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

MEMORANDUM

RULES COMMITTEE

SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

TO: Supervisor Hillary Ronen, Chair
Rules Committee

FROM: Victor Young, Assistant Clerk

DATE: March 5, 2019

SUBJECT: **COMMITTEE REPORT, BOARD MEETING**
Tuesday, March 5, 2019

The following file should be presented as a **COMMITTEE REPORT** at the Board Meeting on Tuesday, March 5, 2019. This item was acted upon at the Rules Committee Meeting on Monday, March 4, 2019, at 10:00 a.m., by the votes indicated.

Item No. 53 File No. 190209

Mayoral Reappointment, Historic Preservation Commission - Richard Johns

Motion approving the Mayor's nomination of Richard Johns for reappointment to the Historic Preservation Commission, for a term ending December 31, 2022.

RECOMMENDED AS AMENDED AS A COMMITTEE REPORT

Vote: Supervisor Hillary Ronen - Aye
Supervisor Shamann Walton - Aye
Supervisor Gordon Mar - Aye

c: Board of Supervisors
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
Alisa Somera, Legislative Deputy Director
Jon Givner, Deputy City Attorney

File No. 190209 Committee Item No. 1
Board Item No. _____

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Rules Committee **Date** March 4, 2019

Board of Supervisors Meeting **Date** _____

Cmte	Board	
☑	☒	Motion
☐	☐	Resolution
☐	☐	Ordinance
☐	☐	Legislative Digest
☐	☐	Budget and Legislative Analyst Report
☐	☐	Youth Commission Report
☐	☐	Introduction Form
☑	☒	Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report
☐	☐	Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
☐	☐	Grant Information Form
☐	☐	Grant Budget
☐	☐	Subcontract Budget
☐	☐	Contract/Agreement
☐	☐	Form 126 - Ethics Commission
☐	☐	Award Letter
☐	☐	Application
☐	☐	Form 700
☐	☐	Vacancy Notice
☐	☐	Information Sheet
☐	☒	Public Correspondence

OTHER **(Use back side if additional space is needed)**

☐	☐	_____
☐	☐	_____
☐	☐	_____
☐	☐	_____
☐	☐	_____
☐	☐	_____
☐	☐	_____
☐	☐	_____
☐	☐	_____

Completed by: Victor Young **Date** Feb. 28, 2019
Completed by: VY **Date** 3/5/19

AMENDED IN COMMITTEE
03/04/19

FILE NO. 190209 MOTION NO.

[Mayoral Reappointment, Historic Preservation Commission - Richard Johns]

Motion approving the Mayor's nomination of Richard Johns for reappointment to the Historic Preservation Commission, for a term ending December 31, 2022.

WHEREAS, Pursuant to Charter, Section 4.135, the Mayor submitted a communication notifying the Board of Supervisors of the nomination of Richard Johns to the Historic Preservation Commission, received by the Clerk of the Board on February 22, 2019; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors has the authority to hold a public hearing and vote on the appointment within 60 days following transmittal of the Mayor's Notice of Appointment, and the failure of the Board to act on the nomination within the 60-day period shall result in the nominee being deemed approved; now, therefore, be it

MOVED, That the Board of Supervisors hereby approves the Mayor's nomination of Richard Johns for reappointment to the Historic Preservation Commission, seat no. 4, for the unexpired portion of a four-year term ending December 31, 2022.

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

MEMORANDUM

Date: February 22, 2019

To: Members, Board of Supervisors

From: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Subject: Appointment by the Mayor

On February 22, 2019, the Mayor submitted the following complete (re)appointment packages for the Historic Preservation Commission, pursuant to Charter, Section 4.135:

- **Richard Johns** - term ending December 31, 2022 (reappointment)
- **Kate Black** - term ending December 31, 2022 (new appointment)
- **Andrew Wolfram** - term ending December 31, 2022 (reappointment)

Pursuant to Charter, Section 4.135, these appointments are subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors and shall be subject to a hearing and vote within 60 days from the date the notice of appointment is transmitted to the Clerk of the Board. If the Board fails to act on the appointment within 60 days, the appointments shall be deemed approved.

