

File No. 190133

Committee Item No. 7

Board Item No. 19

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Rules Committee

Date Feb. 4, 2019

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date 2/12/2019

Cmte Board

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

Completed by: Victor Young

Date Jan. 31, 2019

Completed by: VY

Date 2/6/19

1 [Appointment, Elections Commission - Christopher Jerdonek]

2
3 **Motion appointing Christopher Jerdonek, term ending January 1, 2024, to the Elections**
4 **Commission.**

5
6 MOVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco does
7 hereby appoint the hereinafter designated person to serve as a member of the Elections
8 Commission, pursuant to the provisions of Charter, Section 13.103.5, for the term specified:

9 Christopher Jerdonek, seat 1, succeeding themselves, term expired, must be broadly
10 representative of the general public, for the unexpired portion of a five-year term ending
11 January 1, 2024.



Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
(415) 554-5184 FAX (415) 554-5163

Application for Boards, Commissions, Committees, & Task Forces

Elections Commission

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

Seat # or Category (If applicable): _____ Seat #1 (for reappt for 2nd term) District: 8

Name: Christopher J. Jerdonek _____

_____ San Francisco, CA Zip: 94110

Home Phone: _____ Occupation: Software Developer

Work Phone: (415) 286-2238 Employer: Shotwell Labs (co-founder)

Business Address: 1300 McAllister St., San Francisco, CA Zip: 94115

Business E-Mail: chris@shotwell-labs.com Home E-Mail: _____

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

Check All That Apply:

Resident of San Francisco: Yes ☒ No ☐ If No, place of residence: _____

Registered Voter in San Francisco: Yes ☒ No ☐ If No, where registered: _____

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

I have lived in San Francisco for thirteen years -- for five years in District 9 and in District 8 after that. I have always been a renter. I work in the city, and I ride a bicycle daily. I also belong to the communities of interest that are interested in democracy, election security and integrity, open source software, and government transparency in general.

I have been active in elections and electoral reform issues for over fifteen years. I have been a polling place inspector twenty times in San Francisco starting in 2006. My technical knowledge and skills as a software developer and as a PhD in mathematics are both unique on the Commission. I would like to continue my work on the Commission improving elections in San Francisco and setting a model for the rest of the country to improve.

Business and/or professional experience:

I work as a software developer in San Francisco. In 2015, I cofounded a company called Shotwell Labs that works on collaboration software. From 2007 to 2013, I was a senior software developer at Granicus. Before being acquired, Granicus was a San Francisco-based company that provides government agencies with technology that increases transparency and public access to government information. Before working at Granicus I received a PhD in mathematics from UC Davis.

I am a long-time contributor to open source software, primarily with the Python programming language. I am a Python core developer. As Chair of the Commission's Open Source Voting System Technical Advisory Committee (OSVTAC), I have done a lot of technical work to support OSVTAC's function. This includes maintaining their website in an open source fashion and contributing to its open source, proof-of-concept election software.

Civic Activities:

Most of my civic energy over the last five years has been focused on activities related to the Elections Commission. I dedicate a large amount of time to this work.

I was elected and served as Commission President twice (in 2015 and 2017) and as Vice President in 2014 and 2016. I served on the Commission's only committee, the Budget and Oversight of Public Elections Committee (BOPEC), for over two years and have also chaired it. I had perfect attendance at all Commission and BOPEC meetings, was never late, and had to leave a meeting early only once (for a meeting that went past 9pm).

I currently chair the Commission's 5-member Open Source Voting System Technical Advisory Committee (OSVTAC), which I have done since its creation. OSVTAC has met monthly for the past eighteen months. It is made up of members of the public. I led its creation and met with and interviewed all applicants. (continued next page)

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

Appointments confirmed by the Board of Supervisors require an appearance before the Rules Committee. Once your application is received, the Rules Committee Clerk will contact you when a hearing is scheduled. *(Please submit your application 10 days before the scheduled hearing.)*

Date: January 3, 2019 Applicant's Signature: (required)

Christopher J. Jerdonek

(Manually sign or type your complete name.)

NOTE: By typing your complete name, you are hereby consenting to use of electronic signature.)

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Appointed to Seat #: _____ Term Expires: _____ Date Seat was Vacated: _____

Elections Commission Application (continued)

Civic Activities (continued):

Within five months after being appointed to the Commission, I spearheaded the following improvements: I restructured the Commission's website to make past and upcoming meetings easier to locate; initiated posting all meeting audio to YouTube; created a Commission Twitter account; and added to the Commission's website a grid of Commissioner attendance and kept it current.

While President, I on-boarded two new Commission Secretaries. I also kept the Commission's website updated when the Commission didn't have a secretary. I drafted three of the four resolutions that the Commission passed over the last five years. I also worked with Disability Rights California to pass the Commission's fourth resolution on the topic of voter education and accessible voting options.

I have been spearheading the Commission's efforts to support the City and County's development of the country's first open source voting system. This work supports and carries out the open source voting resolution the Board of Supervisors passed unanimously in December 2014. I have educated hundreds of individuals about open source voting at many events, including at UC Hastings Law School, UC Berkeley Law School, the annual conference of the National Election Center in Orange County, before many political groups, and at many civic tech events. I presented on open source voting before the Rules Committee, the Budget & Finance Sub-Committee, and the Committee on Information Technology (COIT). I have also met and spoken individually with many people about open source voting, including reporters, activists, and elected officials.

Outside the Commission, I am an invited member of the Election Verification Network, a national network of about one hundred election integrity experts. In addition, I have been an active member of the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition for eight years. I ride my bicycle nearly every day in San Francisco, and I ride it to nearly all Commission meetings.

CALIFORNIA FORM 700
 FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION
 A PUBLIC DOCUMENT

STATEMENT OF ECONOMIC INTERESTS
COVER PAGE

Date Initial Filing

Received
Official Use OnlyE-Filed
04/02/2018
14:23:54Filing ID:
170590928

Please type or print in ink.

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

Jerdonek, Christopher John

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

Elections Commission

Member

► 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 or Court Commissioner (Statewide Jurisdiction)☐ Multi-County _____☒ County of San Francisco☒ City of San Francisco☐ Other _____**3. Type of Statement (Check at least one box)**☒ Annual: The period covered is January 1, 2017, through December 31, 2017

-or-

The period covered is ____/____/____, through December 31, 2017

☐ Leaving Office: Date Left ____/____/____
(Check one)☐ The period covered is January 1, 2017, through the date of leaving office.☐ Assuming Office: Date assumed ____/____/____☐ The period covered is ____/____/____, through the date of leaving office.☐ Candidate: Date of Election _____ and office sought, if different than Part 1: _____**4. Schedule Summary (must complete) ► Total number of pages including this cover page: 3****Schedules attached**☐ Schedule A-1 - Investments - schedule attached☒ Schedule C - Income, Loans, & Business Positions - schedule attached☒ Schedule A-2 - Investments - schedule attached☐ Schedule D - Income - Gifts - schedule attached☐ Schedule B - Real Property - schedule attached☐ Schedule E - Income - Gifts - Travel Payments - schedule attached

-or-

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

San Francisco

CA

94119

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 04/02/2018

(month, day, year)

Signature Christopher John Jerdonek

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

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

Jerdonek, Christopher John

► 1. BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST

Shotwell Labs, Inc.

Name

San Francisco, CA 94115

Address (Business Address Acceptable)

Check one

☐ Trust, go to 2 ☒ Business Entity, complete the box, then go to 2

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

Software startup

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____/____/____
ACQUIRED____/____/____
DISPOSED

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☐ Partnership☐ Sole Proprietorship☒ Corporation

Other

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION Co-founder**► 1. BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST**

Name

Address (Business Address Acceptable)

Check one

☐ Trust, go to 2 ☐ Business Entity, complete the box, then go to 2

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

FAIR MARKET VALUE

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:

☐ \$0 - \$1,999☐ \$2,000 - \$10,000☐ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$100,001 - \$1,000,000☐ Over \$1,000,000____/____/____
ACQUIRED____/____/____
DISPOSED

NATURE OF INVESTMENT

☐ Partnership☐ Sole Proprietorship☐ _____

Other

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION _____

► 2. IDENTIFY THE GROSS INCOME RECEIVED (INCLUDE YOUR PRO RATA SHARE OF THE GROSS INCOME TO THE ENTITY/TRUST)☐ \$0 - \$499☒ \$10,001 - \$100,000☐ \$500 - \$1,000☐ OVER \$100,000☐ \$1,001 - \$10,000**► 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**► 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 PROPERTYName of Business Entity, if Investment, or
Assessor's Parcel Number or Street Address of Real PropertyDescription 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____/____/____
ACQUIRED____/____/____
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**► 4. INVESTMENTS AND INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY HELD OR LEASED BY THE BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST**

Check one box:

☐ INVESTMENT☐ REAL PROPERTYName of Business Entity, if Investment, or
Assessor's Parcel Number or Street Address of Real PropertyDescription 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____/____/____
ACQUIRED____/____/____
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 <u>Jerdonek, Christopher John</u>

▶ 1. INCOME RECEIVED

NAME OF SOURCE OF INCOME

Shotwell Labs, Inc.

