

# San Francisco Sentencing Commission

## City & County of San Francisco

(Administrative Code 5.250 through 5.250-3)

---

### AGENDA

Thursday, June 25, 2026

10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

#### Location:

San Francisco District Attorney's Office  
350 Rhode Island Street, North Building, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Obama Conference Room  
San Francisco, CA 94103

This meeting will be held in person at the location listed above. Members of the public may attend the meeting to observe and provide public comment at the physical meeting location listed above or by calling in to the number below. Instructions for providing remote public comments by phone are provided below.

#### Join Zoom Meeting:

<https://sfdistrictattorney.zoom.us/j/86360445855?pwd=ouObT7aGzDy1bRTOKn1CMtV4MlUqmv.1>

**Meeting ID:** 863 6044 5855

**Passcode:** 741118

**One tap mobile:** +14086380968,,86360445855#,,,,\*741118# US (San Jose)  
+16694449171,,86360445855#,,,,\*741118# US

**Public Comment:** Members of the public will have an opportunity to provide public comments at the beginning and end of the meeting. Members of the public wishing to make a public comment will be allotted up to 3 minutes to speak. Meeting materials link: [Sentencing Commission Agendas and Minutes – San Francisco District Attorney](#)

1. Call to Order; Roll call

Pursuant to Sentencing Commission by laws, acknowledgment of the ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone, the original inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula

2. Public Comment on Any Item Listed Below (discussion only)

3. Review and Adoption of Meeting Minutes from March 26<sup>th</sup>, 2026 (discussion & action)

4. Staff Report on Sentencing Commission Activities, Reports from the Reentry Council, the Family Violence Council, and the MacArthur Foundation-funded Safety & Justice Challenge Initiative (discussion & possible action)

5. Discussion series: Review of Top Recommendations, Recommendations and Reporting Out.

6. Members' Comments, Questions & Next Steps

7. Public Comment on Any Item Listed Above, as well as Items not Listed on the Agenda (discussion only)

8. Adjournment

SUBMITTING WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENT TO THE SAN FRANCISCO SENTENCING COMMISSION

# San Francisco Sentencing Commission

## City & County of San Francisco

(Administrative Code 5.250 through 5.250-3)

---

Persons who are unable to attend the public meeting may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting to the San Francisco District Attorney's Office (SFDA) by the time the proceedings begin. These comments will be made a part of the official public record. Written comments should be submitted to: Alexandra Lopes, SFDA, via email: [alexandra.lopes@sfgov.org](mailto:alexandra.lopes@sfgov.org) or Kelly VerHage at [kelly.verhage@sfgov.org](mailto:kelly.verhage@sfgov.org).

### MEETING MATERIALS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

Explanatory and/or Supporting Documents, if any, will be posted at: <https://sfdistrictattorney.org/sentencing-commission-relevant-documents>. The material can be faxed or mailed to you upon request. In addition to in-person public comment, the Sentencing Commission will hear up to 20 minutes of remote public comment in the order that commenters add themselves to the queue to comment on an item. Because of the 20-minute time limit, it is possible that not every person in the queue will have an opportunity to provide remote public comment. Remote public comments from those who have received accommodation due to disability (as described below) will not count toward the 20-minute limit. Members of the public are encouraged to participate remotely by submitting written comments electronically to Alexandra Lopes via email at [alexandra.lopes@sfgov.org](mailto:alexandra.lopes@sfgov.org) or Kelly VerHage at [kelly.verhage@sfgov.org](mailto:kelly.verhage@sfgov.org). These comments will be made part of the official public record in these matters and shall be brought to the attention of the members of the committee.

### ACCOMMODATIONS

The meeting location is wheelchair accessible. Wheelchair-accessible entrances at City Hall are located on Van Ness Avenue and Grove Street. Please note: the wheelchair lift at the Goodlett Place/Polk Street is temporarily unavailable. It is being replaced to improve service and reliability and to address the need for multiple repairs and subsequent additional breakdowns. A functioning lift is anticipated after completion of construction in May 2025. Elevators and accessible restrooms are located on every floor. To access the meeting remotely as an accommodation, please visit <https://sfdistrictattorney.zoom.us/j/86360445855?pwd=ouObT7aGzDy1bRTOKn1CMtV4MlUqmv.1> or call (669) 444-9171. For remote public comments, instructions on how to use the Zoom platform can be found [here](#). Captions can be enabled – instructions can be found [here](#). Sign Language Interpretation is available upon request (see "Translation" section below). Allowing a minimum of 48 business hours for all other accommodation requests (for example, for other auxiliary aids and services) helps ensure availability. To request an accommodation, please contact Alexandra Lopes, SFDA, via email or telephone: [alexandra.lopes@sfgov.org](mailto:alexandra.lopes@sfgov.org), (628) 652-4296; or Kelly VerHage at [kelly.verhage@sfgov.org](mailto:kelly.verhage@sfgov.org).

