



HEALTH SERVICE BOARD

CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Mary Hao
President

Art Howard
Vice President

Jack Cremen
Commissioner

Supervisor Matt Dorsey
District 6
Commissioner

Diana Guevara
Commissioner

Gus Vallejo
Commissioner

Fiona Wilson, MD
Commissioner

Rey Guillen
Executive Director
Health Service System

Holly Lopez
Executive Secretary

TEL (628) 652-4646
<http://www.sfhss.org/>

HEALTH SERVICE BOARD

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES **DRAFT**

Friday, April 24, 2026, 1:30 p.m.
City Hall, Room 408
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

and

VIRTUAL PRESENTATION BY SFGOV TV and Webex

Remote Meeting Access

The Health Service Board welcomes public participation during public comment periods. There will be an opportunity for the public to comment at the beginning of the meeting and on each discussion or action item on the agenda. Each comment is limited to 3 minutes, and the Chair may, at their discretion, limit public comment to less than 3 minutes per member of the public. For those attending remotely, the Commission will hear up to 30 minutes of remote public comment total for each agenda item. Remote public comment from people who have received an accommodation due to disability will not count toward the 30-minute limit. Remote viewing may not be available due to technology outages.

Watch at 1:30 p.m. on April 24, 2026 (via SFGovTV schedule)

Click the link to join the meeting – [April 24, 2026 HSB Regular Meeting WebEx link](#)

Public Comment Call-In: 415-655-0001 / Access Code: 2661 140 6097 Webinar Password: 1145

Listening to the meeting via phone

1. Dial **415-655-0001** and then enter **access code** 2661 140 6097#, then # again
2. Press *3 to enter the Public Comment queue, and you will hear the prompt, “You have raised your hand to ask a question; please wait to speak until the host calls on you.” When the system message says, “Your line has been unmuted,” - **THIS IS YOUR TIME TO SPEAK.**
3. You will be muted when your time to speak has expired.

Watching the meeting on WebEx

1. Join via hyperlink [April 24, 2026 HSB Regular Meeting WebEx link](#)
2. Webinar Password: 1145
3. **Click on the Raise Hand Icon** to be placed in the queue to speak. A raised hand will appear next to your name. When you are unmuted in the system, a request to unmute will appear on your screen, please select unmute to speak.
4. When you are unmuted in the system, a request to unmute will appear on your screen, please select unmute to speak. Once you hear me say “Welcome Caller,” you can begin speaking.
5. When your time has expired, you will be muted. Please click on the Raise Hand Icon to lower your hand.

Members of the public are encouraged to state their name clearly, although you may remain anonymous. You will hear an audible warning when you have 30 seconds remaining. When your 3 minutes have ended, you will be placed back on mute.

Best Practices when Calling in for Public Comment:

- Call from a quiet location
- Speak slowly and clearly
- Turn down any televisions or radios around you
- Address the Commission as a whole; do not address individual Commissioners

Written Public Comment

Persons unable to attend the meeting may submit written public comments regarding an agenda item. These comments will be made part of the official public record and shall be brought to the attention of the Health Service Board. Written public comments expected to be part of the official record should be submitted to the Board email, health.service.board@sfgov.org and **received by 4 p.m. on Thursday, April 23, 2026**, before the meeting. Members can also call 628-652-4646 with any questions.

All comments received by the deadline will be forwarded to Board members, and the Board Secretary will note on the record during the specific agenda item that the Board received written public comment on that item and will include that note in the meeting minutes. In the body of your email, indicate the meeting date and the particular agenda item number. If you do not specify an agenda item, your emailed public comment will be read under general comment.

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** 1:31 p.m.

2. **ROLL CALL:**

Commissioner Fiona Wilson, MD.- Present
Commissioner Mary Hao- Present
Commissioner Diana Guevara- Present

3. **GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT - This is an opportunity for members of the public to comment on any matter within the Board’s jurisdiction that is not on the agenda, including requesting that the Board place a matter on a future agenda.**

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

4. **REVIEW AND RECOMMEND CHANGES TO CURRENT EVALUATION FOR THE HEALTH SERVICE BOARD ANNUAL SELF-EVALUATION: (Action)**

[See pdf of HSB Self-Evaluation for Plan Year 2025](#)

[See pdf of HSB Self-Evaluation Summary of Suggested Changes](#)

[See pdf of HSB Self-Evaluation Summary of Suggested Changes Presentation](#)

Holly Lopez, Board Secretary presented the following items:

- Background and Timeline
- Areas to review: 1. Specific Questions 2. Evaluation Sections 3. Rating Scale 4. Supporting Comments 5. Evaluation Period 6. Board Education
- Today’s Recommendation

Summary of Discussion Points

The committee reviewed each section of the evaluation and considered whether to keep, modify or remove each question. Below is a summary of decisions and discussion for each question. Some questions were a quick agreement with no discussion.