ADDRESS (Business Address Acceptable)

San Francisco, CA 94115

BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE

Software startup

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION

Co-founder

GROSS INCOME RECEIVED

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

CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH INCOME WAS RECEIVED

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

(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

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

CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH INCOME WAS RECEIVED

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

(Describe)

☐ Other _____
(Describe)**▶ 2. LOANS RECEIVED OR OUTSTANDING DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD**

* You are not required to report loans from commercial lending institutions, 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

TERM (Months/Years)

_____% ☐ None

SECURITY FOR LOAN

☐ None☐ Personal residence☐ Real Property

Street address

City

☐ Guarantor☐ Other

(Describe)

Comments:

From: Jim Soper2 <jimsoper2@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 03, 2019 10:53 PM
To: Beinart, Amy (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Wong, Alan (BOS);
Waltonstaff (BOS); Gee, Natalie (BOS); Ronen, Hillary
Cc: Young, Victor (BOS)
Subject: Endorsement for Chris Jerdonek for Elections Commission (Rules Cmte)

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

Dear Supervisor

I would like to urge you approve Chris Jerdonek's application to retain his position on the Elections Commission.

I have been an advocate for open source election systems in San Francisco since 2005. I am the author of <http://CountedAsCast.com> and co-chair of the Voting Rights Task Force in the East Bay.

I have known Chris since 2005, and observed his contributions both on the Elections Commission, and on its Technical Advisory Committee. Chris has been the most important advocate and then commissioner for open source in San Francisco for years. He has kept the concept alive and moving forward, so that now San Francisco will probably be the first provider of open source systems in the country.

Chris's technical knowledge is very good (I am a programmer too) and this has been important. The Elections Commission needs that kind of insight as election systems are computers. Chris's ability to work with others is excellent. He's calm, knowledgeable, and fair.

I strongly urge you to confirm his application.

Thank you.

Jim Soper

Gerard Gleason
100 2nd Avenue #4
San Francisco CA 94118

January 29, 2019

Supervisor Hillary Ronen, Supervisor Shamann Walton, Supervisor Gordon Mar
Rules Committee
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
One Dr Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco CA 94102

RE: Appointment of Chris Jerdonek to the San Francisco Elections Commission

Dear Members of the Rules Committee,

I am writing in support of the reappointment of Chris Jerdonek to the San Francisco Elections Commission. I whole-heartedly believe that Mr. Jerdonek has been a standout member of the Elections Commission for the past 5 years, that the residents and voters of San Francisco are truly well-served by having him on the Commission and would benefit from having his continued insight and attention to detail as it relates to oversight of our public elections.

I was previously the publications and ballot production manager for The San Francisco Department of Elections (1999-2002) as an intermittent employee of the City & County. For 10 years (2004 -2013) I was the Board of Supervisors appointee to the San Francisco Elections Commission. For the past 12 years I have worked for a private foundation engaged in promoting democracy and civic engagement, funding well-known NGOs involved in protecting fair open elections and the right of all citizens to exercise the vote. While at the Department of Elections, while on the Commission, and subsequently after, I continue to serve as an Election Day polling place worker – 25+ elections at this point – assisting my fellow neighbors with the ability to vote. I would like to point out that Mr. Jerdonek has likewise served as an Election Day polling place worker prior to and including while on the Elections Commission.

Mr. Jerdonek has a proven track record of concern for the fundamental and necessary transparent conduct of public elections. Nothing can be more basic to a hallmark of a good democracy. Open participation. That is what Mr. Jerdonek provides. It may sound simple. Maybe it is. But to have that deep core commitment to open participation – and I have to say this – *regardless of outcome*. That is the qualification needed. We need to guard against the involvement of those who confuse election campaigns with election administration. San Francisco has a sad history of that. Therefore the Elections Commission.

Additionally, Mr. Jerdonek's talents and skills are well utilized for oversight of elections administration. His background in mathematics has been very useful when reviewing post-election audits, ensuring the fair conduct of elections. He is right about the idea of considering the public ownership of vote tabulating equipment. His insights will be extremely useful as most counties in California move to conduct all elections as Vote-by-Mail, which is challenging and could possibly disenfranchise some people in our highly mobile and transient city. Life is complicated and busy, and voting is just one more thing we all need to do. So we need to ensure that someone like Mr. Jerdonek is there to review the process; so it remains as open and accessible and readily serves the voters, the people, not just the apparatus.

Both Mr. Jerdonek and I have stood face-to-face with voters who arrive at a polling place on Election Day, and their name not in the voting roster. We can of course give the voter a Provisional Ballot. But both Mr. Jerdonek and I are of the opinion that our duty is not to simply placate the voter by handing them a Provisional Ballot that may or may not be counted. Our duty is to exhaust all efforts to ensure that that voter's ballot counts.

I will just conclude that elections administration requires a certain level of passion. Not over done, but truly sufficient. It would be nice if the San Francisco Elections Department participated in efforts such as the collaboratively run **Future of California Elections***. Currently that has not been the case, however Mr. Jerdonek himself and on his own has been engaged in that and other efforts. Furthermore, it is my understanding that Mr. Jerdonek has not missed a single meeting of the Elections Commission over the past 5 years. That, as far as commitment, speaks for itself. I would respectfully ask that you consider Mr. Jerdonek's reappointment to the Elections Commission.

Sincerely,



Gerard Gleason

*The Future of California Elections <http://futureofcaelections.org/>

cc: Victor Young, Clerk, Rules Committee

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2019 FEB -5 PM 4:47
BY [Signature]



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

Application for Boards, Commissions, Committees, & Task Forces

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

Seat # or Category (If applicable): 1 District: _____

Name: Anupama (Anu) Menon

Zip: 94122

Occupation: Non-profit executive

Work Phone: _____ Employer: n/a - on job search

Business Address: _____ Zip: _____

Business E-Mail: _____ Home E-Mail: _____

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

Check All That Apply:

Registered voter in San Francisco: Yes ☒ No ☐ If No, where registered: _____

Resident of San Francisco ☒ Yes ☐ No If No, place of residence: _____

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

I am a South Asian American woman living in the Inner Sunset. I am married, the parent of a school age child, and have worked in social justice my entire career.

Business and/or professional experience:

See attachment

Please see my Linkedin profile for more details: <https://www.linkedin.com/in/anumenon>

Civic Activities:

See attachment

Have you attended any meetings of the Board/Commission to which you wish appointment?

Yes ☒ No ☐

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

Date: 12/29/18 Applicant's Signature: (required) Anupama Menon

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

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Appointed to Seat #: _____ Term Expires: _____ Date Seat was Vacated: _____

01/20/12

Elections Commission Application (attachment)

Anu Menon

Business and/or professional experience:

Please see my LinkedIn profile for more details: <https://www.linkedin.com/in/anumenon>

I am a public interest lawyer who has dedicated my career to promoting the rights of women and disadvantaged communities domestically and internationally. I believe that free and fair elections are the cornerstone of a healthy democracy so would be honored to utilize my experience and knowledge to serve on the Elections Commission.

I have worked on a range of civil and human rights issues at the City and County of San Francisco Department on the Status of Women, ACLU of Northern California, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, Stanford Community Law Clinic, and Human Rights First. Most recently I led Community Partnerships and Development at Help a Mother Out, a local nonprofit that works to improve baby and family well-being by increasing access to diapers for Bay Area families in need.

My ACLU experience is of particular note for the Elections Commission. I was recruited by the ACLU to contribute to a multi-tiered campaign to combat felony disenfranchisement laws throughout the state of California. I worked on a lawsuit to ensure that people with certain convictions (felony misdemeanors) were able to vote. I also wrote policy papers and produced an award-winning media campaign to ensure that people who had felony convictions but were not in prison or on parole knew that they were eligible to vote.

