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

March 16, 2026

Board of Supervisors
The Honorable Raphael Mandelman, President of the Board of Supervisors
The Honorable Connie Chan, Supervisor, District 1
The Honorable Stephen Sherrill, Supervisor, District 2
The Honorable Danny Sauter, Supervisor, District 3
The Honorable Alan Wong, Supervisor, District 4
The Honorable Bilal Mahmood, District 5
The Honorable Matt Dorsey, Supervisor, District 6
The Honorable Myrna Melgar, District 7
The Honorable Jackie Fielder, Supervisor, District 9
The Honorable Shamann Walton, Supervisor, District 10
The Honorable Chyanne Chen, District 11
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

"The Board of Supervisors must follow its '*Rules of Order*,' specifically Rule §3.22, '*30-Day Rule*' and §5.31, '*Duplication of File*.'

Importantly, the Board should ignore today incorrect information in the Streamlining Task Force's PowerPoint presentation that '*Proposition E*' requires eight Board member votes to '*duplicate the file*.' That's untrue!"

Re: **Testimony on File #260147 — Hearing - Proposition E Commission Streamlining Task Force Recommendations, Final Report, and Charter Amendment**

Dear President Mandelman and Board of Supervisors,

The Streamlining Task Force's proposed Ordinance before this "*Committee of the Whole*" today appears to incorrectly state on slide #25 in its PowerPoint presentation that "***Proposition E***" provides regarding the **Ordinance**:

> "*The Board of Supervisors … may veto or duplicate/amend by 8 votes*" — a two-thirds majority.

That is **not** what the language in *Proposition E* states. Instead, §4.100.1.e, *Commission Streamlining Task Force,* states:

> "… *Such ordinance(s) shall go into effect 90 days after the date of introduction unless before the expiration of the 90-day period* ***two-thirds of all members*** *of the Board of Supervisors* ***vote to disapprove the ordinance***."

Note that the language in §4.100.1.e does **not** state anything about **duplicating** the file, or requiring a two-thirds vote to duplicate the legislative file. Indeed, §4.100.1.e further states that introduction of a Charter Amendment or an Ordinance by the Board of Supervisors must be "*consistent with the process set forth in the Municipal Elections Code and the Board* [of Supervisors] *"**Rules of Order**" in effect at that time*. **§4.100.1.e is *silent* on duplication of files!**

In fact, the Board's *Rules of Order* regarding Duplication of Files states:

> **§5.31, *Duplication of File.* At the request of *any Supervisor*, prior to the roll call for action on a matter, the President or the chair of the committee shall order a file duplicated. Once duplicated each piece of legislation shall be considered separately and processed accordingly.**

§5.31 appears to suggest that before action on a matter, a **single** member of the Board of Supervisors can request a file be duplicated. §5.31 appears to be **silent** on whether such a request is subject to a separate vote by the Board of Supervisors.

Rather than "*Prop. E*"-style reforms voters expected, the "*Prop. E*" Streamlining Task Force developed and submitted "*Prop. D*"-style recommendations in its "*Final Report*" to the Board of Supervisors!

At a minimum, the Board of Supervisors should carefully "*duplicate*" both the Proposed Charter Amendment and the initial proposed Ordinance submitted for your review. The Board should schedule a full round of hearings to reconsider recommendations in the duplicated files that were made by this five-member Task Force of appointed members who are not held accountable to San Franciscans, or to San Francisco's voters. The Board of Supervisors must continue to take and consider additional public testimony before approving an Ordinance or placing a proposed Charter Amendment measure on the November 2026 ballot.

After all, during a Town Hall event on March 11, 2026 sponsored by "*Real Reform SF*" and the *San Francisco League of Women Voters*, Streamlining Chairperson Ed Harrington stated that now that the Streamlining Task Force's *"Final Report*" and associated legislation is under consideration by the Board of Supervisors, topics for possible changes the Supervisors can consider, but aren't limited to, include: the Commission on the Status of Women, Human Rights Commission, Entertainment Commission, Youth Commission, and various Children's, Seniors, and Homeless Commissions. Harrington added the Supervisors could also make changes to the Task Force's recommendations concerning the Mayoral authority to remove Commissioners "*At Will,*" Mayoral authority to hire and fire City Department Heads, and Police Department discipline of police officers.

In reality, the Board of Supervisors can amend, or reject, any or all of the 800-plus recommendations the Task Force submitted, including, for example, the recommendation regarding Sunshine Task Force nominating-body authority; restoring seat-level requirements for all bodies that have them as **required** qualifications, not "***desirable***" qualifications; and restoring the Ethics Commission's full authority to place Ballot Measures on the ballot without requiring Board of Supervisors approval.

Board of Supervisors **Rule §3.22**, the "*30-Day Rule*" specifically states that measures introduced to the Board of Supervisors that would create or *revise major City policy*, the committee to which the measure is assigned shall not consider the measure until at ***least*** 30 days after the day of introduction of the legislation. That Rule is meant to ensure that major policy legislation is not rushed, allowing time for public review, committee scrutiny, and analysis before a hearing. It prevents taking immediate action on significant City policies by mandating a 30-day waiting period.

The Board of Supervisors must carefully review, and reject, many of the Task Force's recommendations — or face widespread voter rejection of any Board and Commission Charter Amendments placed on the November 2026 ballot!

Failure by the Board of Supervisors to reject many of the Streamlining Task Force's recommendations will be sufficient grounds to oppose your proposed Charter amendment. Voters expect robust Board of Supervisors revisions to the Streamlining Task Force's recommendations and proposed Charter Amendment be heard in detailed Rules Committee public hearings!

Specifically, **Rule §3.22** states that measures introduced to the Board of Supervisors that would create or ***revise major City policy***, the committee to which the measure is assigned **shall not consider the measure until at *least* 30 days after the day of introduction of the legislation**.

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

Allow the Rules Committee to conduct thoughtful review of the 800-plus recommendations in the Streamlining Task Force's 134-page "*Final Report*," and the 475 pages of its proposed legislation. Conducting review of 608 pages of recommendations from the Streamlining Task Force during a single "*Committee of the Whole*" hearing does not do justice to massively overhauling participatory democratic governance of our City.

Please allow the Rules Committee review process to fully play out. **Don't be complicit with billionaire oligarchs destroying participatory governance in San Francisco!**

Respectfully submitted,

/s/
Patrick Monette-Shaw
Columnist/Reporter
Westside Observer Newspaper

cc: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Alisa Somera, Legislative Deputy Director, Clerk of the Board's Office