 2006 survey found that 15.4% of adults in San Francisco identify as LGBTQIA+⁸.

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

Figure 13: LGBTQIA+ Identity of Appointees, 2021




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

⁷ Gary J. Gates and Frank Newport, "San Francisco Metro Area Ranks Highest in LBGT Percentage," GALLUP (March 20, 2015) https://news.gallup.com/poll/182051/san-francisco-metro-area-ranks-highest-lgbtpercentage.aspx?utm_source=Social%20Issues&utm_medium=newsfeed&utm_campaign=titles.

⁸ Gary J. Gates, "Same Sex Couples and the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual Population: New Estimates from the American Community Survey," The Williams Institute on Sexual Orientation Law and Public Policy, UCLA School of Law (2006).

Figure 14: LGBTQIA+ Population of Appointees, 2021



E. Disability Status

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

Figure 15: Disability Status of Appointees, 2021






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



F. Veteran Status

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

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



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

Figure 18: Appointees with Military Service, 2021





Figure 19: Appointees with Military Service by Gender, 2021



G. Policy Bodies by Budget

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

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

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

Figure 20: Percent of Women, Women of Color, and People of Color on Commissions and Boards with Largest and Smallest Budgets in Fiscal Year 2020-2021




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

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


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

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

H. Comparison of Advisory Body and Commission and Board Demographics

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


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



I. Demographics of Mayoral, Supervisorial, and Total Appointees

Figure 24 compares the representation of women, women of color, and people of color for appointments made by the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and by the total of all approving authorities combined. Mayoral appointments are more diverse, and consist of more women, women of color, and people of color compared to Supervisorial appointments. Mayoral appointments include 60% women, 37% women of color, and 59% people of color, while Supervisorial appointments are 56% women, 36% women of color, and 58% people of color. The total of all approving authorities combined average out at 55% women, 32% women of color, and 54% people of color. This disparity in diversity between Mayoral and Supervisorial appointments may be due in part to the appointment selection process for each authority. The 11-member Board of Supervisors only sees applicants for specific bodies through the 3- member Rules Committee or by designees, stipulated in legislation (e.g., "renter," "landlord," "consumer advocate"), whereas the Mayor typically has the ability to take total appointments into account during selections, and can therefore better address gaps in diversity.


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



J. Religious Affiliations

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

Figure 25: Religious Affiliations of Appointees, 2021



III. Methodology and Limitations

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

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

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

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

As acquiring data was the biggest limitation of this report, ensuring participation from all policy bodies could significantly improve or further efforts to address underrepresentation. Some methods of guaranteeing participation include surveying all appointees during their initial onboarding training with the City, as well as relying on paper/in-person survey outreach for future reports.

The surveyed policy bodies fall under two categories designated by the San Francisco Office of the City Attorney document entitled List of City Boards, Commissions, and Advisory Bodies Created by Charter, Ordinance, or Statute.⁹ This document separates San Francisco policy bodies into two different categories. The first category includes Commissions and Boards with decision-making authority and whose members are required to submit financial disclosures with the Ethics Commission. The second category encompasses Advisory Bodies whose members do not submit financial disclosures with the Ethics Commission. Depending on the analysis criteria in each section of this report, the surveyed policy bodies and appointees are either examined comprehensively as a whole or examined separately in the two categories designated by the Office of the City Attorney.

Data from the U.S. Census American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates provides a comparison to the San Francisco population. Due to census data not being collected during COVID-19, updated demographic information on the general population of San Francisco was not available for years more recent than 2019. Comparisons of 2021 demographic data to data on the San Francisco population reference population data from previous years (2015-2019) and will be noted as such. Figures 26 and 27 in the Appendix display these population estimates by race/ethnicity and gender.

⁹"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).

IV. 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 2021 Gender Analysis Report finds the percentage of women appointees is 55%, which exceeds the population of women in San Francisco.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women

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

Kimberly Ellis, Director
Department on the Status of Women

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

City and County of San Francisco
Department on the Status of Women
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 240
San Francisco, California 94102
sfgov.org/dosw
dosw@sfgov.org
415.252.2570

Appendix

Figure 26: Policy Body Demographics, 2021

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

Figure 26: Policy Body Demographics, 2021, Continued

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

Figure 26: Policy Body Demographics, 2021, Continued

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

Figure 26: Policy Body Demographics, 2021, Continued

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

Figure 26: Policy Body Demographics, 2021, Continued

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

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

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

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

San Francisco Population estimates come from the 2017 and 2018 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

**Due to unavailable updated data on San Francisco population, the data used to represent the San Francisco population is from the 2019 Gender Analysis Report.*



London N. Breed
Mayor

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



Acknowledgments

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

San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women

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

Kimberly Ellis, Director
Department on the Status of Women

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

City and County of San Francisco
Department on the Status of Women
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 240
San Francisco, California 94102
sfgov.org/dosw
dosw@sfgov.org
415.252.2570



Dear Members of the Rules Committee,

I am writing to express my enthusiastic support for Amy Campbell's nomination to the San Francisco Planning Commission. As the CEO of the San Francisco Gay Men's Chorus, I had the privilege of working closely with Amy for the last two+ years during her role leading the renovation of 170 Valencia, the new Chan National Queer Arts Center and home of the SFGMC in the Mission.

During our collaboration, Amy consistently demonstrated competence, integrity, and compassion. Her expertise in architecture was invaluable as she guided us through our difficult renovation project and permitting process and helped ensure that our vision for the Center was realized with great care.