Moreover, I served as the Associate Director of the San Francisco Dept. on the Status of Women for several years so am quite familiar with how the CCSF government and its commissions function which is a valuable attribute for a commissioner.

I hold a BA from Stanford University, an MA in International Relations from Johns Hopkins University, and a JD from the University of California, Berkeley.

Civic Activities:

I currently serve on the following non-profit boards and advisory groups:

Presidio Knolls School - Presidio Knolls is a progressive, Mandarin-immersion preschool-8th grade independent school in SOMA. I serve on the Board of Directors. I have chaired the Trustees and Governance committee for 3 years, led the Head of School search, and served on the communications and development committees.

De Marillac Academy - De Marillac Academy provides an accessible Catholic educational experience for the underserved children, youth and families of the Tenderloin and surrounding communities. I chair the development council which oversees the fundraising activities of the school.

Ferocious Lotus Theatre Company - I serve on the Advisory Board for this San Francisco Bay Area-based theatre group whose mission is to give voice to artists with diverse and international perspectives.

I am also active in the Inner Sunset Parkside Neighbors group. I volunteer for Moms' Demand Action (gun-sense group) and the Post-March Salon (women's political activism group).

In the recent past, I served on the City and County of San Francisco's Equal Pay Advisory Board and Co-Chaired the John Gardner Fellowship Association Board.

STATEMENT OF ECONOMIC INTERESTS

Date Initial Filing Received
Official Use Only

COVER PAGE

Please type or print in ink.

NAME OF FILER (LAST) (FIRST) (MIDDLE)
Menon Anupama Krishna

1. Office, Agency, or Court

Agency Name (Do not use acronyms)

Elections Commission

Commissioner

Division, Board, Department, District, if applicable

Your Position

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

Agency: Position:

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

☐ State

☐ Judge or Court Commissioner (Statewide Jurisdiction)

☐ Multi-County

☒ County of San Francisco

☐ City of

☐ Other

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

☐ Annual: The period covered is January 1, 2018, through December 31, 2018.

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

-or-

The period covered is through December 31, 2018.

☐ The period covered is January 1, 2018, through the date of leaving office.

☒ Assuming Office: Date assumed 1 / 17 / 2019

-or-

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

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

4. Schedule Summary (must complete)

► Total number of pages including this cover page: 3

Schedules attached

☒ Schedule A-1 - Investments - schedule attached

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

☐ Schedule A-2 - Investments - schedule attached

☐ Schedule D - Income - Gifts - schedule attached

☐ Schedule B - Real Property - schedule attached

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

-or-

☐ None - No reportable interests on any schedule

5. Verification

MAILING ADDRESS STREET CITY STATE ZIP CODE
(Business or Agency Address Recommended - Public Document)

San Francisco

CA

94108

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 1/17/19
(month, day, year)

Signature
(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%)

Do not attach brokerage or financial statements.

CALIFORNIA FORM

700

FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Name

Anupama Menon

<BLUE> is a required field

NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY	GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS ACTIVITY	FAIR MARKET VALUE (Select from drop down list)	NATURE OF INVESTMENT (Select from drop down list If other, describe)	IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE (mm/dd/2018)	
				ACQUIRED	DISPOSED
ABBOTT LABORATORIES	Medical Devices	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock		
ACCENTURE PLC IRELAND CL A	Information Technology Services	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock		
ACTIVISION BLIZZARD INC	Electronic Gaming & Multimedia	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock		
AEGON NV ADR	Insurance - Diversified	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock		
ALLERGAN PLC SHS	Drug Manufacturers - Specialty & Ge	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock		
ALPHABET INC CL A	Internet Content & Information	\$10,001 - \$100,000	Stock		
AMER INTL GP INC NEW	Insurance - Diversified	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock		
APPLE INC	Consumer Electronics	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock		
BARCLAYS PLC ADR	Banks - Global	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock		
BIOTELEMETRY INC COM	Diagnostics & Research	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock		
BLACKROCK INC	Asset Management	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock		
BOSTON SCIENTIFIC CORP	Medical Devices	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock		
BOTTOMLINE TECH DE INC	Technology	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock		
BP PLC ADS	Energy	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock		
CARREFOUR SA SPONSORED ADR	Grocery Stores	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock		
CBS CORP NEW CL B SHRS	Media - Diversified	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock		
CEMEX SAB DE CV	Building Materials	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock		
CHEVRON CORP	Oil & Gas Integrated	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock		
CHINA MOBILE LTD	Telecom Services	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock		
CHUBB LTD	Insurance - Property & Casualty	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock		
CISCO SYS INC	Communication Equipment	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock		
CLOUDERA INC	Software - Application	\$2,000 - \$10,000	Stock		

February 1, 2019

Supervisors Ronen, Walton and Mar
Rules Committee
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall
San Francisco CA 94102

Supervisors Ronen, Walton and Mar:

It is an honor to be considered for appointment to the Elections Commission. I apologize for being unable to attend the hearing in person as I have pre-planned international travel this week. Please accept this letter in lieu of an in-person statement.

As I noted in my application, I believe that free and fair elections are the cornerstone of a healthy democracy. Where San Francisco goes, the nation follows, and in these turbulent political times having cutting edge, yet fair elections policy is particularly critical. I would be honored to utilize my experience and knowledge to serve on the Elections Commission.

I am a public interest lawyer who has dedicated my career to promoting the rights of women and disadvantaged communities domestically and internationally. I have worked on a range of civil and human rights issues at the City and County of San Francisco Department on the Status of Women, ACLU of Northern California, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, Stanford Community Law Clinic, and Human Rights First.

My ACLU experience is of particular note for the Elections Commission. I worked on racial justice while at the ACLU and focused on coordinating a multi-tiered campaign to combat felony disenfranchisement laws throughout the state of California. I worked on a lawsuit to ensure that people with certain convictions were able to vote. I also wrote policy papers and produced an award-winning media campaign to ensure that people who had felony convictions but were not in prison or on parole knew that they were eligible to vote.

Moreover, I served as policy analyst and later Associate Director of the San Francisco Dept. on the Status of Women for several years. While there I coordinated the inaugural gender analysis of boards and commissions in 2007 and wrote material for the general public on how appointments to boards and commissions work to ensure fairness and transparency in the process. I am therefore quite familiar with how both the San Francisco government and its commissions function which is a valuable attribute for a commissioner.

I am an Asian-American woman, a parent of a school-aged child, and a resident of the Inner Sunset. I am quite active in the community including serving on the board of Presidio Knolls School, chairing the Development Council at De Marillac Academy in the Tenderloin, acting as a fundraising advisor for a local Asian-American theater group and volunteering for women's groups on a range of issues. I would like to engage more deeply with San Francisco government and have a hand in shaping the future of elections in San Francisco.

It would be honor to serve on the Elections Commission. Thank you again for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Anu Menon

cc: Victor Young, Clerk

San Francisco
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Date Printed: March 24, 2017

Date Established: January 1, 2002

Active

ELECTIONS COMMISSION

Contact and Address:

Tachina Alexander Commission Secretary
Elections
City Hall, Room 48
San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: (415) 554-4305

Fax: (415) 554-7457

Email:

Authority:

Charter Section 13.103.5

Board Qualifications:

The Elections Commission consists of seven members, one of whom is appointed by the Board of Supervisors and is broadly representative of the general public. The composition of the other members are as follows: one member appointed by the Mayor; the City Attorney, the Public Defender, the District Attorney, the Treasurer, and the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District. The member appointed by the Mayor shall have a background in the electoral process. The member appointed by the City Attorney shall have a background in elections law. The member appointed by the Treasurer shall have a background in financial management. The members appointed by the District Attorney, Public Defender, the Board of Education of SFUSD shall be broadly representative of the general public.

Term of Office: The Commission members shall serve five-year terms. No person appointed as a Commission member may serve as such for more than two successive five-year terms. Any person appointed as a commission member to complete more than two and one half years of a five-year term shall be deemed to have served one full term. In the event a vacancy occurs, the appointing authority who appointed the member vacating the office shall appoint a qualified person to complete the remainder of the term. All members initially appointed shall take office on January 1, 2002.