### TRANSLATION

Interpreters for languages other than English are available upon request. Sign language interpreters are also available upon request. For either accommodation, please contact Alexandra Lopes at [alexandra.lopes@sfgov.org](mailto:alexandra.lopes@sfgov.org) or Kelly VerHage at [kelly.verhage@sfgov.org](mailto:kelly.verhage@sfgov.org) at least two business days before the meeting.

### CHEMICAL SENSITIVITIES

To assist the City in its efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illness, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.

### KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code)

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Public Library, and on the City's web site at: [www.sfgov.org/sunshine](http://www.sfgov.org/sunshine).

### FOR MORE INFORMATION ON YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE OR TO REPORT A VIOLATION OF THE ORDINANCE, CONTACT THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE TASK FORCE

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102-4683; Telephone: (415) 554-7724; E-Mail: [soft@sfgov.org](mailto:soft@sfgov.org)

### CELL PHONES

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Co-Chairs may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices.

### LOBBYIST ORDINANCE

Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance (SF Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code sections 2.100-2.160) to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3900, San Francisco CA 94102, telephone (415) 581-2300, FAX (415) 581-2317, and website <http://www.sfgov.org/ethics/>.

## SENTENCING COMMISSION: MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, March 26, 2026

10:00 am - 12:00 pm

### Location:

San Francisco District Attorney's Office  
350 Rhode Island Street, 1st Floor, Obama Conference Room  
San Francisco, CA 94103

### 1. Call to Order; Roll Call

Representative Monifa Willis, Chief of Staff for the San Francisco District Attorney's Office, welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. Samantha Ellis from the San Francisco District Attorney's Office, called roll for the meeting.

### Members in Attendance:

- District Attorney's Office – Representative **Monifa Willis**, *Chief of Staff*
- Adult Probation – Representative **Mark Hudgins**, *Division Director*
- Sheriff's Office – Representative **Ali Riker**, *Director of Programs*
- Superior Court – Representative **Melanie Kushnir**, *Director of Collaborative Courts*
- Public Defender's Office – Representative **Carolyn Goossen**, *Director of Policy*
- Juvenile Probation – Representative **Gabriel Calvillo**, *Assistant Chief*
- Reentry Council – Representative **Karen Roye**, *Assistant to the Director of Child Support Services*
- Police Department – Representative **Tom Maguire**
- Academic Researcher with expertise in data analysis appointed by the mayor – Member **Mia Bird**, *Assistant Research Professor at the Goldman School of Public Policy, University of California, Berkeley*
- Member of a nonprofit organization serving victims chosen by Family Violence Council – Member **Beverly Upton**, *Executive Director, San Francisco Domestic Violence Consortium*

Sentencing Expert chosen by the Board of Supervisors – Member **Theshia Naidoo**, *Legal Director, Criminal Justice Drug Policy Alliance* **Members Absent:**

- Department of Public Health – Representative **Annie Shui**, *Behavioral Health Services Utilization Management Director*
- Member of nonprofit working with formerly incarcerated people appointed by the Reentry Council – Appointee **William Palmer**

Pursuant to Sentencing Commission bylaws, Representative Willis read the acknowledgement of the ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone, the original inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula.

### 2. Public Comment on Any Item Listed Below (discussion only)

No public comment received.

### 3. Review and Adoption of Meeting Minutes from December 11th, 2025 (discussion & possible action)

Representative Willis introduced the meeting minutes from the Sentencing Commission meeting held on December 11<sup>th</sup>, 2025. Members and representatives reviewed the meeting minutes. Representative Willis asked for a motion to accept the December 11<sup>th</sup>, 2025, Sentencing Commission Meeting Minutes. Member Riker moved to accept, and the motion was seconded by Member Upton. The minutes were unanimously approved in a roll call vote. Motion passed.

