

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2014 Response	2014 Response Text	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2012-13	Are the Wheels Moving Forward?	1.1. Bicycle safety education should be continued, expanded and extended to non-cyclists and motorists.	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency	Recommendation Implemented	In addition to the numerous bicycle safety courses described in the Civil Grand Jury Report, the SFMTA has implemented the additional safety education initiatives in 2013 and 2014: increased taxi driver training programs, transit operator education programs, distribution of foldable bicycle map and bicycle guides that includes key safety messages, distribution of bicycle lights and bells. In 2014, the SFMTA also partnered with the Mayor's Office of the Be Nice Look Twice educational campaign. The SFMTA continues to roll out and expand our safety education programs to an increasingly diverse population.	**	
2012-13	Are the Wheels Moving Forward?	1.2. SFMTA should collaborate with SFBC to include SFBC flyers that promote and provide bicycle education in SFMTA Renewal Residential Parking Permit packets.	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency	Will Not be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	Recommendation will not be implemented as it would be administratively and financially burdensome. The residential permit parking permit mailings are sent using an automated process that is not conducive to including external materials.	**	
2012-13	Are the Wheels Moving Forward?	1.3. Provide incentives to participants who complete SFBC Urban Bicycling Workshops in order to increase enrollment. Incentives could include SFMTA's City Pass, MUNI Passport or Clipper Card.	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency	Will Not be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	Recommendation will not be implemented because classes are already oversubscribed and additional incentives for attendance are not needed. Rather, efforts should focus on identifying additional grant funds to expand the reach of classes.	**	
2012-13	Are the Wheels Moving Forward?	1.4. Publicize classes and promote safe roadway behavior (share the road, obey traffic laws, etc.) on banners, billboards, and signs throughout the City, including MUNI bus stop shelters and the sides of MUNI vehicles.	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency	Recommendation Implemented	The Mayor's Office Developed a "Be Nice Look Twice" safety educational campaign with includes safety messages in MUNI stations and on buses. Messages encourage motorists to drive careful and to look out for others, including people riding bikes. Other initiatives may be developed in the future.	**	
2012-13	Are the Wheels Moving Forward?	1.5. Offer bicycle-training courses to private San Francisco businesses.	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency	Recommendation Implemented	The SFMTA has launched a new Commute by Bike pilot program targeting employers and employees. The program is funded through a Transportation for Clean Air (TFCA) grant and contracts with the SFBC to provide bicycle training classes and technical assistance to employers. The program will start with 75 companies, totaling 7500 employees, in 4-5 neighborhoods throughout the city. The program will include bicycle safety classes, online contests to encourage bicycle use, and an evaluation to determine how best to design and expand similar programs in the future.	**	
2012-13	Are the Wheels Moving Forward?	2.1. SFPD should expand training related to bicycle safety and enforcement and implement the following:	San Francisco Police Department	Recommendation Implemented	Had been implemented prior to the original report's release.	**	
2012-13	Are the Wheels Moving Forward?	2.2. SFPD should establish a comprehensive bicycle safety training program for new recruit officers, as well as ongoing bicycle training in its continuing education program for police officers, i.e., a stand-alone class reviewing California Vehicle Code and Traffic Code provisions specific to bicycling	San Francisco Police Department	Recommendation Implemented	Had been implemented prior to the original report's release. The Police Department currently has bicycle safety training, and has had such for many years, including recertification training for officers as outlined below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruit officers receive 16 hours of traffic enforcement training. As part of the 16 hours, there is one hour of training specific to bicycle enforcement. Recruit officers receive 40 hours of traffic collision investigation. Within that time, bicycle enforcement is discussed at specific points of the instruction. From 2001 to present, approximately 320 members have been certified in bicycle operations through a three day in-house education/training course. An additional 260 members have been recertified through a one day refresher course. 	**	
2012-13	Are the Wheels Moving Forward?	2.3. SFPD should create an updated bicycle safety video modeled on Chicago's "Traffic Enforcement for Bicycle Safety" that includes all California Vehicle Codes and Traffic Codes related to bicycles.	San Francisco Police Department	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Police Department continues to work with the Bicycle Coalition on the production of a bicycle safety video. Once the content is scripted and mutually agreed upon, production of the video will be scheduled.	Recommendation Implemented	On February 24, 2014, the SFPD created a video in coordination with the SF Bicycle Coalition, Walk SF, and other stakeholders in regard to traffic safety. The video addresses all safe bicycling and enforcement concerns and all those involved with the production approved of the final product. An abbreviated form of the video was produced and released to the public for further awareness. The SFPD made this video part of required training for all officers and by June 2015, all members of the department had acknowledged receipt of the training. In 2016, the SFPD will release the training again as an update; however, there have been no changes to any of the laws addressed in the video.