The Elections Commission shall oversee all public federal, state, district and municipal elections in the City and County. The Commission shall set general policies for the Department of Elections and shall be responsible for the proper administration of the general practices of the

"R Board Description" (Screen Print)

San Francisco
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS


Department, subject to the budgetary and fiscal provision of the Charter. These duties shall include but not be limited to approving written plans prior to each election, submitted by the Director of Elections, detailing the policies, procedures, and personnel that will be used to conduct the election as well as an assessment of how well the plan succeeded in carrying out a free, fair and functional election. See Charter for restrictions on membership.

Sunset Date: None

Reports: None referenced.

"R Board Description" (Screen Print)

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

VACANCY NOTICE

ELECTIONS COMMISSION

Replaces All Previous Notices

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

Seat 1, succeeding Christopher Jerdonek, term expiring January 1, 2019, must be broadly representative of the general public, for a five-year term ending January 1, 2024.

Report: None.

Sunset Date: None.

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

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

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

Please Note: Depending upon the posting date, a vacancy may have already been filled. To determine if a vacancy for this Commission is still available, or if you require additional information, please call the Rules Committee Clerk at (415) 554-7702.

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

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

DATED/POSTED: November 29, 2018



Emily M. Murase, PhD
Director

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



City and County of
San Francisco

2017 Gender Analysis of Commissions and Boards: Executive Summary

Overview

A 2008 City Charter Amendment passed by the voters of San Francisco enacted a city policy that membership of Commissions and Boards reflect the diversity of the population. As part of this measure, the Department on the Status of Women is required to conduct a biennial gender analysis of Commissions and Boards. Data was collected from 57 policy bodies with a total of 540 members primarily appointed by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

Gender Analysis Findings


Gender

- Women's representation on Commissions and Boards in 2017 is 49%, equal to the female population in San Francisco.
- Since 2007 there has been an overall increase of women on Commissions with women comprising 54% of Commissioners in 2017.
- Women's representation on Boards has declined to 41% this year following a period of steady increases over the past 3 reports.

Race and Ethnicity


- While 60% of San Franciscans are people of color, 53% of appointees are racial and ethnic minorities.
- Minority representation on Commissions decreased from 60% in 2015 to 57% in 2017.
- Despite a steady increase of people of color on Boards since 2009, minority representation on Boards, at 47%, remains below parity with the population.
- Asian, Latinx/Hispanic, and multiracial individuals are underrepresented on Commissions and Boards.
- There is a higher representation of White and Black/African American members on policy bodies than in the San Francisco population.

Figure 1: 10-Year Comparison of Women's Representation on Commissions and Boards



Sources: Department Survey, Mayor's Office, 311.

Figure 2: 8-Year Comparison of Minority Representation on Commissions and Boards



Sources: Department Survey, Mayor's Office, 311.

Race and Ethnicity by Gender

- In San Francisco, 31% of the population are women of color. Although representation of women of color on Commissions reaches parity with the population, only 19% of Board members are women of color.
- Men of color comprise 26% of both Commissioners and Board members compared to 29% of the San Francisco population.
- The representation of White men on policy bodies is 28%, exceeding the 22% of the San Francisco population, while White women are at parity with the population at 19%.
- Underrepresentation of Asian and Latinx/Hispanic individuals is seen among both men and women.
 - One-tenth of Commissioners and Board members are Asian men and 12% are Asian women compared to 16% and 18% of the population, respectively.
 - Latinos are 6% of Commissioners and Board members and Latinas are 4% of Commissioners and Board members compared to 8% and 7% of San Franciscans, respectively.

Additional Demographics

- Among Commissioners and Board members, 17% identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender (LGBT).
- Individuals with a disability comprise 11% of appointees on policy bodies, just below the 12% of the adult population with a disability in San Francisco.
- Representation of veterans on Commissions and Boards is 13%, exceeding the 4% of San Franciscans that have served in the military.

Budget

- Women and women of color, in particular, are underrepresented on the policy bodies with the largest budgets while exceeding or nearing parity on policy bodies with the smallest budgets.
- Minority representation on policy bodies with both the largest and smallest budgets is at least 60%, equal to the population.

Table 1: Demographics of Appointees to San Francisco Commissions and Boards, 2017

	Women	Minority	Women of Color	LGBT	Disabilities	Veterans
San Francisco Population	49%	60%	31%	5%-7%	12%	4%
Commissions and Boards Combined	49%	53%	27%	17%	11%	13%
Commissions	54%	57%	31%	18%	10%	15%
Boards	41%	47%	19%	17%	14%	10%
10 Largest Budgeted Bodies	35%	60%	18%			
10 Smallest Budgeted Bodies	58%	66%	30%			

Sources: 2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Department Survey, Mayor's Office, 311, FY17-18 Annual Appropriation Ordinance, FY17-18 Mayor's Budget Book.

The full report is available at the San Francisco Department on the Status of Women website, <http://sfgov.org/dosw/>.



Emily M. Murase, PhD
Director

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



City and County of
San Francisco

Gender Analysis of San Francisco Commissions and Boards

December 2017

Acknowledgements

This report is dedicated in memory of the late Mayor Edwin M. Lee, who made an inclusive San Francisco a priority, including through the appointment of numerous women to public policy bodies throughout the City.

The San Francisco Department on the Status of Women would like to thank the various commission secretaries and department staff who graciously assisted in collecting and providing information about their respective commissions and boards. We also want to thank Francis Tsang, Deputy Chief of Staff for the Office of Mayor Edwin M. Lee, as well as the 311 Information Directory Department ("311") for providing much of the data necessary for the completion of this report.

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

This document was presented to and adopted by the San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women in December 2017.

San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women

President Debbie Mesloh

Vice President Breanna Zwart

Commissioner Marjan Philhour

Commissioner Olga Ryerson

Commissioner Carrie Schwab-Pomerantz

Commissioner Andrea Shorter

Commissioner Julie D. Soo

The full report is available at the San Francisco Department on the Status of Women website, <http://sfgov.org/dosw/>.

Table of Contents

Table of Figures and Tables.....	3
Executive Summary.....	4
I. Introduction.....	6
II. Methodology and Limitations	7
III. San Francisco Population Demographics	8
IV. Gender Analysis Findings.....	12
A. Gender.....	13
B. Ethnicity.....	16
C. Race/Ethnicity by Gender	22
D. Sexual Orientation.....	24
E. Disability	25
F. Veterans.....	26
G. Policy Bodies by Budget Size	27
V. Conclusion	31
Appendix I: 2015 Population Estimates for San Francisco County.....	32
Appendix II: Commissions and Boards Demographics.....	34

Table of Figures and Tables

Figure 1: San Francisco Population by Race/Ethnicity	8
Figure 2: San Francisco Population by Race/Ethnicity and Gender	9
Figure 3: San Francisco Adults with a Disability by Gender	10
Figure 4: Veterans in San Francisco by Gender	11
Figure 5: Summary Data Comparing Representation on Commissions and Boards	
Figure 6: 10-Year Comparison of Women's Representation on Commissions and Boards	13
Figure 7: Commissions and Boards with Most Women	14
Figure 8: Commissions and Boards with Least Women	15
Figure 9: 8-Year Comparison of Minority Representation on Commissions and Boards	16
Figure 10: Race/Ethnicity of Commissioners Compared to San Francisco Population	17
Figure 11: Race/Ethnicity of Board Members Compared to San Francisco Population	18
Figure 12: Commissions with Most Minority Appointees	19
Figure 13: Commissions with Least Minority Appointees	20
Figure 14: Minority Representation on Boards	21
Figure 15: Women and Men of Color on Commissions and Boards	22
Figure 16: Commission and Board Appointees by Race/Ethnicity and Gender	23
Figure 17: LGBT Commission and Board Appointees	24
Figure 18: Commission and Board Appointees with Disabilities	25
Figure 19: Commission and Board Appointees with Military Service	26
Figure 20: Women, Minorities, and Women of Color on Largest and Smallest Budget Bodies	28
Table 1: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Largest Budgets	29
Table 2: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Smallest Budgets	30

Executive Summary

Overview


A 2008 City Charter Amendment passed by the voters of San Francisco enacted a city policy that membership of Commissions and Boards reflect the diversity of the population. As part of this measure, the Department on the Status of Women is required to conduct a biennial gender analysis of Commissions and Boards. Data was collected from 57 policy bodies with a total of 540 members primarily appointed by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

Key Findings

Gender

- Women's representation on Commissions and Boards in 2017 is 49%, equal to the female population in San Francisco.
- Since 2007, there has been an overall increase of women on Commissions: women compose 54% of Commissioners in 2017.
- Women's representation on Boards has declined to 41% this year following a period of steady increases over the past 3 reports.