Section: Governance, Structure, and Policies

Q1 — Commissioner Guevara and Hao said the question was too vague as written. Committee members discussed who the “key parties” actually are and concluded the wording should be made more specific. They identified HSS staff, carriers/plan representatives, and stakeholders as the appropriate groups and agreed the question should be modified to reflect those parties rather than use broad terminology like “all key parties.”

Q2 — Remove; not clear how it would be answered.

Q3 — Keep as is

Q4 — Remove

Q5 — Keep as is

Q6 — Remove; Always receive on time, so not helpful for evaluation.

Q7 — Keep as is

Section: Board Member Interactions & Meeting Activities

Q8 — Keep (“Board members are adequately prepared for meetings”).

Q9 — Remove; “well-organized” question flagged as not informative and doesn’t need to be evaluated

Q10 — Modify (remove “strategy” from “Board focuses on policy and strategy in addition to operations”); The committee agreed the question should be modified, noting that the Board’s role is policy-focused, not strategy-focused. Commissioner Hao noted that “strategy” should be removed, as strategic planning is developed by staff and only comes to the Board for approval.

Chair Wilson noted strategy is addressed only every few years and does not regularly drive Board meetings.

Q11 — Modify → split into two questions: (a) understanding/acting in the settlor role; (b) understanding/acting in the fiduciary role; Chair Wilson noted that the suggestion was to expand the question to include both the settlor role and the fiduciary role. Commissioner Hao recommended instead that the item be divided into two distinct questions, explaining that a Board member might understand one role but not the other. Commissioner Guevara agreed.

Q12 — Keep as is

Q13 — Modify-keep question and add the word “professional”; Chair Wilson observed that Questions 13 and 14 addressed similar themes about respect, professionalism, and handling differing opinions. Commissioner Guevara proposed combining the questions and removing question 14. Commissioner Hao suggested that Question 13 should serve as the base. Chair Wilson said if the Board is respectful and professional, disagreements are already implicitly covered. The committee reached consensus to keep Question 13 (with the word “professional” added) and delete Question 14, since its content would be incorporated into the revised Question 13.

Q14 — Remove; content folded into Q13.

Q15 — Modify to combine Q15 and Q16 concepts “The Board adheres to and acts in accordance with its own policies.”. Chair Wilson explained it is difficult to answer these questions because Board members generally cannot observe whether peers are failing to act in accordance with policy. Commissioner Guevara proposed combining adhere and acts in accordance with. Commissioner Hao proposed eliminating the need to evaluate how Board members “manage” each other’s behavior. The committee agreed to keep question 15 with revised wording.

Q16 — Remove (merged into Q15).

Q17 — Modify to “Board members accept decisions of the Board, even if they did not vote in favor and communicate the decision in one voice.”

Q18 — Keep as is

Q19 — Keep as is

Q20 — Keep as is

Section: Evaluation & Goal Setting

Q21 — Modify to “The Board provides feedback on performance goals for the organization as a whole.” Chair Wilson commented that the Board does not typically set organizational goals and therefore does not operate in the “goal-setting” space as described in Question 21. Commissioner Guevara said the Board does provide feedback, it is mostly feedback on performance goals, not on establishing the goals themselves. Commissioner Guevara proposed the question be “The Board provides feedback on performance goals for the organization as a whole.”

Q22 — Remove- Chair Wilson said member-services goal setting is too granular and not Board’s role. The committee agreed.