These appointments will be scheduled for a Rules Committee hearing and considered for approval within 60 days from when the notice of appointment was received by the Clerk of the Board.

(Attachments)

c: Alisa Somera - Legislative Deputy
Jon Givner - Deputy City Attorney
Mawuli Tugbenyoh - Mayor's Legislative Liaison

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO

LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

Notice of Reappointment

February 21, 2019

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

Honorable Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to Charter Section 4.135, of the City and County of San Francisco, I make the following reappointments:

Richard Johns to Seat 4 of the Historic Preservation Commission for a four year term ending December 31, 2022.

Kate Black to Seat 6 of the Historic Preservation Commission for a four year term ending December 31, 2022.

Andrew Wolfram to Seat 2 of the Historic Preservation Commission for a four year term ending December 31, 2022.

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

Should you have any question about these appointments, please contact my Director of Appointments, Mawuli Tugbenyoh, at 415.554.6298.

Sincerely,

London Breed

London N.
Mayor

1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, ROOM 200
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102-4681
TELEPHONE: (415) 554-6141

RICHARD S. E. JOHNS

Law Offices Of Richard S. E. Johns

AVENUE

SAN F. A 94118

@yahoo.com

Overview

Forty-five years of experience in litigation and dispute resolution, including jury trials and appearances before California and United States' administrative agencies, in actions involving real estate disputes, antitrust violations, securities laws, fraudulent activity, and various tort actions.

Represent and advise small- to medium-sized businesses in organization, acquisition of other entities, asset purchases and sales, and day-to-day business matters including the problems related to growing a new business. Participated in the founding of several start-up companies involving new products.

Have written musical productions and performed in various plays for The Family. Have participated in many Concordia-Argonaut musicals as an actor, dancer, and singer. In 2014 co-authored a club musical: "Wilkes Bashford and the Mystery of the Missing Yamulkas."

Have assembled an extensive collection of music about San Francisco

Education

1971: J.D., University of California, Hastings College of the Law.

1968: B.A., University of California, Santa Barbara, English Major.

Memberships

State Bar of California, American Bar Association, Bar Association of San Francisco. Admitted before all Federal District Courts in California and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. Formerly a member of the Illinois State Bar. Concordia-Argonaut, 1975 to present. The Family, 2015 to present.

Honors

2015 Board of Governors, Hastings College of The Law

2010 Appointed by Mayor Newsom and later Mayor Lee to be a Member of the San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission, reappointed 2014

2006 to 2008	President of the San Francisco Museum and Historical Society
2002 to 2004	President of the San Francisco Bay Area Chapter of the American Jewish Committee
2002:	Mayor's Task Force on the San Francisco Old Mint
1987 to date:	Rated AV by Martindale-Hubbell; Listed in Directory of Preeminent Counsel
1990 to date:	Who's Who In American Law.
1992 to date:	Who's Who Of Emerging Leaders In America.
1994 to date:	Who's Who In America
1994 to 1999:	Vice President of the Museum of the City of San Francisco
1981:	Authored "Guidelines For Proof Of Concerted Action Under The Sherman Act." Eastern Trans. Law Seminar, Association of ICC Practitioners.
1972:	Bigelow Fellow and Instructor, University of Chicago Law School. Authored "The After-Acquired Surety: Commercial Paper" 59 Calif. L. Rev. 1459 (with Roscoe T. Steffen).
1971:	Hastings Law Journal: Board of Editors.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

1998 to present

Retained by Willie L. Brown, Jr., Trustee, to act as attorney for the multi-million dollar Estate of Wilkes Bashford.

Chairman of the Liquidation Oversight Committee in the bankruptcy of Coudert Brothers, the oldest international law firm in America, pending in the Southern District of New York.

Successfully represented the seller of an apartment complex in Hayward in overturning a judicial arbitration award for breach of contract for $372,000, winning an award of substantial costs and attorney fees for client; and resolving a very complicated and contentious commercial dispute. Coordinated sale of $4.5 million residence covered by multiple liens and conflicting creditor claims, while avoiding litigation.

