File No. 200235 Committee Item No. 3
Board Item No. 21

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Rules Committee Date March 2, 2020

Board of Supervisors Meeting Date MARCH 10, 2020

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 February 27, 2020
Completed by: [signature] Date 3/2/20

PREPARED IN COMMITTEE
3/2/20

FILE NO. 200235 MOTION NO.

[Appointment, Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee - Marta Lindsey]

Motion appointing Marta Lindsey, term ending March 31, 2022, to the Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee.

MOVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco does hereby appoint the hereinafter designated person to serve as a member of the Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee, pursuant to the provisions of Administrative Code, Article IV, Sections 5.20 and 5.21, for the term specified:

Marta Lindsey, Seat 1, succeeding Howard Bloomberg, deceased, for a two-year term beginning March 31, 2020, and expiring March 31, 2022, must be a representative from a pedestrian safety organization, appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

Save Form | Print Form

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: Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee

Seat # or Category (If applicable): 1: Pedestrian safety organization District: N/A (I live in 5)

Name: Marta Lindsey

Home Address: [redacted] Zip: 94122

Home Phon[redacted] Occupation: Communications Director

Work Phone: _____ Employer: Walk San Francisco

Business Address: 333 Hayes St. Zip: 94012

Business E-Mail: marta@walksf.org Home E-Mail: [redacted]

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 have worked at Walk San Francisco for nearly two years, and been a member for more than ten.

I am also the mother of two young children, one of whom is now a student within SFUSD. I care deeply about pedestrian safety from a personal perspective, but also as a parent who believes all our children should be safe while walking, biking, and scooting in our city.

Business and/or professional experience:

I have worked at Walk San Francisco for nearly two years as the Communications Director, but with an active role in policy. I previously worked for eight years at TransForm, which works to improve walking, biking, and public transportation in the Bay Area and all of California.

Civic Activities:

I am involved as a volunteer with Grattan Elementary School, Seventh Avenue Presbyterian Church, and Point Reyes National Seashore.

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: January 10, 2020 **Applicant's Signature: (required)** Marta Lindsey

(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

San Francisco
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Date Printed: December 16, 2019 Date Established: June 7, 2002

Active

PEDESTRIAN SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Contact and Address:

Victoria Chong
Department of Parking and Traffic
1 South Van Ness Avenue, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

Phone: (415) 701-5485
Fax: (415) 701-4343
Email: victoria.chong@sfmta.com

Authority:

Administrative Code, Chapter 5, Article IV, Sections 5.4-1 through 5.4-3 (Ordinance Nos. 85-02, 127-07, 287-08, 220-16, and 270-19).

Board Qualifications:

The Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee, composed of concerned and informed residents, will provide a source of expertise on issues concerning pedestrian safety, convenience, ambiance, and planning. The Advisory Committee shall consist of seventeen (17) voting members.

> Seat 1 shall be held by a representative from a pedestrian safety organization, appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

> Seats 2 and 3 shall be held by representatives from senior or disability organizations, appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

> Seat 4 shall be held by a representative from a bicycle or other non-motorized wheeled personal transport organization, appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

> Seat 5 shall be held by a representative from a transit or environmental organization, appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

> Seats 6 through 16 shall be appointed by individual members of the Board of Supervisors, with each member of the Board appointing one member of the Advisory Committee.

"R Board Description" (Screen Print)

> Seat 17 shall be held by a parent of a student in the San Francisco Unified School District, appointed by the Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District. If at any time the Superintendent declines to appoint an individual to Seat 17 for 60 days or longer, the Board of Supervisors may appoint a new member with the same or different qualifications to fill the seat for the remainder of the term.

The terms for odd-numbered seats shall expire on March 31, 2018, and every two years thereafter. The terms for even-numbered seats shall expire on March 31, 2019, and every two years thereafter.

The Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District may appoint a member of the San Francisco Unified School District's Student Advisory Council to serve as a non-voting member of the Advisory Committee. The individual appointed to this seat may participate in Advisory Committee discussions to the same extent as other members of the Advisory Committee but may not vote on any matter and shall not be counted toward a quorum.

The following City departments shall select and send designate a non-voting representative to attend Advisory Committee meetings at the request of the Advisory Committee: Department of Public Health, Municipal Transportation Agency, Public Works, Planning Department, Police Department, Recreation and Parks Department, District Attorney's Office, and Mayor's Office on Disability; and any other City departments whose work impacts pedestrians shall also designate a non-voting representative to Advisory Committee meetings upon request of the Advisory Committee. Every year by July 1, each department required to designate a non-voting representative shall inform the Advisory Committee in writing of the name, work phone number, and work email address of its representative.

Report: The Committee shall report to the Board of Supervisors on an annual basis, with quarterly appearances before the Board of Supervisors as needed, on statistics on pedestrians injury and fatality statistics, causes of pedestrian injuries and fatalities, recommendations for changes in policies, funding and enforcement, and other pertinent issues. By May 1, 2020, the Committee shall submit a report to the Board of Supervisors recommending possible changes to the structure, duties, or member qualifications of the Committee.

Sunset Date: October 1, 2020.

"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

PEDESTRIAN SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Replaces All Previous Notices

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN of the following seat information and term expirations **(in bold)**, appointed by the Board of Supervisors:

Vacant Seat 1, succeeding Howard Bloomberg, deceased, must be a representative from a pedestrian safety organization, appointed by the Board of Supervisors, for a two-year term ending March 31, 2022.

Vacant Seat 2, succeeding Rebecca Hogue, resigned, must be a representative from a senior or disability organization, appointed by the Board of Supervisors, for the unexpired portion of a two-year term ending March 31, 2021.

Vacant Seat 3, succeeding John Lowell, resigned, must be a representative from senior or disability organizations, appointed by the Board of Supervisors, for a two-year term ending March 31, 2022.