Discussion about Q23-Q26

Chair Wilson opened by noting that Questions 23, 24, and 25 all address communication, but in slightly different ways. She questioned whether the Board truly “communicates effectively” to staff or service providers outside of meeting settings, and whether “communicating with one voice” applies only after Board decisions. She suggested reframing communication around respectfulness rather than “effectiveness.” Commissioner Guevara expressed concern about the “one voice” requirement, noting that during inquiry and information-gathering phases Board members may communicate different perspectives. She clarified that “one voice” only applies after decisions are made. Commissioner Hao suggested that these questions seemed to address the Board’s communication during a Board meeting rather than as individuals. She proposed tying the “one voice” concept to Question 17, since that item already concerns accepting Board decisions.

Commissioner Guevara supported moving “one voice” under Question 17 and removing Question 25. She noted there are two phases: independent inquiry, followed by unified communication once actions are decided. Chair Wilson agreed and instructed that Question 25 be removed and its “one voice” clause added to Question 17. Returning to Question 23, Chair Wilson suggested changing the wording from “communicates effectively” to “communicates respectfully to staff.” She also noted overlap between Question 24 and Question 26 (trust among stakeholders). Chair Wilson recommended removing Question 24 and combining its concept with Question 26 so that Question 26 would read:

“The Board communicates effectively to and instills trust among stakeholders.”

Commissioner Hao agreed and added that “communicates effectively” should remain.

Q23 — Modify to “The Board communicates respectfully to staff.”

Q24 — Remove-Service-provider communication considered duplicative in Q26.

Q25 — Remove- “one voice” concept moved under Q17 to reflect unity after Board decisions.

Q26 — Modify to combine trust and communication: “Board communicates effectively to and instills trust among stakeholders.”

Q27 — Keep as is

Section: Board’s Interaction with Management

Q27 — Keep as is

Q28 — Keep as is

Q29 — Keep as is

Q30 — Keep as is

Q31 — Keep as is

Discussion on Q32 and Q33

Chair Wilson reviewed question 32 “The Board effectively evaluates the Executive Director’s performance” and question 33 – “The Board provides helpful feedback to enhance future performance” noting they were closely related. She suggested they might be combined, since both address evaluation and feedback. She also noted that although the Board can provide feedback, it cannot determine whether the Executive Director finds it “helpful.” Commissioner Hao proposed combined wording for Q32 and Q33: “The Board effectively evaluates and provides feedback regarding the Executive Director’s performance.” Chair Wilson agreed with this combined version and confirmed that Question 33 would be removed since its content would be folded into the new combined statement.

Q32 — Modify → Combine with Q33 into one statement: “The Board effectively evaluates and provides feedback regarding the Executive Director’s performance.”

Q33 — Remove (merged into Q32).

Q34 — Remove; Chair Wilson recommended removing Question 34, which concerns making recommendations about succession planning, stating it was not necessary to retain.

Q35 — Keep as is

Q36 — Keep as is

Section: Board Education & Final Items

Q36–Q42 — Keep as is

Evaluation Sections: Keep as is

Four sections total.

- Governance Structure and Policies
- Board member interactions and Meeting Activities
- Goal Setting and Communication
- Board’s Interaction with Management

Rating Scale: Modify- rating scale of strongly disagree to strongly agree.; Change “Neutral” rating to Neither Disagree nor Agree”. Chair Wilson recommended keeping the existing 1–5 rating scale,

noting that it allows for year-over-year comparison, especially since many questions are unchanged from prior evaluations. She also felt the scale of “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” remained appropriate and functional. Commissioner Hao suggested revising the neutral option to read “neither disagree nor agree” for greater clarity. The committee agreed.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	----------------------------	-------	----------------

Supporting Comments: Keep as is-Maintain the requirement to provide supporting comments with a 1,2,4,5 rating. If rated a 3, no supporting comments are required.

Evaluation Period: Keep as is- The evaluation period is the calendar year January through December.

Board Education: Modify- SFHSS Staff will create a proposed calendar of education items after the Board submits recommendations for the Education Topics each year. Secretary Lopez asked whether the Board should establish a Board education schedule. She explained this was not part of the evaluation tool, but there was room to develop it as a new practice. Chair Wilson expressed support for the idea of creating an annual calendar of Board education topics. She said mapping out expected topics could reduce ad-hoc requests from Board members and help them anticipate when certain subjects would be addressed. She also acknowledged that although it was a good idea, this meeting was not the place to finalize such a schedule. Secretary Lopez confirmed that while the evaluation includes a section for suggesting education topics, adding a formal schedule would be a separate operational practice implemented by staff rather than a change to the evaluation tool itself.