Represented Scott Salyer and related interests in defense of a vastly complex bankruptcy case related to federal indictments, and coordinated the defense of multiple Superior Court actions in related litigation.

Trustee of the Jane Chapin Fontana Trust, in charge of operating and administering at trust with a value of over $13,000,000.

Retained by the Wilkes Bashford Company in pre-bankruptcy reorganization to supervise negotiation and reduction of accounts payable

to vendors. Represented the Wilkes Bashford Company in discretely collecting accounts receivable from prominent customers.

Represented (successfully) a skincare products manufacturing company in complex trade secrets litigation, including claims of defamation and other torts, at trial and on appeal.

General Counsel for: The San Francisco Cannery, LLC, G. S. Cosmeceutical USA, Inc. American Realty & Construction, Webster Tower, McCoy's Patrol Services, 1001 California Street Homeowners Association, in a wide variety of business litigation and transactional advice.

Representing, on an ongoing basis, estate development brokerages in San Mateo County, Contra Costa County, and San Francisco.

Represented a large San Francisco owner of residential apartments in upholding a settlement agreement attacked under the San Francisco rent Control ordinance, resulting in the decision known as *Kaufman v. Goldman* (2011) 195 Cal.App.4th 734.

Retained to successfully represent the interests of insurance carriers in preventing a forced assignment of insurance policies to a judgment creditor.

Retained as an expert witness by Winston & Strawn in a complex real estate development litigation.

Successfully represented members of a mosque in a fight with the Imam over ownership of the congregation's property.

Overturned a series of real estate conveyances on the West Bank in Palestine that had been based on forged powers of attorney procured in Texas. s

Successfully represented a large developer of residential housing (1900 Bryant Street Developers) in a dispute over the project's exemption from San Francisco Rent Control Ordinance.

Successfully represented Primary Steel Company, Inc. in litigation seeking damages due to disruption of its ability to receive steel shipments when a BNSF siding was damaged by a third party.

Represented Danzas, a major worldwide transportation company, now DHL, in defense of claim for damage to property transported from France to California.

Successfully completed a three-week jury trial in San Diego defending a software development company and its investors against tort claims made by a terminated executive.

Recovered funds a lender embezzled from a borrower through the use of forged signatures on checks paid through an escrow account on a refinancing of property.

Successfully represented an international import-export company seeking to recovery money stolen by a former employee in a complicated scheme by which he sold the employer's inventory.

Successfully defended the owner of rental property in Berkeley against claims of wrongful eviction.

Represented former Oakland Raider Marquez Pope in a business case involving a personal guarantee he was defrauded into signing and in litigation against his business manager and attorney for malpractice and fraud.

Successfully defended Theodore Brown & Associates in an architect malpractice suit, and as a plaintiff in a separate dispute over the lease of several floors in a commercial building he owns.

Successfully represented one of the partners in a retail clothing store in a partnership dissolution suit.

Successfully defended a seller of telephone calling cards in fraud action.

Successfully represented First Union Baptist Church in defending an action by Lanier Worldwide who was seeking to enforce a $60,000 based upon a sister-state judgment. Obtained a reversal on appeal.

Represented Doll-McGinnis Publications in dealing with claims of defamation.

Represented Con-Bay Group Inc., a large Texas-based construction company (Northern California only), and Sierra Electric Company.

Successfully represented employer in a trial of sexual harassment case.

Successfully represented one of the heirs in the distribution of a major estate in Litchfield, Connecticut.

Counseled property developer regarding land use litigation in San Francisco.

Successfully defended a guarantor sole shareholder or a corporation against an alleged obligation on a lease amended in violation of the surety's rights.

Represented the California Pollution Control Financing Authority in concluding fraud litigation and various bankruptcy proceedings; recovered $17,000,000.

Local counsel for Berger & Montague (Philadelphia) in various class-action securities suits.

Provided ongoing counsel to a nationwide developer of self-storage facilities.