Seat 4, Cyndi Bakir, term expiring March 31, 2021, must be a representative from a bicycle or other non-motorized wheeled personal transport organization, appointed by the Board of Supervisors, for a two-year term.

Seat 5, succeeding Howard Strassner, term expired, must be a representative from a transit or environmental organization, appointed by the Board of Supervisors, for a two-year term ending March 31, 2022.

Seat 6, Charles Bain, term expiring March 31, 2021, must be appointed by the District 1 Supervisor, for a two-year term.

Seat 7, succeeding Andrew Harris Jacobs, term expiring March 31, 2020, must appointed by the District 2 Supervisor, for a two-year term ending March 31, 2022.

Seat 8, succeeding Gabriella Haug, term expired, must be appointed by the District 3 Supervisor, for the unexpired portion of a two-year term ending March 31, 2021.

Seat 9, Martin Rawlings-Fein, term expiring March 31, 2020, must appointed by the District 4 Supervisor, for a two-year term March 31, 2022.

Seat 10, Serena Unger, term expiring March 31,2021, must be appointed by the District 5 Supervisor, for a two-year term.

Seat 11, Bettina Cohen, term expiring March 31, 2020, must appointed by the District 6 Supervisor, for a two-year term ending March 31, 2022.

Seat 12, Jon Winston, term expiring March 31, 2021, must be appointed by the District 7 Supervisor, for a two-year term.

Seat 13, Evelyn Posamentier, term expired, must be appointed by the District 8 Supervisor, for a two-year term ending March 31, 2022.

Seat 14, succeeding Kevin Stull, term expired, must be appointed by the District 9 Supervisor, for the unexpired portion of a two-year term ending March 31, 2021.

Seat 15, Thomas Rogers, term expired, must be appointed by the District 10 Supervisor, for a two-year term ending March 31, 2022.

Seat 16, succeeding Jacqueline Lee Chavez, term expired, must be appointed by the District 11 Supervisor, for the unexpired portion of a two-year term ending March 31, 2021.

Seat 17, J Jacqueline Lee Chavez, term expiring March 31, 2020, must be a parent of a student in the San Francisco Unified School District, appointed by the Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District, for a two-year term ending March 31, 2022.

Note: If at any time the Superintendent declines to appoint an individual to Seat 17 for 60 days or longer, the Board of Supervisors may appoint a new member with the same or different qualifications to fill the seat for the remainder of the term.

Report: The Committee shall report to the Board of Supervisors on an annual basis, with quarterly appearances before the Board of Supervisors, as needed, on pedestrian injury and fatality statistics, causes of pedestrian injuries and fatalities, recommendations for changes in policies, funding and enforcement, and other pertinent issues.

Sunset Date: October 1, 2020.

Additional information relating to the Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee, or other seats on this body that are appointed by another authority, may be obtained by reviewing Administrative Code, Sections 5.20 and 5.21, at http://www.sfbos.org/sfmunicodes, Board of Supervisors Ordinance No. 127-07 at http://www.sfbos.org/ordinances, or the Committee's website at http://www.sfmta.com/psac.

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 applying for seats 1 through 5, 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 hearing, and applicants may be asked to state their qualifications. The appointment(s) of individual(s) who are recommended by the Rules Committee will be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for final approval. Applicants applying for seats 6 through 16 will be contacted by the staff of the Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee once they are appointed by a District Supervisor.

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

Further Note: Additional seats on this body may be available through other appointing authorities, including the Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District.

Alicia Somera

for Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

DATED/POSTED: January 17, 2020

GENDER ANALYSIS OF COMMISSIONS AND BOARDS



City and County of San Francisco
London N. Breed
Mayor

Department on the Status of Women
Emily M. Murase, PhD
Director

Acknowledgements

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

The San Francisco Department on the Status of Women would like to thank the various policy body members, Commission secretaries, and department staff who graciously assisted in collecting demographic data and providing information about their respective policy bodies.

San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women
President Debbie Mesloh
Vice President Breanna Zwart
Commissioner Shokooh Miry
Commissioner Carrie Schwab-Pomerantz
Commissioner Andrea Shorter
Commissioner Julie D. Soo

Emily M. Murase, PhD, Director
Department on the Status of Women

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

Contents

Table of Figures

Executive Summary

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

The *2019 Gender Analysis of Commissions and Boards* includes more policy bodies such as task forces, committees, and advisory bodies, than previous analyses, which were limited to Commissions and Boards. Data was collected from 84 policy bodies and from a total of 741 members mostly appointed by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. These policy bodies fall under two categories designated by the San Francisco Office of the City Attorney.[1] The first category, referred to as "Commissions and Boards," are policy bodies with decision-making authority and whose members are required to submit financial disclosures to the Ethics Commission. The second category, referred to as "Advisory Bodies," are policy bodies with advisory function whose members do *not* submit financial disclosures to the Ethics Commission. This report examines policy bodies and appointees both comprehensively as a whole and separately by the two categories.

The *2019 Gender Analysis* evaluates the representation of women; people of color; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and questioning (LGBTQ) individuals; people with disabilities; and veterans on San Francisco policy bodies.

Key Findings

Gender

- Women's representation on policy bodies is 51%, slightly above parity with the San Francisco female population of 49%.
- Since 2009, there has been a small but steady increase in the representation of women on San Francisco policy bodies.

10-Year Comparison of Representation of Women on Policy Bodies



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

[1] "List of City Boards, Commissions, and Advisory Bodies Created by Charter, Ordinance, or Statute," Office of the City Attorney, https://www.sfcityattorney.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Commission-List-08252017.pdf, (August 25, 2017).

Race and Ethnicity

- People of color are underrepresented on policy bodies compared to the population. Although people of color comprise 62% of San Francisco's population, just 50% of appointees identify as a race other than white.