#### **4. Remarks by District Attorney Brooke Jenkins (discussion only)**

Representative Willis asked for a motion to move agenda item 4 to be heard before Public Comment, agenda item 2. Motion from Member Riker and second from Member Upton. Representative Willis moved item 4 to item 2. DA Jenkins thanked commission and their contribution to this commission. The DA will remain focused on ensuring sentencing in San Francisco and across the state are equitable, proportional, and fair. As prosecutors, there is a focus on “long stayers”, and what factors are contributing to choosing not to exercise “speedy trial” right. Incentive use of collaborative courts, which has been successful over time, but have seen diminishing participation due to different diversionary options. Wanting to get to a place and understanding to seek what’s best for people in the system, helping someone move their life forward. This requires a level of collaboration, communication, and honesty. Emphasis and taking what is discussed here to figure out what larger things we can do legislatively to make sentencing and our system fairer. It takes everyone to come to the table.

#### **5. Staff Report on Sentencing Commission Activities, and Reports from the Reentry Council and the Family Violence Council, MacArthur Foundation-funded *Safety & Justice Challenge Initiative* (discussion & possible action)**

Representative Willis provided update on activities from the Sentencing Commission since the last meeting, which has been building out a framework for presentation series focused on sentencing practices and decision making and working towards understanding more about factors that may impact sentencing. During the series, exploring sentencing practices and outcomes in San Francisco (SF) and beyond, providing comparisons across jurisdictions and ways to address inconsistencies. Presentations from SFDA, Adult Probation, and Public Defender’s office. No outside jurisdiction presentation, but California Policy Lab will present. Presentations have examined charging, sentencing, and court flows among felony, misdemeanor, collaborative courts and mental diversion. Discussion points and questions were created from these presentations. Commission scheduled to sundown in June of this year but want to ensure the work of the presentation is honored and provide for engagement for recommendations. The next meeting is scheduled for June 25<sup>th</sup>, 2026.

The Reentry Council meeting schedule for January 15<sup>th</sup> was cancelled, no updates at this time. The next meeting is scheduled for April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2026, at 1:00 PM at City Hall. For inquiries, please contact Victoria Westbrook by email, [victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org](mailto:victoria.westbrook@sfgov.org) or Alec Hartwick, [alec.hartwick@sfgov.org](mailto:alec.hartwick@sfgov.org).

Safety Justice Challenge initiative update by Member Riker. Work with SJC fellows concluded in January with a small graduation ceremony. There was a presentation on findings on employment barriers for people with lived experience, but the last Reentry Council meeting was cancelled. In February there was a small delegation that participated in the California network meeting of all the MacArthur funded sites that focused on the county and justice initiative. This grant is sunsetting, focusing on last project which is Peer supported arraignment linkages which funds peer navigators and bridge housing.

Family Violence Council update, by Member Upton. Last meeting Feb 25<sup>th</sup>, moved from City Hall to 400 McAllister and will remain through the rest of the year. Some conversations about limiting voting membership to 15 instead of 32 encourage public and non-voting public to give feedback and ideas. Several commissions and departments have taken a step back. Child Abuse and Neglect panel, Pegah Faed from Safe and Sound presented. Panel was well attended, people from Human Services Agency, including people from data and early childhood well-being division, as well as Joey Cordero, from Fatherhood Initiative. A lot of interest on the intersection of domestic violence and child welfare. Honored Annie Chung and have new representative that will take her spot. Council's priority is the intersection of family violence and maternal health. Waiting for Police Department and city departments data. Next meeting in May, the dates were not confirmed.

Question from Member Carolyn Goossen about this body's last meeting in June and verifying if sunsetting, discussion points and purpose. Representative Willis clarified that these were all questions that people had after presentations, to take back to agencies, to further provide input for conversation in June. Opportunity for recommendations to be put forward, or possibility of a small working group.

#### **6. Presentation series: The California Policy Lab: Sentencing Analysis, Insights, and Discussion (discussion & possible action)**

Mia Bird, Assistant Research Professor at Goldman School of Public Policy, presented on the use and impact of sentence enhancements, statewide data sources and discuss the pros and cons. Statewide data sources for sentencing information consist of DOJ automated criminal history systems, which capture arrest and convictions in all counties in CA but does not include charging information. Does not capture enhancements well and under-reporting to DOJ, especially for convictions. Challenge in filling in the gap in trying to link DOJ data with local District Attorney or court data as to get a fuller picture of the progression case. CDCR is another statewide source, which captures enhancements, sentence length, and revocations. SF has very few convictions showing in DOJ data and makes it hard to compare to other counties. There's no charging information, which leaves out case flow information, and limited to people going to prison and SF is the least likely to send to prison.