Extricated the Prentis Cobb Hale Trust from a difficult commercial lease.

Successfully represented a real estate broker in litigation to enforce commission agreement.

Handled various liquor license matters before California ABC.

Successfully defended of surety on lease of commercial recording studio (trial and appeal).

Successfully prosecuted legal malpractice case based upon negligent estate planning by attorneys and accountants.

Obtained defense jury verdict for the California Municipal Bond Advisor in libel action involving a critical review of certificates of deposit issued by the College Savings Bank of Princeton, New Jersey.

Successfully represented well-known jazz musician Ricardo Scales in litigation brought under the Talent Agencies Act.

Obtained substantial settlement for Willie Brown in litigation with Hilton Hotels over its cancellation of the venue for a major fund-raising event.

Successfully defended intouch group, inc., a major multi-media music sampling company, in fraud, RICO, libel and employment litigation.

Represented Adventures Unlimited, the world-famous San Francisco travel agency located at Gump's, in winning major litigation against Royal Viking Lines for double-booking suites on world cruises.

With Willie Brown, assisted The Alley Group in successfully asserting claims for breach of construction contracts against Kaiser Hospitals.

Responsible for legal portion of several conduit refinancings (through the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency) of a $28,000,000 apartment and commercial complex in San Francisco.

Defended CALA Foods in litigation resulting from a failed real estate development in San Francisco.

Represented the California Pollution Control Financing Authority (Plaintiff) in major RICO, securities fraud, and breach of contract litigation in Los Angeles, resulting in two jury trials ending in multi-million dollar verdicts for plaintiff.

2007 – Present Law Offices of Richard S. E. Johns

1998 – 2007 Kipperman & Johns

1985 - 1988 Rubenstein, Bohachek & Johns

While with this firm I represented National Semiconductor, GTE Sprint, and Honey Hill Farms in various commercial and real estate matters, as well as several commercial landlords in disputes over the acquisition and development of commercial space in San Francisco.

1975 - 1984 Furth, Fahrner & Mason

Represented plaintiffs and defendants in major securities fraud and antitrust litigation in both California and federal courts, as well as before regulatory agencies.

Represented defendants in a RICO action brought by IBM against Hitachi and National Semiconductor and was Co-Lead Counsel in the West Coast Department Stores Antitrust Litigation.

Through litigation and negotiation, saved a major manufacturer and shipper (Kellogg Company) $3.5 million annually in rail freight charges.

Successfully represented the California Pollution Control Financing Authority when $40,000,000 in bonds issued for the benefit of Kaiser Steel were imperiled by a proposed merger.

Counsel in *Guild Wineries and Distilleries v. J. Sosnick & Son, Inc.*, 102 Cal.App.3d 627, which established that a dual-distributorship distribution system may be a per se violation of the California Antitrust laws.

1972 - 1975 Santa Fe Industries, Chicago

Represented a diversified transportation, real estate, and natural resources company in the development of real estate and in litigation of a wide variety of matters before state and federal regulatory agencies, and in state and federal courts in Illinois and in California.

Richard Johns Resume

Commissioner
San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission
January 2011 – Present (4 years 1 month)
The San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission is a Charter commission that oversees designation of historic districts and landmarks in San Francisco, and approves exterior modifications to buildings in those districts or that have been landmarked. I am not employed by the Historic Preservation Commission.

Owner
Law Offices of Richard S. E. Johns
2004 – Present (11 years)

President
San Francisco Museum & Historical Society
2006 – 2010 (4 years)

President
San Francisco Museum & Historical Society
2005 – 2009 (4 years)

Owner
Kipperman & Johns
1987 – 2006 (19 years)
This was a law firm engaged in transactional and real estate advice, and business litigation.

Attorney
Furth Fahrner & Mason
1976 – 1984 (8 years)

060600029-NFH-0029

CALIFORNIA FORM 700
FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION
A PUBLIC DOCUMENT

STATEMENT OF ECONOMIC INTERESTS

COVER PAGE

Date Initial Filing Received
Official Use Only

E-Filed
03/20/2018
17:36:08

Filing ID:
169992751

Please type or print in ink.