- While the overall representation of people of color has increased between 2009 and 2019, as the Department collected data on more appointees, the representation of people of color has decreased over the last few years. The percentage of appointees of color decreased from 53% in 2017 to 49% in 2019.

10-Year Comparison of Representation of People of Color on Policy Bodies



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

- As found in previous reports, Latinx and Asian groups are underrepresented on San Francisco policy bodies compared to the population. Latinx individuals are 14% of the population but make up only 8% of appointees. Asian individuals are 31% of the population but make up only 18% of appointees.

Race and Ethnicity by Gender

- On the whole, women of color are 32% of the San Francisco population, and 28% of appointees. Although still below parity, 28% is a slight increase compared to 2017, which showed 27% women of color appointees.

- Meanwhile, men of color are underrepresented at 21% of appointees compared to 31% of the San Francisco population.

10-Year Comparison of Representation of Women of Color on Policy Bodies



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

- Both White women and men are overrepresented on San Francisco policy bodies. White women are 23% of appointees compared to 17% of the San Francisco population. White men are 26% of appointees compared to 20% of the population.

- Black and African American women and men are well-represented on San Francisco policy bodies. Black women are 9% of appointees compared to 2.4% of the population, and Black men are 5% of appointees compared to 2.5% of the population.

- Latinx women are 7% of the San Francisco population but 3% of appointees, and Latinx men are 7% of the population but 5% of appointees.

- Asian women are 17% of the San Francisco population but 11% of appointees, and Asian men are 15% of the population but just 7% of appointees.

Additional Demographics

- Out of the 74% of appointees who responded to the survey question on LGBTQ identity, 19% identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, nonbinary, queer, or questioning, and 81% of appointees identify as straight/heterosexual.

- Out of the 70% of appointees who responded to the question on disability, 11% identify as having one or more disabilities, which is just below the 12% of the adult population with a disability in San Francisco.

- Out of the 67% of appointees who responded to the question on veteran status, 7% have served in the military compared to 3% of the San Francisco population.

Proxies for Influence: Budget & Authority

- Although women are half of all appointees, those Commissions and Boards with the largest budgets have fewer women and especially fewer women of color. Meanwhile, women exceed representation on Boards and Commissions with the smallest budgets and women of color reach parity with the population on the smallest budgeted Commissions and Boards.

- Although still underrepresented relative to the San Francisco population, there is a larger percentage of people of color on Commissions and Boards with both the largest and smallest budgets compared to overall appointees.

- The percentage of total women is greater on Advisory Bodies than Commissions and Boards. Women are 54% of appointees on Advisory Bodies and 48% of appointees on Commissions and Boards. However, the percentages of people of color and women of color on Commissions and Boards exceed the percentages of people of color and women of color on Advisory Bodies.

Appointing Authorities

- Mayoral appointments include 55% women, 52% people of color, and 30% women of color, which is more diverse by gender and race compared to both Supervisorial appointments and total appointments.

Demographics of Appointees Compared to the San Francisco Population

	Women	People of Color	Women of Color	LGBTQ	Disability Status	Veteran Status
San Francisco Population	49%	62%	32%	6%-15%*	12%	3%
Total Appointees	51%	50%	28%	19%	11%	7%
10 Largest Budgeted Commissions & Boards	41%	55%	23%			
10 Smallest Budgeted Commissions & Boards	52%	54%	32%			
Commissions and Boards	48%	52%	30%			
Advisory Bodies	54%	49%	28%			

*Sources: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis, 2019, *Note: Estimates vary by source. See page 16 for a detailed breakdown.*

I. Introduction

Inspired by the 4th UN World Conference on Women in Beijing, San Francisco became the first city in the world to adopt a local ordinance reflecting the principles of the U.N. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination (CEDAW), an international bill of rights for women. The CEDAW Ordinance was passed unanimously by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and signed into law by Mayor Willie L. Brown, Jr. on April 13, 1998.[2] In 2002, the CEDAW Ordinance was revised to address the intersection of race and gender and incorporate reference to the UN Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Race Discrimination. The Ordinance requires City Government to take proactive steps to ensure gender equity and specifies "gender analysis" as a preventive tool to identify and address discrimination. Since 1998, the Department on the Status of Women has employed this tool to analyze the operations of 10 City Departments using a gender lens.

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

- The membership of Commissions and Boards are to reflect the diversity of San Francisco's population,
- Appointing officials are to be urged to support the nomination, appointment, and confirmation of these candidates, and
- The Department on the Status of Women is required to conduct and publish a gender analysis of Commissions and Boards every 2 years.

The *2019 Gender Analysis* examines the representation of women; people of color; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and questioning (LGBTQ) individuals; people with disabilities; and veterans on San Francisco policy bodies primarily appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. This year's analysis included more outreach to policy bodies as compared to previous analyses that were limited to Commissions and Boards. As a result, more appointees were included in the data collection and analysis than even before. These policy bodies fall under two categories designated by the San Francisco Office of the City Attorney. The first category, referred to as "Commissions and Boards," are policy bodies with decision-making authority and whose members are required to submit financial disclosures to the Ethics Commission, and the second category, referred to as "Advisory Bodies," are policy bodies with advisory function whose members do not submit financial disclosures to the Ethics Commission. A detailed description of methodology and limitations can be found at the end of this report on page 23.

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

II. Gender Analysis Findings

Many aspects of San Francisco's diversity are reflected in the overall population of appointees on San Francisco policy bodies. The analysis includes 84 policy bodies, of which 823 of the 887 seats are filled leaving 7% vacant. As outlined below in the summary chart, slightly more than half of appointees are women, half of appointees are people of color, 28% are women of color, 19% are LGBTQ, 11% have a disability, and 7% are veterans.