Figure 1: 10-Year Comparison of Women's Representation on Commissions and Boards




Sources: Department Survey, Mayor's Office, 311.

Race and Ethnicity

- While 60% of San Franciscans are people of color, 53% of appointees are racial and ethnic minorities.
- Minority representation on Commissions decreased from 60% in 2015 to 57% in 2017.
- Despite a steady increase of people of color on Boards since 2009, minority representation on Boards, at 47%, remains below parity with the population.
- Asian, Latinx/Hispanic, and multiracial individuals are underrepresented on Commissions and Boards.
- There is a higher representation of White and Black or African American members on policy bodies than in the San Francisco population.

Figure 2: 8-Year Comparison of Minority Representation on Commissions and Boards



Sources: Department Survey, Mayor's Office, 311.

Race and Ethnicity by Gender

- In San Francisco, 31% of the population are women of color. Although representation of women of color on Commissions reaches parity with the population, only 19% of Board members are women of color.
- Men of color comprise 26% of both Commissioners and Board members compared to 29% of the San Francisco population.
- The representation of White men on policy bodies is 28%, exceeding the 22% of the San Francisco population, while White women are at parity with the population at 19%.
- Underrepresentation of Asian and Latinx/Hispanic individuals exists among both men and women.
 - One-tenth of Commissioners and Board members are Asian men and 12% are Asian women compared to 16% and 18% of the population, respectively.
 - Latinos are 6% of Commissioners and Board members and Latinas are 4% of Commissioners and Board members compared to 8% and 7% of San Franciscans, respectively.

Additional Demographics

- Among Commissioners and Board members, 17% identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender (LGBT).
- Individuals with a disability comprise 11% of appointees on policy bodies, just below the 12% of the adult population with a disability in San Francisco.
- Representation of veterans on Commissions and Boards is 13%, exceeding the 4% of San Franciscans that have served in the military.

Representation on Policy Bodies by Budget

- Women and women of color, in particular, are underrepresented on the policy bodies with the largest budgets while exceeding or nearing parity on policy bodies with the smallest budgets.
- Minority representation on policy bodies with both the largest and smallest budgets is at least 60%, equal to the population.

Table 1: Demographics of Appointees to San Francisco Commissions and Boards, 2017

	Women	Minority	Women of Color	LGBT	Disabilities	Veterans
San Francisco Population	49%	60%	31%	5%-7%	12%	4%
Commissions and Boards Combined	49%	53%	27%	17%	11%	13%
Commissions	54%	57%	31%	18%	10%	15%
Boards	41%	47%	19%	17%	14%	10%
10 Largest Budgeted Bodies	35%	60%	18%			
10 Smallest Budgeted Bodies	58%	66%	30%			

Sources: 2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Department Survey, Mayor's Office, 311, FY17-18 Annual Appropriation Ordinance, FY17-18 Mayor's Budget Book.

I. Introduction

The central question of this report is whether appointments to public policy bodies of the City and County of San Francisco are reflective of the population at large.

In 1998, San Francisco became the first city in the world to pass a local ordinance reflecting the principles of the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), also known as the "Women's Human Rights Treaty."¹ The Ordinance requires City government to take proactive steps to ensure gender equality and specifies "gender analysis" as a preventive tool to identify and address discrimination.² Since 1998, the Department on the Status of Women (Department) has used this tool to analyze operations of 11 City departments.

In 2007, the Department used gender analysis to analyze the number of women appointed to City Commissions, Boards, and Task Forces.³ Based on these findings, a City Charter Amendment was developed by the Board of Supervisors for the June 2008 election. The Amendment, which voters approved overwhelmingly, made it City policy that:

1. Membership of Commissions and Boards reflect the diversity of the San Francisco population;
2. Appointing officials be urged to support the nomination, appointment, and confirmation of these candidates; and
3. The San Francisco Department on the Status of Women is required to conduct a gender analysis of Commissions and Boards to be published every 2 years.⁴

This 2017 gender analysis assesses the representation of women; racial and ethnic minorities; lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) individuals; people with disabilities; and veterans on San Francisco Commissions and Boards appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.⁵

¹ While 188 of the 193 member states of the United Nations, including all other industrialized countries, have ratified the Women's Human Rights Treaty, the U.S. has not. President Jimmy Carter signed the treaty in 1980, but it has been languishing in the Senate ever since, due to jurisdictional concerns and other issues. For further information, see the United Nations website, available at www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cedaw/index.htm.

² The gender analysis guidelines are available at the San Francisco Department on the Status of Women website, under Women's Human Rights, at www.sfgov.org/dosw.

³ *The 2007 Gender Analysis of Commissions, Boards, and Task Forces* is available online at the Department website, under Women's Human Rights, at www.sfgov.org/dosw.

⁴ The full text of the charter amendment is available at https://sfpl.org/pdf/main/gic/elections/June3_2008.pdf.

⁵ Appointees in some policy bodies are elected or appointed by other entities.

II. Methodology and Limitations

This report focuses on City and County of San Francisco Commissions and Boards whose jurisdiction is limited to the City, that have a majority of members appointed by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors, and that are permanent policy bodies.⁶ Generally, *Commission* appointments are made by the Mayor and *Board* appointments are made by members of the Board of Supervisors. For some policy bodies, however, the appointments are divided between the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, and other agencies. *Commissions* tend to be permanent policy bodies that are part of the City Charter and oversee a department or agency. *Boards* are typically policy bodies created legislatively to address specific issues.

The gender analysis in this report reflects data from the Commissions and Boards that provided information to the Department through survey, the Mayor's Office, and the Information Directory Department (311), which collects and disseminates information about City appointments to policy bodies. Based on the list of Commissions and Boards that are reported by 311, data was compiled from 57 policy bodies with a total of 540 appointees. A Commissioner or Board member's gender identity, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability status, and veteran status were among data elements collected on a voluntary basis. In many cases, identities are vastly underreported due to concerns about social stigma and discrimination. Thus, data on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender (LGBT) identity, disability, and veteran status of appointees were limited, incomplete, and/or unavailable for many appointees, but 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.

For the purposes of comparison in this report, data from the *U.S. Census 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates* is used to reflect the current San Francisco population. Charts 1 and 2 in the Appendix show these population estimates by race/ethnicity and gender.


⁶ It is important to note that San Francisco is the only jurisdiction in the State of California that is both a city and a county. Therefore, while in other jurisdictions, the Human Services Commission is typically a county commission that governs services across multiple cities and is composed of members appointed by those cities, the San Francisco case is much simpler. All members of Commissioner and Boards are appointed either by the San Francisco Mayor or the San Francisco County Board of Supervisors which functions as a city council.

III. San Francisco Population Demographics

An estimated 49% of the population in San Francisco are women and approximately 60% of residents identify as a race or ethnicity other than White. Four in ten San Franciscans are White, one-third are Asian, 15% are Hispanic or Latinx, and 6% are Black or African American.

The racial and ethnic breakdown of San Francisco's population is shown in the chart below. Note that the percentages do not add up to 100% since individuals may be counted more than once.


Figure 1: San Francisco Population by Race/Ethnicity



Source: 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

A more nuanced view of San Francisco's population can be seen in the chart below, which shows race and ethnicity by gender. Most racial and ethnic groups have a similar representation of men and women in San Francisco, though there are about 15% more White men than women (22% vs. 19%) and 12% more Asian women than men (18% vs. 16%). Overall, 29% of San Franciscans are men of color and 31% are women of color.

Figure 2: San Francisco Population by Race/Ethnicity and Gender




Source: 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

The U.S. Census and *American Community Survey* do not count the number of individuals who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender (LGBT). However, there are several reputable data sources that estimate San Francisco has one of the highest concentrations of LGBT individuals in the nation. A 2015 Gallup poll found that among employed adults in the San Francisco Metropolitan Area, which includes San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, and San Mateo counties, 6.2% identify as LGBT, the largest percentage of any populous area in the U.S. The 2010 U.S. Census reported 34,000 same-sex couples in the Bay Area, with an estimated 7,600 male same-sex couples and 2,700 female same-sex couples in the City of San Francisco, approximately 7% of all households. In addition, the Williams Institute at the University of California Los Angeles estimates that 4.6% of Californians identify as LGBT, which is similar across gender (4.6% of males vs. 4.5% of females). The Williams Institute also reported that roughly 92,000 adults ages 18-70 in California, or 0.35% of the population, are transgender. These sources suggest between 5-7% of the San Francisco adult population, or approximately 36,000-50,000 San Franciscans, identify as LGBT.