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

Johns, Richard Seth Ellis

1. Office, Agency, or Court

Agency Name (Do not use acronyms)

City and County of San Francisco

Division, Board, Department, District, if applicable

Historic Preservation Commission

Your Position

Commissioner

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

Agency: _____ Position: _____

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

☐ State

☐ 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, 2017, through December 31, 2017

-or-

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

☐ **Assuming Office:** Date assumed ____/____/____

☐ **Leaving Office:** Date Left ____/____/____ *(Check one)*

○ The period covered is January 1, 2017, through the date of leaving office.

○ The period covered is ____/____/____, through the date of leaving office.

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

4. Schedule Summary (must complete)

► **Total number of pages including this cover page:** 6

Schedules attached

☒ **Schedule A-1** - *Investments* – schedule attached

☒ **Schedule A-2** - *Investments* – schedule attached

☐ **Schedule B** - *Real Property* – schedule attached

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

☐ **Schedule D** - *Income – Gifts* – schedule attached

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

-or-

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

5. Verification

MAILING ADDRESS STREET *(Business or Agency Address Recommended - Public Document)*

CITY

STATE

ZIP CODE

San Francisco

CA

94103

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 03/20/2018 *(month, day, year)*

Signature Richard Seth Ellis Johns *(File the originally signed statement with your filing official.)*

060600029-NFH-0029

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
Johns, Richard Seth Ellis

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY
IBM

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS
computers

FAIR MARKET VALUE
☐ $2,000 - $10,000 ☒ $10,001 - $100,000
☐ $100,001 - $1,000,000 ☐ Over $1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
☒ Stock ☐ Other ________ (Describe)
☐ Partnership ○ Income Received of $0 - $499 ○ Income Received of $500 or More *(Report on Schedule C)*

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

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

FAIR MARKET VALUE
☐ $2,000 - $10,000 ☐ $10,001 - $100,000
☐ $100,001 - $1,000,000 ☐ Over $1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
☐ Stock ☐ Other ________ (Describe)
☐ Partnership ○ Income Received of $0 - $499 ○ Income Received of $500 or More *(Report on Schedule C)*

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

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

FAIR MARKET VALUE
☐ $2,000 - $10,000 ☐ $10,001 - $100,000
☐ $100,001 - $1,000,000 ☐ Over $1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
☐ Stock ☐ Other ________ (Describe)
☐ Partnership ○ Income Received of $0 - $499 ○ Income Received of $500 or More *(Report on Schedule C)*

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

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

FAIR MARKET VALUE
☐ $2,000 - $10,000 ☐ $10,001 - $100,000
☐ $100,001 - $1,000,000 ☐ Over $1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
☐ Stock ☐ Other ________ (Describe)
☐ Partnership ○ Income Received of $0 - $499 ○ Income Received of $500 or More *(Report on Schedule C)*

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

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

FAIR MARKET VALUE
☐ $2,000 - $10,000 ☐ $10,001 - $100,000
☐ $100,001 - $1,000,000 ☐ Over $1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
☐ Stock ☐ Other ________ (Describe)
☐ Partnership ○ Income Received of $0 - $499 ○ Income Received of $500 or More *(Report on Schedule C)*

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

▶ NAME OF BUSINESS ENTITY

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

FAIR MARKET VALUE
☐ $2,000 - $10,000 ☐ $10,001 - $100,000
☐ $100,001 - $1,000,000 ☐ Over $1,000,000

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
☐ Stock ☐ Other ________ (Describe)
☐ Partnership ○ Income Received of $0 - $499 ○ Income Received of $500 or More *(Report on Schedule C)*

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

Comments: ________

060600029-NFH-0029

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
Johns, Richard Seth Ellis

▶ 1. BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST

Law Offices of Richard S.E. Johns
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
Law Practice