Figure 1: Summary Data of Policy Body Demographics, 2019

Appointee Demographics	Percentage of Appointees
Women (n=741)	51%
People of Color (n=706)	50%
Women of Color (n=706)	28%
LGBTQ Identified (n=548)	19%
People with Disabilities (n=516)	11%
Veteran Status (n=494)	7%

Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

However, further analysis reveals underrepresentation of particular groups. Subsequent sections present comprehensive data analysis providing comparison to previous years, detailing the variables of gender, race/ethnicity, LGBTQ identity, disability, veteran status, and policy body characteristics of budget size, decision-making authority, and appointment authority.

A. Gender

On San Francisco policy bodies, 51% of appointees identify as women, which is slightly above parity compared to the San Francisco female population of 49%. The representation of women remained stable at 49% from 2013 until 2017. This year, the representation of women increased by 2 percentage points, which could be partly due to the larger sample size used in this year's analysis compared to previous years. A 10-year comparison shows that the representation of women appointees has gradually increased since 2009 by a total of six percentage points.

Figure 2: 10-Year Comparison of Representation of Women on Policy Bodies



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

Figures 3 and 4 analyze Commissions and Boards. Figure 3 showcases the five Commissions and Boards with the highest representation of women appointees as compared to 2015 and 2013. The Children and Families (First Five) Commission and the Commission on the Status of Women are currently comprised of all women appointees. This finding has been consistent for the Commission on the Status of Women in 2015 and 2017. While the Ethics Commission has 100% women appointees, much more than 2015 and 2017, its small size of five appointees means that minimal changes in its demographic composition greatly impacts percentages. This is also the case for other policy bodies with a small number of members. The Library Commission and the Commission on the Environment are fourth and fifth on the list at 71% and 67% women, respectively, with long standing female majorities on each.

Figure 3: Commissions and Boards with Highest Percentages of Women, 2019 Compared to 2017, 2015



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

Out of the Commissions and Boards in this section, 23 have 40% or less women. The five Commissions and Boards with the lowest representation of women are displayed in Figure 4. The lowest percentage is found on the Board of Examiners where currently *none* of the 13 appointees are women. Unfortunately, demographic data is unavailable for the Board of Examiners for 2017 and 2015. Next is the Building Inspection Commission at 14%, which is a decrease of female representation compared to 2017 and 2015. The Oversight Board of Community Investment and Infrastructure, Fire Commission, and Sunshine Ordinance Task Force also have some of the lowest percentages of women at 17%, 20%, and 27%, respectively. Unfortunately, the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force did not participate in previous analyses and therefore demographics data is unavailable for 2017 and 2015.

Figure 4: Commissions and Boards with Lowest Percentage of Women, 2019 Compared to 2017, 2015



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

In addition to Commissions and Boards, Advisory Bodies were examined for the highest and lowest percentages of women. This is the first year such bodies have been included, thus comparison to previous years is unavailable. Figure 9 below displays the five Advisory Bodies with the highest and the five with the lowest representations of women. The Workforce Community Advisory Committees has the greatest representation of women at 100%, followed by the Office of Early Care and Education Citizen's Advisory Committee at 89%. The Advisory Bodies with the lowest percentage of women are the Urban Forestry Council at 8% of the 13-member body and the Abatement Appeals Board at 14% of the 7-member body.

Figure 5: Advisory Bodies with the Highest and Lowest Percentage of Women, 2019



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

B. Race and Ethnicity

Data on racial and ethnic identity was collected for 706, or 95%, of the 741 surveyed appointees. Although half of appointees identify as a race or ethnicity other than white or Caucasian, people of color are still underrepresented compared to the San Francisco population of 62%. The representation of people of color has increased since 2009 but has decreased following 2015. The number of appointees analyzed increased substantially in 2017 and 2019 compared to 2015, and these larger data samples have coincided with smaller percentages of people of color. The percentage decrease following 2017 could be partially due to the inclusion of more policy and advisory bodies, as the representation of people of color on Commissions and Boards dropped only slightly from 53% in 2017 to 52% in 2019.

Figure 6: 10-Year Comparison of Representation of People of Color on Policy Bodies



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

The racial and ethnic breakdown of policy body members compared to the San Francisco population is shown in Figure 7. This analysis reveals underrepresentation and overrepresentation in San Francisco policy bodies for certain racial and ethnic groups. Half of all appointees are white, an overrepresentation by more than 10 percentage points. The Black and African American community is well represented on appointed policy bodies at 14% compared to 5% of the population of San Francisco. Characterizing this as an overrepresentation is inaccurate given the representation of Black or African American people on policy bodies has been consistent over the years while the San Francisco population has declined over the same period.[3] Furthermore, the most recent nationwide estimate for the Black or African American population is 13%, which is nearly equal to the 14% of Black or African American appointees present on San Francisco policy bodies.[4]

Considerably underrepresented racial and ethnic groups on San Francisco policy bodies compared to the San Francisco population are individuals who identify as Asian or Latinx. While Asians are 31% of the San Francisco population, they only make up 18% of appointees. While the Latinx population of San Francisco is 14%, only 8% of appointees are Latinx. Although there is a small population of Native

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

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

Americans and Alaska Natives in San Francisco of 0.4%, none of the surveyed appointees identified themselves as such.

Figure 7: Race and Ethnicity of Appointees Compared to San Francisco Population, 2019



Sources: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

The next two graphs illustrate Commissions and Boards, and Advisory Bodies with the highest and lowest percentages of people of color. As shown in Figure 8, the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure remained at 100% from 2017, while the Juvenile Probation Commission has returned to 100% this year after a dip in 2017. Next is the Health Commission, Immigrant Rights Commission, and Housing Authority Commission at 86%, 85%, and 83%, respectively. Percentages of people of color on both the Health Commission and the Housing Authority Commission increased following 2015, and have remained consistent since 2017.