Statewide and using CDCR data, there is a high prevalence of enhancements, 70% of people incarcerated in 2022 had enhancements, which added about 2 years to their sentence, for people admitted between 2015-2022. Four categories accounted for 80% of the years added to sentences: strike, firearms, nickel prior, gang.

In the 80's through the early 2000s, there was a ramping up of enhancements, enacting harsher laws, which then lead to realignment and reform starting in 2012, Prop 36. In recent years, California (CA) enacted numerous sentence enhancement reform, Prop 57. Timeline of reform from 1976-2021. In 2021, more judicial discretion, legislature primarily through proposition started to tackle long sentences. In terms of admissions to prison, SF sends such a small share of felony convictions to prison, that's typically a more serious group and different from the rest of the state. From SF majority of people going to prison for 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> degree murder. Which is different than the rest of the state, other counties. The most common category for sending people to prison is assault and battery. Data also shows that SF sentences are a bit shorter by offense type on average compared to other counties in the state.

Looking at enhancements by race and age, slight differences in race, and one lens to think about is prevalence of enhancements of population over the age of 50. Data can be sorted by certain demographic, age, age groups, race, gender groups, or by offense type. Firearm enhancement and use, you can look at prevalence of different types of enhancements by time, 5 different categories. In San Francisco, firearm use enhancement at 24.6% vs other counties at 14.9%. SF has similar use of common enhancements by commitment county: Prior prison term, Offense on bail, nickel prior, GBI, GBI (DV). In a statewide study, 41% of people in prison had two or more enhancements on their sentence. More than one and ten had five or more enhancements. Time enhancements can often exceed the length of the primary sentence. Across the counties, Bay Area, Southern California coastal counties have the lowest rates of enhancement use per 100,000 felony arrests versus Northern, Central Valley, and Inland Empire which have the highest rates.

Question from Sheriff's department was raised by Lucas Jennings about looking through the data and seeing enhancements in demographics and did any particular use of enhancements among those demographics stand out?

Presenter Mia Bird referred to the CA prison population dashboard: current population, admissions, and releases. The dashboard is dynamic. Categories, demographic, offense, or group and it will populate to show you data. Captures vast majority. Disproportional use of enhancements in black and brown populations, [capolicylab.org/californias-prison-population-dashboards/](http://capolicylab.org/californias-prison-population-dashboards/)

Question from Member Carolyn Goossen is there a difference in gender breakdown and differences in racial breakdowns versus if it's gender and how enhancements are used or seen in the data.

Presenter Mia Bird, reports that women are less likely to have enhancements and less likely to have more serious offenses bringing them to prison according to the report. In the report, they don't control for the case characteristics when looking at gender.

Follow up from member Goossen, on reform and looking at admissions, it doesn't reflect the reforms having made a big change in the number of people going to prison.

Presenter Bird commented that looking at data post 2020 and studying each reform independently and looking at who would have been eligible and who is or isn't in prison.

Currently working on evaluation of Prop 57 and looking at gang enhancements, nickel priors and what's changing. Acknowledges that Prop 36 (2012) did have a big impact on reform.

Representative Willis made a comment regarding the previous statement on gender and question about gender differences. Presenter Bird clarified that it is a big generalization, but on average, women who go to prison are less likely to have enhancements on their sentence and they tend to go to prison for less time. Representative Willis shared that the DA's office has been going to Chowchilla to speak to women about their sentencing and those serving life without parole and is inconsistent and not comparable in sentencing. Qualitative experience is different from data.

Presenter Bird provided a descriptive difference between 2015-2022, 31% of women had an enhancement vs 43% of men, but not adjusting for criminal history, other demographic differences.

Comment by member Upton, DV female offenders disproportionately sentenced and in cases where domestic violence played a role, there were high sentences, a few with life without parole and did not seem to commiserate with other populations with the same crime.

Follow up comment from member Goossen regarding if looked at where in the country throughout and doing reforms that are leading the way. Presenter Bird commented that not all states had the same trajectory at building enhancements up the way CA has so CA is going to approach reform differently. Reinstating judicial discretion, reforming specific enhancement types to what CA has done. Other states are trying to address over sentencing, or the potential for over sentencing. The state is trying to change conditions that create overlaps and potential for over sentencing.