FAIR MARKET VALUE
☒ $0 - $1,999
☐ $2,000 - $10,000
☐ $10,001 - $100,000
☐ $100,001 - $1,000,000
☐ Over $1,000,000

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

NATURE OF INVESTMENT
☐ Partnership ☒ Sole Proprietorship ☐ _____ Other

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION owner

▶ 2. IDENTIFY THE GROSS INCOME RECEIVED (INCLUDE YOUR PRO RATA SHARE OF THE GROSS INCOME TO THE ENTITY/TRUST)

☐ $0 - $499
☐ $500 - $1,000
☐ $1,001 - $10,000
☒ $10,001 - $100,000
☐ OVER $100,000

▶ 3. LIST THE NAME OF EACH REPORTABLE SINGLE SOURCE OF INCOME OF $10,000 OR MORE (Attach a separate sheet if necessary.)

☒ None or ☐ Names listed below

▶ 4. INVESTMENTS AND INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY HELD OR LEASED BY THE BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST

Check one box:
☐ INVESTMENT ☐ REAL PROPERTY

Name of Business Entity, If Investment, or
Assessor's Parcel Number or Street Address of Real Property

Description of Business Activity or
City or Other Precise Location of Real Property

FAIR MARKET VALUE
☐ $2,000 - $10,000
☐ $10,001 - $100,000
☐ $100,001 - $1,000,000
☐ Over $1,000,000

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
__/__/__ 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

▶ 1. BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST

Eureka Trust 2000
Name
San Francisco, CA 94118
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
☐ $0 - $1,999
☐ $2,000 - $10,000
☐ $10,001 - $100,000
☐ $100,001 - $1,000,000
☐ Over $1,000,000

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
__/__/__ 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
☐ $500 - $1,000
☐ $1,001 - $10,000
☒ $10,001 - $100,000
☐ OVER $100,000

▶ 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
Helen King and Joanne Samples
Jeffrey Eisenberg and Melinda Aquino
Virginia Brilliant

▶ 4. INVESTMENTS AND INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY HELD OR LEASED BY THE BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST

Check one box:
☐ INVESTMENT ☒ REAL PROPERTY

Name of Business Entity, If Investment, or
Assessor's Parcel Number or Street Address of Real Property
rental units

Description of Business Activity or
City or Other Precise Location of Real Property

FAIR MARKET VALUE
☐ $2,000 - $10,000
☐ $10,001 - $100,000
☐ $100,001 - $1,000,000
☒ Over $1,000,000

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
__/__/__ 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:

060600029-NFH-0029

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: Johns, Richard Seth Ellis

1. BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST

Eureka Trust 2000 (CONTINUATION)
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
☐ $0 - $1,999
☐ $2,000 - $10,000
☐ $10,001 - $100,000
☐ $100,001 - $1,000,000
☐ Over $1,000,000

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
__/__/__ 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
☐ $500 - $1,000
☐ $1,001 - $10,000
☐ $10,001 - $100,000
☐ OVER $100,000

3. LIST THE NAME OF EACH REPORTABLE SINGLE SOURCE OF INCOME OF $10,000 OR MORE (Attach a separate sheet if necessary.)

☐ None or ☐ Names listed below

4. INVESTMENTS AND INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY HELD OR LEASED BY THE BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST

Check one box:
☒ INVESTMENT ☐ REAL PROPERTY

ETF's and Mutual Funds
Name of Business Entity, if Investment, or
Assessor's Parcel Number or Street Address of Real Property

security investments
Description of Business Activity or
City or Other Precise Location of Real Property

FAIR MARKET VALUE
☐ $2,000 - $10,000
☐ $10,001 - $100,000
☐ $100,001 - $1,000,000
☒ Over $1,000,000

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

NATURE OF INTEREST
☐ Property Ownership/Deed of Trust ☐ Stock ☐ Partnership
☐ Leasehold _____ Yrs. remaining ☒ Other ETF's and mutual funds