Figure 8: Commissions and Boards with Highest Percentage of People of Color, 2019 Compared to 2017, 2015



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

There are 23 policy bodies that have 40% or less appointees who identified a racial and ethnic category other than white. Although the Public Utilities Commission has two vacancies, *none* of the current appointees identify as people of color. The Historic Preservation Commission and Building Inspection Commission are both at 14% representation for people of color. The Building Inspection Commission had a large drop from 43% in 2015, with the percentage of people of color decreasing to 14% in 2017 and remaining at this percent for 2019. Lastly, the War Memorial Board of Trustees and City Hall Preservation Advisory Commission have 18% and 20%, respectively.

Figure 9: Commissions and Boards with Lowest Percentage of People of Color, 2019 Compared to 2017, 2015



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

In addition to Commissions and Boards, Advisory Bodies were examined for the highest and lowest percentages of people of color. This is the first year such bodies have been included, thus comparison to previous years is unavailable. All members of the Workforce Community Advisory Committee are people of color. People of color comprise 80% of the Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee, and 75% of appointees on the Children, Youth and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee, the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority, and the Local Homeless Coordinating Board. Out of the five Advisory Bodies with the lowest representation of people of color, the Ballot Simplification Committee and the Mayor's Disability Council have 25% appointees of color, and the Abatement Appeals Board has 14% appointees of color. The Urban Forestry and the Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee have no people of color currently serving.

Figure 10: Advisory Bodies with the Highest and Lowest Percentage of People of Color, 2019



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

C. Race and Ethnicity by Gender

White men and women are overrepresented on San Francisco policy bodies, while Asian and Latinx men and women are underrepresented. While women of color continue to be underrepresented at 28% compared to the San Francisco population of 32%, this is a slight increase from 2017 which showed 27% women of color. Meanwhile, men of color are 21% of appointees compared to 31% of the San Francisco population.

Figure 11: 10-Year Comparison of Representation of Women of Color on Policy Bodies



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

The following figures present the breakdown for appointees and the San Francisco population by race and ethnicity and gender. White men and women are overrepresented, holding 27% and 23% of appointments, respectively, compared to 20% and 17% of the population, respectively. Asian men and women are both greatly underrepresented with Asian women making up 11% of appointees compared to 17% of the population while Asian men comprise 7% of appointees and 15% of the population. Latinx men and women are also underrepresented, particularly Latinx women, who are 3% of appointees and 7% of the population, while Latinx men are 5% of appointees and 7% of the population. Black or African American men and women are well-represented with Black women comprising 9% of appointees and Black men comprising 5% of appointees. Pacific Islander men and women, and multiethnic women also exceed parity with the population. Although Native American men and women make up only 0.4% of San Francisco's population, none of the surveyed appointees identified themselves as such.

Figure 12: Appointees by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 2019



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

Figure 13: San Francisco Population by Race/Ethnicity, 2019



Source: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

D. LGBTQ Identity

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and questioning (LGBTQ) identity data was collected from 548, or 75%, of the 741 surveyed appointees, which is much more data on LGBTQ identity compared to previous reports. Due to limited and outdated information on the population of the LGBTQ community in San Francisco, it is difficult to adequately assess the representation of the LGBTQ community. However, compared to available San Francisco, larger Bay Area, and national data, the LGBTQ community is well represented on San Francisco policy bodies. Recent research estimates the national LGBT population is 4.5%.[5] The LGBT population of the San Francisco and greater Bay Area is estimated to rank the highest of U.S. cities at 6.2%,[6] while a 2006 survey found that 15.4% of adults in San Francisco identify as LGBT[7].

Of the appointees who responded to this question, 19% identify as LGBTQ and 81% identify as straight or heterosexual. Of the LGBTQ appointees, 48% identify as gay, 23% as lesbian, 17% as bisexual, 7% as queer, 5% as transgender, and 1% as questioning. Data on LGBTQ identity by race was not captured. Efforts to capture data on LGBTQ identity by race for future reports would enable more intersectional analysis.

Figure 14: LGBTQ Identity of Appointees, 2019

(N=548)



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

Figure 15: LGBTQ Population of Appointees, 2019

(N=104)



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

E. Disability Status

Overall, 12% of adults in San Francisco have one or more disabilities, and when broken down by gender, 6.2% are women and 5.7% are men. Disability data for transgender and gender non-conforming individuals in San Francisco is currently unavailable. Data on disability was obtained from 516, or 70%, of the 714 appointees who participated in the survey. Of the 516 appointees, 11.2% reported to have one

[5] Frank Newport, "In U.S., Estimate of LGBT Population Rises to 4.5%," *GALLUP* (May 22, 2018) https://news.gallup.com/poll/234863/estimate-lgbt-population-rises.aspx.

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

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

or more disabilities, which is near parity with the San Francisco population. Of the 11.2% appointees with one or more disabilities, 6.8% are women, 3.9% are men, 0.4% are trans women, and 0.2% are trans men.

Figure 16: San Francisco Adult Population with a Disability by Gender, 2017

(N=744,243)



Source: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Figure 17: Appointees with One or More Disabilities by Gender, 2019

(N=516)



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

F. Veteran Status

Overall, 3.2% of the adult population in San Francisco has served in the military. There is a considerable difference by gender, as male veterans are 3% and female veterans are 0.2% of the population. Data on veteran status was obtained from 494, or 67%, of appointees who participated in the survey. Of the 494 appointees who responded to this question, 7.1% have served in the military. Like the San Francisco population, there is a large difference by gender, as men comprise 5.7% and women make up only 1.2% of the total number of veteran appointees. Of participating appointees, 0.2% of veterans are trans women. Veteran status data on transgender and gender non-conforming individuals in San Francisco is currently unavailable.