Women are slightly more likely than men to have one or more disabilities. For women 18 years and older, 12.1% have at least one disability, compared to 11.5% of adult men. Overall, about 12% of adults in San Francisco live with a disability.


Figure 3: San Francisco Adults with a Disability by Gender



Source: 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

In terms of veterans, according to the U.S. Census, 3.6% of the adult population in San Francisco has served in the military. There is a drastic difference by gender. More than 12 times as many men are veterans, at nearly 7% of adult males, than women, with less than 1%.

Figure 4: Veterans in San Francisco by Gender



Source: 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

IV. Gender Analysis Findings

On the whole, appointees to Commissions and Boards reflect many aspects of the diversity of San Francisco. Among Commissioners and Board members, nearly half are women, more than 50% are people of color, 17% are LGBT, 11% have a disability, and 13% are veterans. However, Board appointees are less diverse than Commission appointees. Below is a summary of key indicators, comparing them between Commissions and Boards. Refer to Appendix II for a complete table of demographics by Commissions and Boards.

Figure 5: Summary Data Comparing Representation on Commissions and Boards, 2017


	Commissions	Boards
Number of Policy Bodies Included	40	17
Filled Seats	350/373 (6% vacant)	190/213 (11% vacant)
Female Appointees	54%	41%
Racial/Ethnic Minority	57%	47%
LGBT	17.5%	17%
With Disability	10%	14%
Veterans	15%	10%

The next sections will present detailed data, compared to previous years, along the key variables of gender, ethnicity, race/ethnicity by gender, sexual orientation, disability, veterans, and policy bodies by budget size.

A. Gender

Overall, the percentage of female appointees to City Commissions and Boards is 49%, equal to the female percentage of the San Francisco population. A 10-year comparison of the gender diversity on Commissions and Boards shows that the percentage of female Commissioners has increased over the 10 years since the first gender analysis of Commissions and Boards in 2007. At 54%, the representation of women on Commissions currently exceeds the percentage of women in San Francisco (49%). The percentage of female Board appointees declined 15% from the last gender analysis in 2015. Women make up 41% of Board appointees in 2017, whereas women were 48% of Board members in 2015. A greater number of Boards were included this year than in 2015, which may contribute to the stark difference from the previous report. This dip represents a departure from the previous trend of increasing women's representation on Boards.

Figure 6: 10-Year Comparison of Women's Representation on Commissions and Boards




Sources: Department Survey, Mayor's Office, 311.

The next two charts illustrate the Commissions and Boards with the highest and lowest percentage of female appointees in 2017. Data from the two previous gender analyses for these Commissions and Boards is also included for comparison purposes. Of 54 policy bodies with data on gender, roughly one-third (20 Commissions and Boards) have more than 50% representation of women. The greatest women's representation is found on the Commission on the Status of Women and the Children and Families Commission (First 5) at 100%. The Long Term Care Coordinating Council and the Mayor's Disability Council also have some of the highest percentages of women, at 78% and 75%, respectively. However, the latter two policy bodies are not included in the chart due to lack of prior data.

Figure 7: Commissions and Boards with Most Women


**Commissions and Boards with Highest Percentage of Women,
2017 Compared to 2015, 2013**



Sources: Department Survey, Mayor's Office, 311.

There are 14 Commissions and Boards that have 30% or less women. The lowest percentage is found on the Oversight Board of the Office of Community Investment & Infrastructure where currently none of the five appointees are women. The Urban Forestry Council and the Workforce Investment Board also have some of the lowest percentages of women members at 20% and 26%, respectively, but are not included in the chart below due to lack of prior data.

Figure 8: Commissions and Boards with Least Women




Sources: Department Survey, Mayor's Office, 311.

B. Ethnicity

Data on racial and ethnic background were available for 286 Commissioners and 183 Board members. More than half of these appointees identify as people of color. However, representation of people of color on Commissions and Boards falls short of parity with the approximately 60% minority population in San Francisco. In total, 53% of appointees identify as racial and ethnic minorities. The percentage of minority Commissioners decreased from 2015, while the percentage of minority Board members has been steadily increasing since 2009. Yet, communities of color are represented in greater numbers on Commissions, at 57%, than Boards, at 47%, of appointees. Below is the 8-year comparison of minority representation on Commissions and Boards. Data on race and ethnicity were not collected in 2007.


Figure 9: 8-Year Comparison of Minority Representation on Commissions and Boards



Sources: Department Survey, Mayor's Office, 311.

The racial and ethnic breakdown of Commissioners and Board members as compared to the San Francisco population is presented in the next two charts. There is a greater number of White and Black/African American Commissioners in comparison to the general population, in contrast to individuals identifying as Asian, Latinx/Hispanic, multiracial, and other races who are underrepresented on Commissions. One-quarter of Commissioners are Asian compared to more than one-third of the population. Similarly, 11% of Commissioners are Latinx compared to 15% of the population.


Figure 10: Race/Ethnicity of Commissioners Compared to San Francisco Population



Sources: Department Survey, Mayor's Office, 311.

A similar pattern emerges for Board appointees. In general, racial and ethnic minorities are underrepresented on Boards, except for the Black/African American population with 16% of Board appointees compared to 6% of the population. White appointees far exceed the White population with more than half of appointees identifying as White compared to about 40% of the population. Meanwhile, there are considerably fewer Board members who identify as Asian, Latinx/Hispanic, multiracial, and other races than in the population. Particularly striking is the underrepresentation of Asians, where 17% of Board members identified as Asian compared to 34% of the population. Additionally, 9% of Board appointees are Latinx compared to 15% of the population.


Figure 11: Race/Ethnicity of Board Members Compared to San Francisco Population



Sources: Department Survey, Mayor's Office, 311.

Of the 37 Commissions with information on ethnicity, more than two-thirds (26 Commissions) have at least 50% of appointees identifying as persons of color and more than half (19 Commissions) reach or exceed parity with the nearly 60% minority population. The Commissions with the highest percentage of minority appointees are shown in the chart below. The Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure and the Southeast Community Facility Commission both are comprised entirely of people of color. Meanwhile, 86% of Commissioners are minorities on the Juvenile Probation Commission, Immigrant Rights Commission, and Health Commission.


Figure 12: Commissions with Most Minority Appointees



Sources: Department Survey, Mayor's Office, 311.

Seven Commissions have fewer than 30% minority appointees, with the lowest percentage of minority appointees being found on the Building Inspection Commission at 14% and the Historic Preservation Commission at 17%. The Commissions with the lowest percentage of minority appointees are shown in the chart below.


Figure 13: Commissions with Least Minority Appointees



Sources: Department Survey, Mayor's Office, 311.

For the 16 Boards with information on race and ethnicity, nine have at least 50% minority appointees. The Local Homeless Coordinating Board has the greatest percentage of members of color with 86%. The Mental Health Board and the Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board also have a large representation of people of color at 69% and 67%, respectively. Meanwhile, seven Boards have a majority of White members, with the lowest representation of people of color on the Oversight Board at 20% minority members, the War Memorial Board of Trustees at 18% minority members, and the Urban Forestry Council with no members of color.

Figure 14: Minority Representation on Boards




Sources: Department Survey, Mayor's Office, 311.

C. Race/Ethnicity by Gender

Minorities comprise 57% of Commission appointees and 47% of Board appointees. The total percentage of minority appointees on Commissions and Boards in 2017 is 53% compared to about 60% of the population. There are slightly more women of color on Commissions and Boards at 27% than men of color at 26%. Women of color appointees to Commissions reach parity with the population at 31%, while women of color are 19% of Board members, far from parity with the population. Men of color are 26% of appointees to both Commissions and Boards, below the 29% men of color in the San Francisco population.