2012-13	Are the Wheels Moving Forward?	3. SPFD should update the citation form to include a category for bicycle infractions.	San Francisco Police Department	Recommendation Implemented	Had been implemented prior to the original response, July 2013.	**	
2012-13	Are the Wheels Moving Forward?	4.1. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should support SFPD efforts to successfully enforce roadway laws by adopting a San Francisco Bicycle Enforcement Safety Agreement that would pursue the goals of zero bicycle fatalities and a 50% annual reduction in bicycle collisions.	Mayor	Will Be Implemented in the Future	See response to 4.2	Recommendation Implemented	See response to 4.2
2012-13	Are the Wheels Moving Forward?	4.1. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should support SFPD efforts to successfully enforce roadway laws by adopting a San Francisco Bicycle Enforcement Safety Agreement that would pursue the goals of zero bicycle fatalities and a 50% annual reduction in bicycle collisions.	Board of Supervisors	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Board of Supervisors reports that it has not implemented but will implement Recommendation 4.1 within six months of the publication of the Civil Grand Jury report, from June 10, 2013 to no later than December 10, 2013. (File No. 130602 Resolution No. 338-13)	Recommendation Implemented	Pursuant to Charter, Section 2.114, the Non-Interference In Administration clause, the Board of Supervisors (Board) shall deal with administrative service or other functions only through the department head, elective or executive officer. On March 13, 2014, the Board held a hearing with Police Department and the Municipal Transportation Agency to investigate the recommendation and the departments position; and ultimately expressed support for the recommendation. The Board considers its responsibility required under the California Penal Code, Section 933.05(b) to " have been implemented" (corresponding language in the 2016 Action Plan column). The Board considers their response to have been sufficiently provided. The actual outcome of the implementation should be posed to the listed departments.
2012-13	Are the Wheels Moving Forward?	4.1. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should support SFPD efforts to successfully enforce roadway laws by adopting a San Francisco Bicycle Enforcement Safety Agreement that would pursue the goals of zero bicycle fatalities and a 50% annual reduction in bicycle collisions.	San Francisco Police Department	Will Not be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	No response on the part of the Police Department as this is specific to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.	**	

(1) ***** Response not required: Recommendation has been fully implemented or abandoned.