Figure 18: San Francisco Adult Population with Military Service by Gender, 2017

(N=747,896)



Source: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Figure 19: Appointees with Military Service, 2019

(N=494)



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

G. Policy Bodies by Budget

This report also examines whether policy bodies with the largest and smallest budget sizes and other characteristics are demographically representative of the San Francisco population. In this section, budget size is used as a proxy for influence. Although this report has expanded the scope of analysis to include more policy bodies compared to previous reports, this section of analysis was limited to Commissions and Boards with decision-making authority and whose members file financial disclosures with the Ethics Commission. The purpose of this analysis is to evaluate the demographics for the spectrum of budgetary influence of policy bodies with decision-making authority in San Francisco.

Overall, appointees from the 10 largest budgeted Commissions and Boards are 55% people of color, 41% women, and 23% women of color. Appointees from the 10 smallest budgeted Commissions and Boards are 54% people of color, 52% women, and 32% women of color. Although still below parity with the San Francisco population, the representation of people of color on both the largest and smallest budgeted policy bodies is greater than the percentage of people of color for all appointees combined (50%). For women and women of color, their representation meets or exceeds parity with the population on the 10 smallest budgeted bodies. However, it falls far below parity for the 10 largest budgeted bodies. The representation of total women and women of color is greater on smaller budgeted policy bodies by 27%, and 39%, respectively.

Figure 20: Percent of Women, Women of Color, and People of Color on Commissions and Boards with Largest and Smallest Budgets in Fiscal Year 2018-2019



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

Figure 21: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Largest Budgets, 2019

Body	FY18-19 Budget	Total Seats	Filled seats	Women	Women of Color	People of Color
Health Commission	$2,200,000,000	7	7	29%	14%	86%
Public Utilities Commission	$1,296,600,000	5	3	67%	0%	0%
MTA Board of Directors and Parking Authority Commission	$1,200,000,000	7	7	57%	14%	43%
Airport Commission	$1,000,000,000	5	5	40%	20%	40%
Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure	$745,000,000	5	5	60%	60%	100%
Police Commission	$687,139,793	7	7	43%	43%	71%
Health Authority (Plan Governing Board)	$666,000,000	19	15	33%	27%	47%
Human Services Commission	$529,900,000	5	5	40%	0%	40%
Fire Commission	$400,721,970	5	5	20%	20%	40%
Aging and Adult Services Commission	$334,700,000	7	7	43%	14%	57%
Total	**$9,060,061,763**	**72**	**66**	**41%**	**23%**	**55%**

Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

Figure 22: Demographics of Commissions and Boards with Smallest Budgets, 2019

Body	FY18-19 Budget	Total Seats	Filled Seats	Women	Women of color	People of Color
Rent Board Commission	$8,543,912	10	9	44%	11%	33%
Commission on the Status of Women	$8,048,712	7	7	100%	71%	71%
Ethics Commission	$6,458,045	5	4	100%	50%	50%
Human Rights Commission	$4,299,600	12	10	50%	50%	70%
Small Business Commission	$2,242,007	7	7	43%	29%	43%
Civil Service Commission	$1,262,072	5	4	50%	0%	25%
Board of Appeals	$1,072,300	5	5	40%	20%	40%
Entertainment Commission	$1,003,898	7	7	29%	14%	57%
Assessment Appeals Board No.1, 2, & 3	$663,423	24	18	39%	22%	44%
Youth Commission	$305,711	17	16	56%	44%	75%
Total	**$33,899,680**	**99**	**87**	**52%**	**32%**	**54%**

Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

H. Comparison of Advisory Body and Commission and Board Demographics

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

Figure 23: Demographics of Appointees on Commission and Boards and Advisory Bodies, 2019



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

I. Demographics of Mayoral, Supervisorial, and Total Appointees

Figure 24 compares the representation of women, women of color, and people of color for appointments made by the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and by the total of all approving authorities combined. Mayoral appointments are more diverse, and consist of more women, women of color, and people of color compared to Supervisorial appointments. Mayoral appointments include 55% women, 30% women of color, and 52% people of color, while Supervisorial appointments are 48% women, 24% women of color, and 48% people of color. The total of all approving authorities combined average out at 51% women, 28% women of color, and 50% people of color. This disparity in diversity between Mayoral and Supervisorial appointments may be due in part to the appointment section process for each authority. The 11-member Board of Supervisors only sees applicants for specific bodies through the 3-member Rules Committee or by designees, stipulated in legislation (e.g. "renter," "landlord," "consumer advocate"), whereas the Mayor typically has the ability to take total appointments into account during selections, and can therefore better address gaps in diversity.

Figure 24: Demographics of Mayoral, Supervisorial, and Total Appointees, 2019



Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis.

III. Conclusion

Since the first gender analysis of Commissions and Boards in 2007, the representation of women appointees on San Francisco policy bodies has gradually increased. The *2019 Gender Analysis* finds the percentage of women appointees is 51%, which slightly exceeds the population of women in San Francisco.

When appointee demographics are analyzed by gender and race, women of color continue to be underrepresented on San Francisco policy bodies compared to the San Francisco population. Most notably underrepresented are Asian women who make up 17% of the population but only 11% of appointees, and Latinx women who make up 7% of the population but only 3% of appointees. Additionally, men of color are underrepresented relative to their San Francisco population, primarily Asian and Latinx men.