Commissioner Hao moved to approve all the changes to the current evaluation for the Health Service Board annual self-evaluation as discussed. Commissioner Guevara seconded the motion.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

VOTE: Ayes: Hao, Guevara, Wilson Noes: None

ACTION: The Health Service Board Governance Committee unanimously approved the changes for the Health Service Board annual self-evaluation as discussed.

5. REVIEW AND RECOMMEND CHANGES TO CURRENT EVALUATION FOR THE ANNUAL EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: (Action)

[See pdf of HSB Employee Performance Evaluation of SFHSS ED 2025](#)

[See pdf of HSB Employee Performance Evaluation Summary of Suggested Changes](#)

[See pdf of HSB Employee Performance Evaluation of SFHSS ED 2025 questions](#)

[See the PDF of HSB Employee Performance Evaluation Summary of Suggested Changes Presentation](#)

Holly Lopez, Board Secretary presented the following items:

- Background and Timeline
- Areas to review: 1. Questions 2. Evaluation Sections 3. Rating Scale 4. Supporting Comments 5. Evaluation Period 6. Mid-Year Check-in 7. Staff Participation
- Today’s Recommendation

Summary of Discussion Points

Adding Two New Leadership Attributes

1st Item: Secretary Lopez reported that committee members noted the evaluation sections contained appropriate attributes but emphasized that some attributes were not observable by the

Board, and therefore such items should be reconsidered or removed if they could not be directly evaluated.

2nd Item: Secretary Lopez further stated that members recommended adding a fiscal-responsibility question under the Resource Management section to clearly reflect the Executive Director's accountability for managing and adhering to the approved departmental budget, in coordination with the Chief Financial and Affordability Officer.

Chair Wilson opened the discussion by noting challenges encountered during the previous evaluation cycle, specifically the Board evaluated an Executive Director who had only been in the role for half of the year. Chair Wilson explained that the individual had not yet completed a full annual cycle, making a traditional year-end evaluation difficult. Chair Wilson proposed keeping the current evaluation tool in place for a mid-year review, emphasizing the value of early feedback for an Executive Director who has not yet completed a full year in the role. Commissioner Guevara agreed, noting that mid-year evaluations are common for new employees and provide necessary guidance during the first year. Commissioner Guevara added that given recent leadership transitions, a mid-year review should become standard practice for any new Executive Director. Chair Wilson raised whether the tool should be shared with the Executive Director to identify missing elements, but Commissioner Hao expressed concern about having employees influence the structure of their own evaluation. Commissioner Hao clarified that evaluation criteria should focus on leadership attributes rather than specific projects, and Chair Wilson agreed.

Chair Wilson recommended adding a fiscal-responsibility question to the evaluation tool under Resource Management, noting that a clearer reference to departmental budget oversight should be included. Commissioner Hao suggested wording that emphasized the Executive Director working closely with the Chief Financial and Affordability Officer (CFAO) to manage and adhere to the approved budget. Commissioner Guevara supported this concept but emphasized that the Executive Director must also maintain overall responsibility for the departmental budget, even while the Chief Financial and Affordability Officer manages day-to-day monitoring and adjustments, thus both collaboration and ultimate accountability. The committee agreed to "The Executive Director assumes overall responsibility for the department's budget and works closely with the Chief Financial and Affordability Officer to manage and adhere to the approved budget."

Chair Wilson also identified a gap related to innovation and change management, suggesting that the evaluation should reflect the Executive Director's role in adapting to evolving systems and organizational needs. Commissioner Guevara questioned whether the evaluation should emphasize merely "embracing" innovation or also initiating and practicing it and highlighted the need for clarity in how innovation relates to operational and technological changes. Commissioner Hao cautioned that some aspects of innovation may not be directly observable by the Board, resulting in a reliance on the Executive Director's self-evaluation and demonstrated accomplishments to support scoring. Chair Wilson responded that including such a question signals expectations and prompts the Executive Director to demonstrate how innovation and change management are being practiced. Chair Wilson supported language that the Executive Director should "embrace and practice" innovation and change management, noting that innovation encompasses both technology and organizational adaptation. Commissioner Guevara expressed concern that the wording would not become too narrowly focused on technology and agreed that the Executive Director should embrace the adoption of new technology and broader change management. Commissioner Hao added that the Executive Director should demonstrate being nimble in responding to innovation and managing organizational change. The committee agreed to adding a sentence within the Leadership and Vision section that "the Executive Director

be nimble in embracing innovations and change management.”