Question from member Kushiner, LWOP sentencing for women for crimes committed when they also played the role of a victim. Is the Attorney General getting involved and looking at these cases? And how are different counties looking at these to potentially right their wrongs?

Representative Willis commented on steps being taken by the SFDA's office. Working with "For the People." Looking at cases, there are 4 women incarcerated and not up for resentencing at this time. As the DA hears about cases of incarcerated women, she is flagging them for the DA in their counties and "For the People," which promotes prosecutor-led resentencing. Currently, there is not a built-in step for flagging cases to the Attorney General.

Member Goossen commented that Public Defender's office has a unit called "Freedom Project," specifically focusing on resentencing, and many of the clients in that group they have helped are elders. Either PD or DA has to go the workup on these types of cases, and so far, they've brought home about 100 people, with the help of some state funding. It takes funding to do the work to make these reforms real. Danielle Harris runs that program in the PD's office.

Comment from Presenter Bird, that there is a big difference depending on the structure of the policy and whose responsibility it is to implement. Going back to data on felony murder, and acknowledgment of reform disproportionately effected women, with 11% of resentencing were female.

Question from member Upton on the prevalence of sentencing to batterers intervention programs. Member Upton and presenter Bird had previously discussed a pilot project to shorten CA's sentencing for program from 52 weeks to something much less. SF has 10 programs, mostly embedded in community and Sheriff's office and utilizing that as an option.

Presenter Bird responded that DV pilot evaluation will be coming out in a month. There's a lot of variation across counties in the quality of programming. In many counties, there are limited options, transportation issues, and work schedule conflicts. pilot gave counties flexibility in risk/needs responsivity model, which shows effective in DV treatment. Every county kept the 52 weeks for high-risk offenders; some people were assessed both in general and in terms of DV medium risk and some counties went to 26 weeks. Literature for low-risk folks shows that sometimes we can over program and make things worse. Programming is still effective while still assessing other issues such as substance use, mental health, and other needs that need to be addressed.

Comment from member Riker, wanting to know if there is any research on impact and use of enhancement and if impacts time in which a case resolves? Presenter Bird responded that they haven't researched this specifically and proposed the question back and asking if member Riker had a theory, if reforming enhancements would lead to a speedier resolution or possibly the reverse?

Question from member Naidoo on Prop 36 and curious of outcomes from new Prop 36 and impacts. Looking at data from what they have already. Judicial data and different effects in various counties. Presenter Bird responded that they were looking at data they already had, who's going to prison, and tracking information on how many people are showing up in prison based on penal code, demographic breakdown, and median sentence length. Using this to see the impact of Prop 36.

Comment from member Kushiner regarding the data on the Judicial Council and their tracking by county, because of the difference in charging when it comes to Prop 36. One has to do with repeated theft, and one has to do with substance abuse.

## **7. Members' Comments, Questions, Requests for Future Agenda Items (discussion & possible action)**

Representative Willis asked for further discussion on questions provided and how to pick points for next meeting. Everyone looks through and picks top 3 recommendations, and we can come away with something tangible and possibly have a working group set up after this commission ends.

Question from Member Carolyn Goossen regarding question 4, "an advocate for defendant to educate on all pathways." Response from member Willis, that this topic came up from a "lived experience" individual and we should consider a lived experience advocate, someone from re-

entry to educate defendants on all their pathways and options. Member Goosen commented that this would be pre-conviction and not considered re-entry.

Comment from member Kushiner about defendants should have someone educate defendants and that often justice involved individuals are hearing about alternatives and options from cellmates or others and not their attorneys. Member Kushnir commented regarding public safety being on the rise, according to numbers, referrals to collaborative courts have gone down since 2018-2025. 75% mental health diversion and other diversion have gone up, and referrals to mental health diversion have increased 35,000% between 2018, since the introduction, to 2025. Public safety improvement. On diversion vs. Collaborative courts. Possible research project, successes and challenges in diversion and collaborative courts.

Comment from Mia Bird, research can look at individuals and their change over time and who is having success.

**8. Public Comment on Any Item Listed Above, as well as Items not Listed on the Agenda (discussion only)**

No public comment received.

**9. Adjournment**

Representative Willis reminded members that the next Sentencing Commission Meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 25<sup>th</sup>, 2026, at 10:00 am. A motion to adjourn the meeting was introduced by Representative Willis, motion supported by Member Naidoo and seconded by Representative Riker. The motion passed unanimously.