Furthermore, when analyzing the demographic composition of larger and smaller budgeted Commissions and Boards, women are underrepresented on those with the largest budgets, and overrepresented or reach parity with the population on smaller budgeted Commissions and Boards. These two trends are amplified for women of color appointees. Women comprise 41% of total appointees on the largest budgeted policy bodies, which is 8 percentage points below the population, and women of color comprise 23% of total appointees on the largest budgeted policy bodies, 9 percentage points below their San Francisco population. Comparatively, women are 52% of total appointees on the smallest budgeted policy bodies, and women of color are 32% of appointees, which is equal to the San Francisco population. However, the issue of largest and smallest budgeted policy bodies does not seem to impact the representation of people of color. People of color make up 55% of appointees on the largest budgeted policy bodies and 54% of appointees on the smallest budgeted policy bodies compared to 50% of total appointees. Nonetheless, these percentages still fall below the San Francisco population of people of color at 62%.

In addition to using budget size as a proxy for influence, this report analyzed demographic characteristics of appointees on Commissions and Boards who file disclosures of economic interest and have decision-making authority, and appointees on Advisory Bodies who do not file economic interest disclosures. Over half (54%) of appointees on Advisory Bodies are women, while 48% of appointees on Commissions and Boards are women. Although 48% is only slightly below the San Francisco population of women, women comprise a decently higher percentage of appointees on Advisory Bodies compared to Commissions and Boards.

This year's report features more data on LGBTQ identity, veteran status, and disability than previous gender analyses. The *2019 Gender Analysis* found a relatively high representation of LGBTQ individuals on San Francisco policy bodies. For the appointees that provided LGBTQ identity information, 19% identify as LGBTQ with the largest subset being gay men at 48%. It is recommended for future gender analyses to collect LGBTQ data by race and gender to provide additional intersectional analysis. The representation of appointees with disabilities is 11%, just below the 12% population. Veterans are highly represented on San Francisco policy bodies at 7% compared to the veteran population of 3%.

Additionally, this report evaluates and compares the representation of women, women of color, and people of color appointees by the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and by the total of all approving authorities combined. Mayoral appointees include 55% women, 30% women of color, and 52% people

of color, which overall is more diverse by gender and race compared to both Supervisorial appointees and total appointees.

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

IV. Methodology and Limitations

This report focuses on City and County of San Francisco Commissions, Boards, Task Forces, Councils, and Committees that have the majority of members appointed by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors and that have jurisdiction limited to the City. The gender analysis reflects data from the policy bodies that provided information to the Department on the Status of Women through digital and paper survey.

Data was requested from 90 policy bodies and acquired from 84 different policy bodies and a total of 741 appointees. A Commissioner or Board member's gender identity, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability status, and veteran status were among data elements collected on a voluntary basis. Data on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, or questioning (LGBTQ) identity, disability, and veteran status of appointees were incomplete or unavailable for some appointees but are included to the extent possible. As the fundamental objective of this report is to surface patterns of underrepresentation, every attempt has been made to reflect accurate and complete information in this report. Data for some policy bodies was incomplete, and all appointees who responded were included in the total demographic categories. Only policy bodies with full data on gender and race for all appointees were included in sections comparing demographics of individual bodies. It should be noted that for policy bodies with a small number of members, the change of a single individual greatly impacts the percentages of demographic categories. As such, these percentages should be interpreted with this in mind.

The surveyed policy bodies fall under two categories designated by the San Francisco Office of the City Attorney document entitled *List of City Boards, Commissions, and Advisory Bodies Created by Charter, Ordinance, or Statute.*[8] This document separates San Francisco policy bodies into two different categories. The first category includes Commissions and Boards with decision-making authority and whose members are required to submit financial disclosures with the Ethics Commission, and the second category encompasses Advisory Bodies whose members do not submit financial disclosures with the Ethics Commission. Depending on the analysis criteria in each section of this report, the surveyed policy bodies and appointees are either examined comprehensively as a whole or examined separately in the two categories designated by the Office of the City Attorney.

Data from the U.S. Census 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates provides a comparison to the San Francisco population. Figures 26 and 27 in the Appendix display these population estimates by race/ethnicity and gender.

[8] "List of City Boards, Commissions, and Advisory Bodies Created by Charter, Ordinance, or Statute," Office of the City Attorney, https://www.sfcityattorney.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Commission-List-08252017.pdf, (August 25, 2017).

Appendix

Figure 25: Policy Body Demographics, 2019[9]

Policy Body	Total Seats	Filled Seats	FY18-19 Budget	Women	Women of Color	People of Color
Abatement Appeals Board	7	7	$76,500,000	14%	0%	14%
Aging and Adult Services Commission	7	7	$334,700,000	57%	33%	57%
Airport Commission	5	5	$1,000,000,000	40%	50%	40%
Arts Commission	15	15	$37,000,000	67%	50%	60%
Asian Art Commission	27	27	$30,000,000	63%	71%	59%
Assessment Appeals Board No.1	8	5	$663,423	20%	0%	20%
Assessment Appeals Board No.2	8	8	-	50%	75%	63%
Assessment Appeals Board No.3	8	4	-	50%	50%	50%
Ballot Simplification Committee	5	4	$0	75%	33%	25%
Bayview Hunters Point Citizens Advisory Committee	12	9	$0	33%	100%	67%
Board of Appeals	5	5	$1,072,300	40%	50%	40%
Board of Examiners	13	13	$0	0%	0%	46%
Building Inspection Commission	7	7	$76,500,000	14%	0%	14%
Child Care Planning and Advisory Council	25	19	$26,841	84%	50%	50%
Children and Families Commission (First 5)	9	8	$28,002,978	100%	75%	75%
Children, Youth, and Their Families Oversight and Advisory Committee	11	10	$155,224,346	50%	80%	75%
Citizen's Committee on Community Development	9	8	$39,696,467	75%	67%	63%
City Hall Preservation Advisory Commission	5	5	$0	60%	33%	20%
Civil Service Commission	5	4	$1,262,072	50%	0%	25%
Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure	5	5	$745,000,000	60%	100%	100%
Commission on the Aging Advisory Council	22	15	$0	80%	33%	31%
Commission on the Environment	7	6	$27,280,925	67%	50%	50%
Commission on the Status of Women	7	7	$8,048,712	100%	71%	71%
Dignity Fund Oversight and Advisory Committee	11	11	$3,000,000	82%	33%	45%
Eastern Neighborhoods Citizens Advisory Committee	19	13	$0	38%	40%	44%
Elections Commission	7	7	$15,238,360	57%	25%	29%
Entertainment Commission	7	7	$1,003,898	29%	50%	57%
Ethics Commission	5	4	$6,458,045	100%	50%	50%
Film Commission	11	11	$0	55%	67%	50%
Fire Commission	5	5	$400,721,970	20%	100%	40%
Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority	7	6	$0	50%	67%	75%