Rating Scale

Chair Wilson initially suggested that the current 5-point rating scale remains in place. Commissioner Hao expressed a preference for a 3-point scale, noting difficulty distinguishing between “above expectations” and “exceptional performance,” and suggesting a simpler structure of exceeds, meets, or does not meet expectations. Chair Wilson said that changing the scale would reduce comparability with prior evaluations, which is an important consideration. Commissioner Guevara agreed that the 5-point scale’s upper distinctions can be ambiguous, but emphasized that the broader range is helpful for identifying “needs improvement” versus “failing,” especially in a mid-year review. The Committee agreed to keep the scale unchanged. The committee agreed to maintain the requirement to provide supporting comments with a 1,2,4,5 rating. If rated as 3, no supporting comments are required.

Staff Participation and Mid-Year Check-in

Commissioner Hao recommended keeping the same pool of evaluators (the full Board) for the mid-year to maintain consistent comparability in the first year, noting that newly added evaluation points (budget and innovation) would be targeted for the annual cycle (December/January). Chair Wilson agreed that the full Board should conduct the mid-year review, emphasizing the value of broad feedback for a relatively new Executive Director. Secretary Lopez proposed June/July (during the Board’s typical July recess) for Board members to complete the evaluation, with results brought back at the August meeting; asked whether the committee should see the results first or proceed directly to the full Board closed session. Chair Wilson indicated the committee might review first but noted that the decision did not need to be finalized at that moment. Secretary Lopez confirmed marking July as the mid-year checkpoint and that Board members would take the evaluation. Chair Wilson emphasized including input from the full leadership team for the mid-year check-in and continuing the practice going forward.

Evaluation Sections:

Secretary Lopez asked whether any of the overarching evaluation sections should be removed, noting that the material had been reorganized into bullet points to help the committee assess whether all attributes still fit the Board’s needs. Chair Wilson stated that the sections appeared appropriate as presented and confirmed that the newly added questions—effective beginning with the next evaluation cycle—addressed the committee’s intended updates.

Clarify term “Client”

Rin Coleridge asked how the committee interprets the term “client” within both the Collaboration and Communication section and the Client Service Focus section, noting that the term could refer either to employer groups or to members. Chair Wilson initially described clients broadly as current employees, departments, and retirees, but acknowledged the need for clearer terminology. Rin Coleridge explained that, in the strictest sense, employers are the clients because they contract with HSS for services, while members are participants who access benefits; therefore, the evaluation tool should clarify which group is meant. Commissioner Hao suggested that the term “clients” could be clarified with a parenthetical list, such as the community college district, SFUSD, and the courts, but also raised concerns about inconsistent use of “employees” in other sections. Rin Coleridge pointed out that in the Collaboration and Communication section, the term “employees” may incorrectly refer to members instead of HSS staff and suggested revising “employees” to “HSS staff.” Chair Wilson agreed with replacing “employees” with “HSS staff” for clarity and supported defining clients in the Client Service Focus section as “employer groups and their members.” The committee agreed to replace “employees” with “HSS staff” in the

Collaboration and Communication section and define “clients” in the Client Service Focus section as employers and their members.

Commissioner Hao moved to approve the recommended changes to the annual employee performance evaluation of the Executive Director for full Board Approval, including conducting a mid-year evaluation in July 2026, and adopting the newly discussed evaluation attributes—fiscal responsibility and innovation and change management—effective with the next annual evaluation cycle. Commission Guevara seconded the motion.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

VOTE: Ayes: Hao, Guevara, Wilson Noes: None

ACTION: The Health Service Board Governance Committee unanimously approved the recommended changes to the annual employee performance evaluation of the Executive Director for full Board Approval, including conducting a mid-year evaluation in July 2026, and adopting the newly discussed evaluation attributes—fiscal responsibility, innovation, and change management—effective with the next annual evaluation cycle.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

6. **ADJOURNMENT:** 2:48 p.m.