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

---

1. BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST

Name

Address *(Business Address Acceptable)*

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

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THIS BUSINESS

FAIR MARKET VALUE
☐ $0 - $1,999
☐ $2,000 - $10,000
☐ $10,001 - $100,000
☐ $100,001 - $1,000,000
☐ Over $1,000,000

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
__/__/__ 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
☐ $500 - $1,000
☐ $1,001 - $10,000
☐ $10,001 - $100,000
☐ OVER $100,000

3. LIST THE NAME OF EACH REPORTABLE SINGLE SOURCE OF INCOME OF $10,000 OR MORE (Attach a separate sheet if necessary.)

☐ None or ☐ Names listed below

4. INVESTMENTS AND INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY HELD OR LEASED BY THE BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST

Check one box:
☐ INVESTMENT ☐ REAL PROPERTY

Name of Business Entity, if Investment, or
Assessor's Parcel Number or Street Address of Real Property

Description of Business Activity or
City or Other Precise Location of Real Property

FAIR MARKET VALUE
☐ $2,000 - $10,000
☐ $10,001 - $100,000
☐ $100,001 - $1,000,000
☐ Over $1,000,000

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
__/__/__ 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 A-2
Investments, Income, and Assets of Business Entities/Trusts
(Ownership Interest is 10% or Greater)

CALIFORNIA FORM 700
FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Name
Johns, Richard Seth Ellis

▶ 1. BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST

Eureka Trust 2000 (CONTINUATION)
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
☐ $0 - $1,999
☐ $2,000 - $10,000
☐ $10,001 - $100,000
☐ $100,001 - $1,000,000
☐ Over $1,000,000

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
__/__/__ 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
☐ $500 - $1,000
☐ $1,001 - $10,000
☐ $10,001 - $100,000
☐ OVER $100,000

▶ 3. LIST THE NAME OF EACH REPORTABLE SINGLE SOURCE OF INCOME OF $10,000 OR MORE (Attach a separate sheet if necessary.)

☐ None or ☐ Names listed below

▶ 4. INVESTMENTS AND INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY HELD OR LEASED BY THE BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST

Check one box:
☐ INVESTMENT ☒ REAL PROPERTY

Name of Business Entity, if Investment, or
Assessor's Parcel Number or Street Address of Real Property

San Francisco

Description of Business Activity or
City or Other Precise Location of Real Property

FAIR MARKET VALUE
☐ $2,000 - $10,000
☐ $10,001 - $100,000
☒ $100,001 - $1,000,000
☐ Over $1,000,000

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
__/__/__ 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

---

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

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
__/__/__ 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
☐ $500 - $1,000
☐ $1,001 - $10,000
☐ $10,001 - $100,000
☐ OVER $100,000

▶ 3. LIST THE NAME OF EACH REPORTABLE SINGLE SOURCE OF INCOME OF $10,000 OR MORE (Attach a separate sheet if necessary.)

☐ None or ☐ Names listed below

▶ 4. INVESTMENTS AND INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY HELD OR LEASED BY THE BUSINESS ENTITY OR TRUST

Check one box:
☐ INVESTMENT ☐ REAL PROPERTY

Name of Business Entity, if Investment, or
Assessor's Parcel Number or Street Address of Real Property

Description of Business Activity or
City or Other Precise Location of Real Property

FAIR MARKET VALUE
☐ $2,000 - $10,000
☐ $10,001 - $100,000
☐ $100,001 - $1,000,000
☐ Over $1,000,000

IF APPLICABLE, LIST DATE:
__/__/__ 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: _____

060600029-NFH-0029

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

CALIFORNIA FORM 700
FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

Name
Johns, Richard Seth Ellis

▶ 1. INCOME RECEIVED

NAME OF SOURCE OF INCOME
Willie Brown Institute

ADDRESS *(Business Address Acceptable)*
San Francisco, CA 94133

BUSINESS ACTIVITY, IF ANY, OF SOURCE
Non Profit

YOUR BUSINESS POSITION
None

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 _____% ☐ None

TERM (Months/Years) _____

SECURITY FOR LOAN
- ☐ None
- ☐ Personal residence
- ☐ Real Property _____ *Street address*

_____ *City*

- ☐ Guarantor _____
- ☐ Other _____ *(Describe)*

Comments: _____

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

Emily M. Murase, PhD
Director

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.