Figure 15: Women and Men of Color on Commissions and Boards



Sources: Department Survey, Mayor's Office, 311, 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

The next chart illustrates appointees' race and ethnicity by gender. The gender distribution in most racial and ethnic groups on policy bodies is similar to the representation of men and women in minority groups in San Francisco except for the White population. White men represent 22% of San Francisco population, yet 28% of Commission and Board appointees are White men. Meanwhile, White women are at parity with the population at 19%. Women and men of color are underrepresented across all racial and ethnic groups, except for Black/African American appointees. Asian women are 12% of appointees, but 18% of the population. Asian men are 10% of appointees compared to 16% of the population. Latina women are 4% of Commissioners and Board members, yet 7% of the population, while 6% of appointees are Latino men compared to 8% of San Franciscans.

Figure 16: Commission and Board Appointees by Race/Ethnicity and Gender




Sources: Department Survey, Mayor's Office, 311.

D. Sexual Orientation

While it is challenging to find accurate counts of the number of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) individuals, a combination of sources, noted in the demographics section, suggests between 4.6% and 7% of the San Francisco population is LGBT. Data on sexual orientation and gender identity was available for 240 Commission appointees and 132 Board appointees. Overall, about 17% of appointees to Commissions and Boards are LGBT. There is a large LGBT representation across both Commissioners and Board members. Three Commissioners identified as transgender.

Figure 17: LGBT Commission and Board Appointees




Sources: Department Survey, Mayor's Office, 311.

E. Disability

An estimated 12% of San Franciscans have a disability. Data on disability was available for 214 Commission appointees and 93 Board appointees. The percentage of Commission and Board appointees with a disability is 11.4% and almost reaches parity with the 11.8% of the adult population in San Francisco that has a disability. There is a much greater representation of people with a disability on Boards at 14% than on Commissions at 10%.

Figure 18: Commission and Board Appointees with Disabilities




Sources: Department Survey, Mayor's Office, 311.

F. Veterans

Veterans are 3.6% of the adult population in San Francisco. Data on military service was available for 176 Commission appointees and 81 Board appointees. Overall, veterans are well represented on Commissions and Boards with 13% of appointees having served in the military. However, there is a large difference in the representation of veterans on Commissions at 15% compared to Boards at 10%. This is likely due to the 17 members of Veterans Affairs Commission of which all members must be veterans.

Figure 19: Commission and Board Appointees with Military Service



Sources: Department Survey, Mayor's Office, 311.

G. Policy Bodies by Budget Size


In addition to data on the appointment of women and minorities to Commissions and Boards, this report examines whether the demographic make-up of policy bodies with the largest budget (which is often proportional to the amount of influence in the City) are representative of the community. On the following page, Figure 19 shows the representation of women, people of color, and women of color on the policy bodies with the largest and smallest budgets.

Though the overall representation of female appointees (49%) is equal to the City's population, Commissions and Boards with the highest female representation have fairly low influence as measured by budget size. Although women's representation on the ten policy bodies with the largest budgets increased from 30% in 2015 to 35% this year, it is still far below parity with the population. The percentage of women on the ten bodies with the smallest budgets grew from 45% in 2015 to 58% in 2017.

With respect to minority representation, the bodies with both the largest and smallest budgets exceed parity with the population. On the ten Commissions and Boards with the largest budgets, 60% of appointees identify as a racial or ethnic minority; meanwhile 66% of appointees identify as a racial or ethnic minority on the ten Commissions and Boards with the smallest budgets. Minority representation on the ten largest budgeted policy bodies was slightly greater in 2015 at 62%, while there was a 21% increase of minority representation on the ten smallest budgeted policy bodies from 52% in 2015.

Percentage of women of color on the policy bodies with the smallest budgets is 30% and almost reaches parity with the population in San Francisco. However, women of color are considerably underrepresented on the ten policy bodies with the largest budgets at 18% compared to 31% of the population.

Figure 20: Women, Minorities, and Women of Color on Largest and Smallest Budget Bodies
Percent Women, Minorities and Women of Color on Commissions and Boards with Largest and Smallest Budgets in Fiscal Year 2017-2018



Sources: Department Survey, Mayor's Office, 311, FY17-18 Annual Appropriation Ordinance, FY17-18 Mayor's Budget Book.

The following two tables present the demographics of the Commissions and Boards overseeing some of the City's largest and smallest budgets.

Of the ten Commissions and Boards that oversee the largest budgets, women make up 35% and women of color are 18% of the appointees. The Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure is the most diverse with people of color in all appointed seats and women comprising half of the members. The Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) Board of Directors and Parking Authority Commission has the next largest representation of women with 43%. Four of the ten bodies have less than 30% female appointees. Women of color are near parity on the Police Commission at 29% compared to 31% of the population. Meanwhile, the Public Utilities Commission and Human Services Commission have no women of color.

Overall, the representation of minorities on policy bodies with the largest budgets is equal to that of the minority population in San Francisco at 60% and four of the ten largest budgeted bodies have greater minority representation. Following the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure with 100% minority appointees, the Health Commission at 86% minority appointees, the Aging and Adult Services Commission at 80% minority appointees, and the Police Commission with 71% minority appointees have the next highest minority representation. In contrast, the Airport Commission has the lowest minority representation at 20%.

Table 1: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Largest Budgets

Body	FY17-18 Budget	Total Seats	Filled Seats	% Women	% Minority	% Women of Color
Health Commission	\$ 2,198,181,178	7	7	29%	86%	14%
MTA Board of Directors and Parking Authority Commission	\$ 1,183,468,406	7	7	43%	57%	14%
Public Utilities Commission	\$ 1,052,841,388	5	5	40%	40%	0%
Airport Commission	\$ 987,785,877	5	5	40%	20%	20%
Human Services Commission	\$ 913,783,257	5	5	20%	60%	0%
Health Authority (SF Health Plan Governing Board)	\$ 637,000,000	19	15	40%	54%	23%
Police Commission	\$ 588,276,484	7	7	29%	71%	29%
Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure	\$ 536,796,000	5	4	50%	100%	50%
Fire Commission	\$ 381,557,710	5	5	20%	60%	20%
Aging and Adult Services Commission	\$ 285,000,000	7	5	40%	80%	14%
Total	\$ 8,764,690,300	72	65	35%	60%	18%

Sources: Department Survey, Mayor's Office, 311, FY17-18 Annual Appropriation Ordinance, FY17-18 Mayor's Budget Book.

Commissions and Boards with the smallest budgets exceed parity with the population for women's and minority representation with 58% women and 66% minority appointees and are near parity with 30% women of color appointees compared to 31% of the population. The Long Term Care Coordinating Council has the greatest representation of women at 78%, followed by the Youth Commission at 64%, and the City Hall Preservation Advisory Commission at 60%. Five of the ten smallest budgeted bodies have less than 50% women appointees. The Southeast Community Facility Commission, the Youth Commission, the Housing Authority Commission, and the Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board have more than 30% women of color members.

Of the eight smallest budgeted policy bodies with data on race and ethnicity, more than half have greater representation of racial and ethnic minority and women of color than the population. The Southeast Community Facility Commission has 100% members of color, followed by the Housing Authority Commission at 83%, the Sentencing Commission at 73%, and the Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board at 67% minority appointees. Only the Historic Preservation Commission with 17% minority members; the City Hall Preservation Advisory Commission at 20% minority members, and the Reentry Council with 57% minority members fall below parity with the population.

Table 2: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Smallest Budgets

Body	FY17-18 Budget	Total Seats	Filled Seats	% Women	% Minority	% Women of Color
Historic Preservation Commission	\$ 45,000	7	6	33%	17%	17%
City Hall Preservation Advisory Commission	\$ -	5	5	60%	20%	20%
Housing Authority Commission	\$ -	7	6	33%	83%	33%
Local Homeless Coordinating Board	\$ -	9	7	43%	n/a	n/a
Long Term Care Coordinating Council	\$ -	40	40	78%	n/a	n/a
Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board	\$ -	7	6	33%	67%	33%
Reentry Council	\$ -	24	23	52%	57%	22%
Sentencing Commission	\$ -	12	12	42%	73%	18%
Southeast Community Facility Commission	\$ -	7	6	50%	100%	50%
Youth Commission	\$ -	17	16	64%	64%	43%
Totals	\$ 45,000	135	127	58%	66%	30%

Sources: Department Survey, Mayor's Office, 311, FY17-18 Annual Appropriation Ordinance, FY17-18 Mayor's Budget Book.

V. Conclusion

Per the 2008 Charter Amendment, the Mayor and Board of Supervisors are encouraged to make appointments to Commissions, Boards, and other policy bodies that reflect the diverse population of San Francisco. While state law prohibits public appointments based solely on gender, race and ethnicity, sexual orientation, or disability status, an awareness of these factors is important when appointing individuals to serve on policy bodies, particularly where they may have been historically underrepresented.