Health Service Board and Health Service System Website: <https://www.sfhss.org/>

Summary of Health Service Board Rules Regarding Public Comment

1. There will be an opportunity for public comment at the beginning of the meeting, and there will be an opportunity to comment on each discussion or action item on the agenda. A member may comment on any matter within the Board's jurisdiction as designated on the agenda.
2. A member of the public has up to three (3) minutes to make pertinent public comments; the Chair has the discretion to limit public comment to less than 3 minutes per member of the public.
3. Public Comment can be given in-person, remotely, or written.
4. Members may submit their comments by email to health.service.board@sfgov.org by 5 p.m. the day before the meeting start time. These comments will be made part of the official public record and shall be brought to the attention of the Health Service Board. All comments received by the deadline will be forwarded to Board members and the Board Secretary will note on the record during the specific agenda item that the Board received written public comment on that item and will include that note in the meeting minutes. In the subject line of your email, indicate the meeting date and the specific agenda item number. If you do not specify an agenda item, your emailed public comment will be read under general comment.
5. Remote public comment from people who have received accommodation due to disability will not count toward the 30-minute limit.

Knowing Your Rights Under the Sunshine Ordinance

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decision in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the City and County of San Francisco 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. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, visit the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force website at <http://www.sfgov.org/sunshine>.

Summary of Health Service Board Rules Regarding Cell Phones and Pagers

The ringing and use of cell phones, pagers, and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at Health Service Board and committee meetings. The Chair of the meeting may order the removal of any person(s) in violation of this rule from the meeting room. The Chair of the meeting may allow an expelled person to return to the meeting following an agreement to comply with this rule. The complete rules are outlined in Chapter 67A of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Disability Access and Accommodation

Regular Health Service Board meetings are held at City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, in Hearing Room 416 at 1:00 PM on the second Thursday of each month. The closest accessible BART station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are #42 Downtown Loop and the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro stations at Van Ness and Market and Civic Center. For more information about MUNI accessible services, call (415) 923-6142. There is accessible parking in the vicinity of City Hall at Civic Center Plaza adjacent to Davies Hall and the War Memorial Complex. Accessible seating for persons with disabilities (including those using wheelchairs) will be available. To obtain a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to participate in the meeting, please contact Holly Lopez, at 628-652-4646 at least 48 hours before the meeting, except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline is 4:00 pm the previous Friday.

City Hall Room 416 is wheelchair accessible. There are elevators and accessible restrooms located on every floor. **Wheelchair-accessible entrances are located on Van Ness Avenue and Grove Street. Please note the wheelchair lift at the Goodlett Place/Polk Street is temporarily not available.** After multiple repairs that were followed by additional breakdowns, the wheelchair lift at the Goodlett/Polk entrance is being replaced for improved operation and reliability. We anticipate having a functioning lift after the completion of construction in May 2025.

This meeting will be broadcast and captioned on SFGovTV. Remote public participation is available upon request for individuals who cannot attend in person due to disability. Making a request to participate remotely no later than one (1) hour prior to the start of the meeting helps ensure the availability of the meeting link. Sign Language Interpretation is also available upon request. If requesting remote Sign Language Interpretation, please submit an accommodation request a minimum of 4 business hours prior to the start of the meeting. 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 Holly Lopez, holly.lopez@sfgov.org, 628-652-4646.

To access the meeting remotely as an accommodation, please use [April 24, 2026 HSB Regular Meeting WebEx link](#) or call 415-655-0001. Please find instructions at the beginning of this agenda for how to use WebEx for the purposes of remote public comment.

Sensitivity to Chemical-based Products

To assist the City's effort to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, 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.

Location of Materials

If any materials related to an item on this agenda have been distributed to the Health Service Board after the distribution of the agenda packet, those materials are available for public inspection at the Health Service System during normal office hours. For more information, please contact Holly Lopez at 628-652-4646 or email holly.lopez@sfgov.org. The following email has been established to contact all members of the Health Service Board: health.service.board@sfgov.org.

Lobbyist Registration and Reporting Requirements

Individuals and entities influencing or attempting to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code § 2.100] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the San Francisco Ethics Commission at 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 252-3100; fax (415) 252-3112; web site <https://sfethics.org/>

ChatGPT and Microsoft CoPilot AI were used to summarize and clarify discussion points in the agenda.