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/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 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/.

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

Emily M. Murase, PhD
Director

City and County of
San Francisco

Gender Analysis of San Francisco Commissions and Boards

December 2017

25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 240 | San Francisco, CA 94102 | sfgov.org/dosw | dosw@sfgov.org | 415.252.2570

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.

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

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



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



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%**



February 25, 2019

Members, Board of Supervisors
San Francisco City Hall
1 Dr. Carleton B. Goodlett Place, #244
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: HPC Commissioners Support Letter

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing to express my support for your approval of a new term for the two nominated members of the Historic Preservation Commission, Commissioner Kate Black and Commissioner Richard Johns. Both have a strong commitment to the work of our Commission exhibited by their deep passion and love for the City and its context and character. I truly believe that San Francisco is a richer place because of their work in the City and their focus on the retention of the unique fabric of San Francisco's neighborhoods and buildings.

While Kate is still the newest member of the HPC, I have had ample time to work alongside her and I have been struck by her curiosity, her intellectual understanding and her very collegial nature. She brings deep experience both in the workings of a Planning Department as well as a grassroots investment into the historical fabric of the City. Despite her protestation to the contrary, as the chair of HPC's Architectural Review Committee, I have been impressed with Kate's quick grasp of both the big picture and the fine detail, quickly understanding the intent of the overall project and finding the good (and sometimes, the bad) details that can make or break a project.

Commissioner Johns always brings his love of all things San Francisco to the proceedings, demonstrating his depth of knowledge of both the physical and the social history that makes San Francisco such an interesting and alive place. His lifetime of commitment to San Francisco, brings to the HPC, a first-hand knowledge and experience of the buildings and cultural contexts that we discuss and review at each hearing. His insights, always presented with a light touch and humor, are invaluable to grounding our discussions in the reality of the history that we grapple with in the face of our rapidly evolving future.

One thing that I'd like to mention is the camaraderie that I feel with my fellow commissioners and the planning preservation staff. There is a great collegial sense, a respect for each other's point-of-view and expertise and a commitment to "do the right thing" to keep the wheels of the City's story turning. Commissioners Black and Johns add greatly to the spirit of the HPC and I ask you all to vote in favor of their nomination to a new term on the Historic Preservation Commission.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Pearlman
Member, Historic Preservation Commission
Principal, Elevation Architects

ELEVATIONarchitects • 1159 Green Street, Suite 4 • San Francisco, CA 94109 • v: 415.537.1125 • www.elevationarchitects.com

Aaron Jon Hyland, FAIA
3425A 16th Street
San Francisco, CA 94114
415-218-8238

March 3, 2019

RE: Reappointment of Historic Preservation Commissioners
Andrew Wolfram, Richard Johns and Kate Black

Dear Honorable Members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors:

I am writing in support of the reappointment of Andrew Wolfram, Richard Johns and Kate Black to the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). Each possesses the skill, expertise, experience and dedication that would continue to be of great value to the City and the Commission.

I have served on the HPC for the past 6 years with Commissioners Wolfram and Johns, and Commissioner Black just recently joined us. Commissioner Wolfram has served on the Commission for the past 10 years; four of those years as President. His expertise as a Preservation Architect and his balanced approached in evaluating projects has been a great asset to us and the City. Commissioner Johns' commitment to making sure our Commission provides consistent and clear decisions has provided predictability to project sponsors and built public trust in our process. Commissioner Black understands the entitlement process very well. She is clear, concise and articulate in her assessments, and has been a great addition. While we haven't always agreed on every issue, we have been able to have robust and respectful dialogue resulting in better decisions.

I look forward to continuing to serve alongside each of them.
Please support and confirm their nominations for reappointment.
If you have any question, or would like to discuss, please let me know.

All the best,

Aaron Jon Hyland, FAIA
2019 President, Historic Preservation Commission