[9] Figure 25 only includes policy bodies with complete data on gender for all appointees. Some bodies had incomplete data on race/ethnicity of appointees. For these, percentages for people of color are calculated out of known race/ethnicity.

Policy Body	Total Seats	Filled Seats	FY18-19 Budget	Women	Women of Color	People of Color
Health Authority (Plan Governing Board)	19	15	$666,000,000	33%	80%	50%
Health Commission	7	7	$2,200,000,000	43%	50%	86%
Health Service Board	7	6	$11,632,022	33%	0%	50%
Historic Preservation Commission	7	7	$53,832,000	43%	33%	14%
Housing Authority Commission	7	6	$60,894,150	50%	100%	83%
Human Rights Commission	12	10	$4,299,600	60%	100%	70%
Human Services Commission	5	5	$529,900,000	40%	0%	40%
Immigrant Rights Commission	15	13	$0	54%	86%	85%
In-Home Supportive Services Public Authority	13	9	$70,729,667	44%	50%	56%
Juvenile Probation Commission	7	6	$48,824,199	33%	100%	100%
Library Commission	7	7	$160,000,000	71%	40%	57%
Local Homeless Coordinating Board	9	9	$40,000,000	56%	60%	75%
Mayor's Disability Council	11	8	$0	75%	17%	25%
Mental Health Board	17	15	$184,962	73%	64%	73%
MTA Board of Directors and Parking Authority Commission	7	7	$1,200,000,000	57%	25%	43%
Office of Early Care and Education Citizens' Advisory Committee	9	9	$0	89%	50%	56%
Oversight Board (COII)	7	6	$745,000,000	17%	100%	67%
Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee	17	13	$0	46%	17%	8%
Planning Commission	7	6	$53,832,000	50%	67%	33%
Police Commission	7	7	$687,139,793	43%	100%	71%
Port Commission	5	5	$192,600,000	60%	67%	60%
Public Utilities Citizen's Advisory Committee	17	13	$0	54%	14%	31%
Public Utilities Commission	5	3	$1,296,600,000	67%	0%	0%
Public Utilities Rate Fairness Board	7	6	$0	33%	100%	67%
Public Utilities Revenue Bond Oversight Committee	7	5	$0	40%	50%	40%
Recreation and Park Commission	7	7	$230,900,000	29%	50%	43%
Reentry Council	24	23	$0	43%	70%	70%
Rent Board Commission	10	9	$8,543,912	44%	25%	33%
Residential Users Appeal Board	3	2	$0	0%	0%	50%
Retirement System Board	7	7	$95,000,000	43%	67%	29%
Sentencing Commission	13	13	$0	31%	25%	67%
Small Business Commission	7	7	$2,242,007	43%	67%	43%
SRO Task Force	12	12	$0	42%	25%	55%
Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee	16	15	$0	67%	70%	80%
Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	11	11	$0	27%	67%	36%
Sweatfree Procurement Advisory Group	11	7	$0	43%	67%	43%
Treasure Island Development Authority	7	6	$18,484,130	50%	N/A	N/A

Policy Body	Total Seats	Filled Seats	FY18-19 Budget	Women	Women of Color	People of Color
Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island Citizens Advisory Board	17	13	$0	54%	N/A	N/A
Urban Forestry Council	15	13	$153,626	8%	0%	0%
Veterans Affairs Commission	17	11	$0	36%	50%	55%
War Memorial Board of Trustees	11	11	$18,185,686	55%	33%	18%
Workforce Community Advisory Committee	8	4	$0	100%	100%	100%
Youth Commission	17	16	$305,711	56%	78%	75%

Source: SF DOSW Data Collection & Analysis, 2019.

Figure 26: San Francisco Population Estimates by Race/Ethnicity, 2017

Race/Ethnicity	Total	
	Estimate	Percent
San Francisco County California	864,263	-
White, Not Hispanic or Latino	353,000	38%
Asian	295,347	31%
Hispanic or Latinx	131,949	14%
Some other Race	64,800	7%
Black or African American	45,654	5%
Two or More Races	43,664	5%
Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	3,226	0.3%
Native American and Alaska Native	3,306	0.4%

Source: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

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

Race/Ethnicity	Total		Female		Male	
	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent
San Francisco County California	864,263	-	423,630	49%	440,633	51%
White, Not Hispanic or Latino	353,000	38%	161,381	17%	191,619	20%
Asian	295,347	31%	158,762	17%	136,585	15%
Hispanic or Latinx	131,949	14%	62,646	7%	69,303	7%
Some Other Race	64,800	7%	30,174	3%	34,626	4%
Black or African American	45,654	5%	22,311	2.4%	23,343	2.5%
Two or More Races	43,664	5%	21,110	2.2%	22,554	2.4%
Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	3,226	0.3%	1,576	0.2%	1,650	0.2%
Native American and Alaska Native	3,306	0.4%	1,589	0.2%	1,717	0.2%

Source: 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

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