Since the first gender analysis of appointees to San Francisco policy bodies in 2007, there has been a steady increase of female appointees. There has also been a greater representation of women on Commissions as compared to Boards. This continued in 2017 with 54% female Commissioners. However, it is concerning that the percentage of female Board members has dropped from 48% in 2015 to 41% in 2017.

People of color represent 60% of the San Francisco population, yet only represent 53% of appointees to San Francisco Commissions and Boards. There is a greater representation of people of color on Commissions than Boards. However, Commissions have fewer appointees identified as ethnic minorities this year, 57%, than the 60% in 2015, while the representation of people of color on Boards increased from 44% in 2015 to 47% in 2017. There is still a disparity between race and ethnicity on public policy bodies and in the population. Especially Asians and Latinx/Hispanic individuals are underrepresented across Commissions and Boards while there is a higher representation of White and Black/African American appointees than in the general population. Women of color are 31% of the population and comprise 31% of Commissioners compared to 19% of Board members. Meanwhile, men of color are 29% of the population and 26% of Commissioners and Board members.

This year there is more data available on sexual orientation, veteran status, and disability than previous gender analyses. The 2017 gender analysis found that there is a relatively high representation of LGBT individuals on the policy bodies for which there was data at 17%. Veterans are also highly represented at 13%, and the representation of people with a disability in policy bodies almost reaches parity with the population with 11.4% compared to 11.8%.

Finally, the policy bodies with larger budgets have a smaller representation of women at 35% while Commissions and Boards with smallest budgets are 58% female appointees. While minority representation exceeds the population on the policy bodies with both the smallest and largest budgets, women of color are considerably underrepresented on the largest budgeted policy bodies at 18% compared to 31% of the population.

This report is intended to inform appointing authorities, including the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, as they carefully select their designees on key policy bodies of the City & County of San Francisco. In the spirit of the charter amendment that mandated this report, diversity and inclusion should be the hallmark of these important appointments.

Appendix I. 2015 Population Estimates for San Francisco County

The following 2015 San Francisco population statistics were obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau's *2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates*.

Chart 1: 2015 Total Population by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Total	
	Estimate	Percent
San Francisco County California	840,763	
White, Not Hispanic or Latino	346,732	41%
Asian	284,426	34%
Hispanic or Latino	128,619	15%
Some Other Race	54,388	6%
Black or African American	46,825	6%
Two or More Races	38,940	5%
Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	3,649	0.4%
American Indian and Alaska Native	2,854	0.3%

Chart 2: 2015 Total Population by Race/Ethnicity and Gender

Race/Ethnicity	Total		Male		Female	
	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent
San Francisco County California	840,763	-	427,909	50.9%	412,854	49.1%
White, Not Hispanic or Latino	346,732	41%	186,949	22%	159,783	19%
Asian	284,426	34%	131,641	16%	152,785	18%
Hispanic or Latino	128,619	15%	67,978	8%	60,641	7%
Some Other Race	54,388	6%	28,980	3.4%	25,408	3%
Black or African American	46,825	6%	24,388	3%	22,437	2.7%
Two or More Races	38,940	5%	19,868	2%	19,072	2%
Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	3,649	0.4%	1,742	0.2%	1,907	0.2%
American Indian and Alaska Native	2,854	0.3%	1,666	0.2%	1,188	0.1%

Appendix II. Commissions and Boards Demographics

Commission	Total Seats	Filled Seats	FY17-18 Budget	% Women	% Minority	% Women of Color
1 Aging and Adult Services Commission	7	5	\$285,000,000	40%	80%	40%
2 Airport Commission	5	5	\$987,785,877	40%	20%	20%
3 Animal Control and Welfare Commission	10	9	\$-			
4 Arts Commission	15	15	\$17,975,575	60%	53%	27%
5 Asian Art Commission	27	27	\$10,962,397	63%	59%	44%
6 Building Inspection Commission	7	7	\$76,533,699	29%	14%	0%
7 Children and Families Commission (First 5)	9	8	\$31,830,264	100%	63%	63%
8 City Hall Preservation Advisory Commission	5	5	\$-	60%	20%	20%
9 Civil Service Commission	5	5	\$1,250,582	40%	20%	0%
10 Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure	5	4	\$536,796,000	50%	100%	50%
11 Commission on the Environment	7	6	\$23,081,438	83%	67%	50%
12 Commission on the Status of Women	7	7	\$8,048,712	100%	71%	71%
13 Elections Commission	7	7	\$14,847,232	33%	50%	33%
14 Entertainment Commission	7	7	\$987,102	29%	57%	14%
15 Ethics Commission	5	5	\$4,787,508	33%	67%	33%
16 Film Commission	11	11	\$1,475,000	55%	36%	36%
17 Fire Commission	5	5	\$381,557,710	20%	60%	20%
18 Health Commission	7	7	\$2,198,181,178	29%	86%	14%
19 Historic Preservation Commission	7	6	\$45,000	33%	17%	17%
20 Housing Authority Commission	7	6	\$-	33%	83%	33%
21 Human Rights Commission	11	10	\$4,299,600	60%	60%	50%
22 Human Services Commission	5	5	\$913,783,257	20%	60%	0%
23 Immigrant Rights Commission	15	14	\$5,686,611	64%	86%	50%
24 Juvenile Probation Commission	7	7	\$41,683,918	29%	86%	29%
25 Library Commission	7	5	\$137,850,825	80%	60%	40%
26 Local Agency Formation Commission	7	4	\$193,168			
27 Long Term Care Coordinating Council	40	40	\$-	78%		
28 Mayor's Disability Council	11	8	\$4,136,890	75%	25%	13%
29 MTA Board of Directors and Parking Authority Commission	7	7	\$1,183,468,406	43%	57%	14%
30 Planning Commission	7	7	\$54,501,361	43%	43%	29%
31 Police Commission	7	7	\$588,276,484	29%	71%	29%
32 Port Commission	5	4	\$133,202,027	75%	75%	50%
33 Public Utilities Commission	5	5	\$1,052,841,388	40%	40%	0%

Commission	Total Seats	Filled Seats	FY17-18 Budget	% Women	% Minority	% Women of Color
34 Recreation and Park Commission	7	7	\$221,545,353	29%	43%	14%
35 Sentencing Commission	12	12	\$-	42%	73%	18%
36 Small Business Commission	7	7	\$1,548,034	43%	50%	25%
37 Southeast Community Facility Commission	7	6	\$-	50%	100%	50%
38 Treasure Island Development Authority	7	7	\$2,079,405	43%	57%	43%
39 Veterans' Affairs Commission	17	15	\$865,518	27%	22%	0%
40 Youth Commission	17	16	\$-	64%	64%	43%
Total	373	350		54%	57%	31%

Board	Total Seats	Filled Seats	FY17-18 Budget	% Women	% Minority	% Women of Color
1 Assessment Appeals Board	24	18	\$653,780	39%	50%	22%
2 Board of Appeals	5	5	\$1,038,570	40%	60%	20%
3 Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority	7	7	\$11,662,000	43%	57%	29%
4 Health Authority (SF Health Plan Governing Board)	19	15	\$637,000,000	40%	54%	23%
5 Health Service Board	7	7	\$11,444,255	29%	29%	0%
6 In-Home Supportive Services Public Authority	12	12	\$207,835,715	58%	45%	18%
7 Local Homeless Coordinating Board	9	7	\$-	43%	86%	
8 Mental Health Board	17	16	\$218,000	69%	69%	50%
9 Oversight Board	7	5	\$152,902	0%	20%	0%
10 Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board	7	6	\$-	33%	67%	33%
11 Reentry Council	24	23	\$-	52%	57%	22%
13 Relocation Appeals Board	5	0	\$-			
12 Rent Board	10	10	\$8,074,900	30%	50%	10%
14 Retirement System Board	7	7	\$97,622,827	43%	29%	29%
15 Urban Forestry Council	15	14	\$92,713	20%	0%	0%
16 War Memorial Board of Trustees	11	11	\$26,910,642	55%	18%	18%
17 Workforce Investment Board	27	27	\$62,341,959	26%	44%	7%
Total	213	190		41%	47%	19%

	Total Seats	Filled Seats	FY17-18 Budget	% Women	% Minority	% Women of Color
Commissions and Boards Total	586	540		49.4%	53%	27%