Amy is not only a skilled professional but also an excellent communicator and listener ensuring that everyone was well-informed about what to anticipate and hearing our concerns along the way. Her collaborative nature and consensus building skills were evident throughout our project and helped keep us aligned and moving forward, particularly during challenging project obstacles.

Beyond her professional contributions, Amy has shown a commitment to our community and our organization. She consistently participated in fundraising events, led site tours, attended stake holder meetings and joined board meetings on her own time in support of our efforts to secure funding, raise awareness, and garner additional community support. Her dedication to advancing the arts and supporting LGBTQ+ initiatives is commendable and reflects her genuine care for the well-being of our diverse community.

I wholeheartedly believe that Amy Campbell's combination of professional expertise, communication skills, collaborative spirit, and commitment to community make her exceptionally well-suited to serve as a commissioner on the San Francisco Planning Commission. I urge you to consider her nomination favorably and am confident that she will contribute significantly to the continued progress and development of our city.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Chris Verdugo". The signature is stylized with a large, sweeping initial "C" and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Chris Verdugo
CEO, San Francisco Gay Men's Chorus & San Francisco Resident

From: [Mr. Robert Vergara](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Rules Committee Consideration of Mayoral Nominee Amy Campbell (Planning Commission)
Date: Wednesday, July 17, 2024 8:46:05 PM

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

Dear Mr. Young,

It is with great enthusiasm that I write this letter of support for the nomination of Amy Campbell to the San Francisco Planning Commission. I have the pleasure of working with Amy as a colleague on the Historic Preservation Commission.

I am continually impressed with the knowledge and skills that Amy brings to her work. Immediately upon her seating on the Commission, Amy was appointed to the Architectural Review Committee, the body that gets into the nuts and bolts of proposed modifications to specific historic structures. The questions Amy asks and the observations she makes inspire me to almost begin taking notes, like a student learning from a professor! Her knowledge of architectural history and preservation, and her ability to clearly articulate that knowledge, is obvious.

It is also obvious that Amy believes in historic preservation, and importantly, she approaches cases not in the abstract, but with an understanding of circumstances, which is so important in a dynamic city like San Francisco, where it is critical to preserve our heritage while also maintaining progress.

Amy is a friendly, personable colleague; approachable and very easy to talk to. She always displays great tact in speaking with her fellow commissioners, with City staff, and with members of the public who come before the Commission. It is clear that Amy loves her City. She is a wonderful ambassador for San Francisco government.

I know that Amy Campbell will bring the same outstanding qualities to the Planning Commission that she exhibits on the Historic Preservation Commission. My only regret is that we on the HPC would be losing a valuable and most enjoyable colleague, but fortunately, our City will continue to benefit from her many gifts.

Sincerely,

Bob Vergara
Seat 4, Historic Preservation Commission

--

Robert Vergara
Social Science Department
St. Ignatius College Preparatory
2001 - 37th Avenue
San Francisco, California 94116
(415) 731-7500 ext. 6785
rvergara@siprep.org

www.siprep.org



AGORA LANDS DEVELOPMENT
1080 Kaden Lane, Tracy Ca 95377
209-595-9818 | veronica@agoraland.com

Dear Rules Committee Members,

I am writing in support of Amy Campbell's nomination to the San Francisco Planning Commission. As President of Agora Land Consulting and a former Planning Commissioner Chair, Elected official in the City of Tracy, Ca, and Founding board member and Chair of the Tri Valley – San Joaquin Valley Rail Authority, (Valley Link) I understand the pivotal role effective leadership plays in urban planning and development.

I have had the opportunity to collaborate closely with Amy since the beginning of this year on a unique development project in Woodlake, CA: a new 4,200 seat Mexican Rodeo Arena serving the Central Valley. Amy has been at the forefront of this effort, leading the team and design effort and her expertise in architecture, planning processes, and project execution has been instrumental in navigating the complexities and nuances of this special project.

Throughout our collaboration, Amy has demonstrated a strong character, and excellent communication skills. She has a remarkable aptitude for listening and seems highly effective at guiding team members, addressing stakeholder concerns and delivering results that exceed expectations. Her collaborative approach and prompt responsiveness have helped lead the effort and navigate unexpected project hurdles along the way.

Amy's ability to connect with diverse communities and her commitment to understanding the urban landscape and built environment make her exceptionally qualified for the Planning Commission. Her skill in building consensus and her clear, thoughtful communication style will undoubtedly contribute to impactful decision-making.

It has been a pleasure working alongside Amy, and I am confident that her leadership, integrity, and dedication will make her an asset to the San Francisco Planning Commission.

I wholeheartedly recommend Amy Campbell for this important role and urge you to support her nomination.

Sincerely,

Veronica Vargas

Veronica Vargas
Owner, Agora Land Consulting
Tracy Tree Foundation Governmental Affairs Board Member
Delta College Foundation Board Member

From: [Diane Matsuda](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Rules Committee Consideration of Mayoral Nominee Amy Campbell (Planning Commission)
Date: Friday, July 5, 2024 1:54:50 PM

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

Dear Mr. Young:

This letter is written in support of Ms. Amy Campbell's nomination to the SF Planning Commission.

Amy and I served on the Historic Preservation Commission together where she played a very important and active role in sharing her architectural expertise on matters of great historic significance to our City. She was always well prepared for each Hearing; listened carefully and respectfully to public comment and offered thoughtful comments throughout her tenure on the Commission.

I am sure that she will be an excellent and critical member to the Planning Commission, particularly with all of the recent changes that the City and County of San Francisco will need to implement in the near future regarding additional housing.

I make this recommendation without any reservation.

Sincerely,
Diane Matsuda