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2014 Response	2014 Response Text	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2012-13	Are the Wheels Moving Forward?	4.2. Through collaboration with SFPD, BAC, and SFMTA the City should build an Enforcement Safety Campaign around the goals in Recommendation 10 and alert the public to the SFPD enforcement plan that will follow.	Mayor	Will Be Implemented in the Future	In response to the recommendations contained in the "Are the Wheels Moving Forward?" Civil Grand Jury report, the Mayor's Office asked the SFMTA, in conjunction with the Department of Public Health, to convene a working group comprised of city agencies focused on bicycle crash analysis and solutions. As mentioned in the SFMTA response, "This group aims to establish the locations where data demonstrates the highest number and/or severity of traffic collisions involving bicyclists, and make recommendations for engineering, education, enforcement and evaluation actions. This effort parallels the analysis and planning work that has already been done for pedestrian crashes through the Pedestrian Safety Task Force." This March, the SFMTA will convene a larger steering committee to review the analysis and assemble the recommendations. Additionally, the Mayor, along with SFMTA, SFPD, and the Fire Department announced a new "Be Nice, Look Twice" public awareness campaign. Launched last month, the campaign will remind all road users to not only slow down and pay more attention to their surroundings, but also help and care for one another as we all travel San Francisco's streets and sidewalks. In addition to the new public awareness campaign, the SFPD will increase enforcement on City streets. The SFPD will target 50 intersections Citywide, leveraging the latest City data to identify and target hotspots. All 10 district stations will participate in the increased enforcement.	Recommendation Implemented	In 2015, SFMTA and SFPD, in partnership with bicycle advocates and safety stakeholders, launched new bicycle safety classes for adults and students at SFUSD Middle Schools and High Schools. A new outreach and education program that will reach cyclists of all availability was also developed. Additionally, training videos, geared toward training drivers of large vehicles, trucks, and passenger vehicles were released and have been viewed by thousands of individuals. SFMTA further deepened their partnership with SFPD around back-to-school safety and outlining an anti-speeding program that is fully funded and launching in 2016.
2012-13	Are the Wheels Moving Forward?	4.2. Through collaboration with SFPD, BAC, and SFMTA the City should build an Enforcement Safety Campaign around the goals in Recommendation 10 and alert the public to the SFPD enforcement plan that will follow.	Board of Supervisors	Requires Further Analysis	Board of Supervisors reports that it requires further analysis for Recommendation 4.2 for reasons as follows: the Board will evaluate what collaboration with the SFPD, Bicycle Advisory Committee, and SFMTA would look like; and conduct this evaluation within six months of the publication of the Civil Grand Jury report, from June 10, 2013 to no later than December 10, 2013. (File No. 130602 Resolution No. 338-13)	Recommendation Implemented	Pursuant to Charter, Section 2.114, the Non-Interference In Administration clause, the Board of Supervisors (Board) shall deal with administrative service or other functions only through the department head, elective or executive officer. On March 13, 2014, the Board held a hearing with Police Department and the Municipal Transportation Agency to investigate the recommendation and the departments position; and ultimately expressed support for the recommendation. The Board considers its responsibility required under the California Penal Code, Section 933.05(b) to "have been implemented" (corresponding language in the 2016 Action Plan column). The Board considers their response to have been sufficiently provided. The actual outcome of the implementation should be posed to the listed departments.
2012-13	Are the Wheels Moving Forward?	4.2. Through collaboration with SFPD, BAC, and SFMTA the City should build an Enforcement Safety Campaign around the goals in Recommendation 10 and alert the public to the SFPD enforcement plan that will follow.	San Francisco Police Department	Will Be Implemented in the Future	<i>Implemented:</i> The SFPD has initiated numerous enforcement operations to address transit safety in the City. Those operations have been data driven. Our primary enforcement effort is entitled "Focus on the Five" which directs our resources to the top five problematic intersection in each of the 10 police districts. This effort also directs our officers to focus their efforts on observing and issuing citations for the top five traffic violations that are the primary cause of traffic collisions (speeding, red light running, stop sign violations, drivers that fail to yield to pedestrians in crosswalks and failing to yield while making left or u-turns). The SFPD and SFMTA have distributed reports to the public that identifies the most problematic areas of the city as it relates to traffic collisions. The SFPD district stations regularly inform their respective communities of enforcement efforts. We routinely coordinate enforcement efforts with the media in an effort to use these enforcement operations as educational opportunities. Through these collaborative efforts with the media, we highlight the problematic behavior as it relates to transit safety, showcasing the enforcement efforts which will ultimately change behavior. The SFPD regularly attends BAC meetings and advise of our enforcement efforts. In January 2014, the SFPD representative attended a meeting of BAC to address concerns on enforcement efforts. <i>Still to be implemented:</i> A collaborative "Enforcement Safety Campaign" with input from BAC is still in the works.	Recommendation Implemented	<i>Implemented:</i> Although the collaborative "Enforcement Safety Campaign" with input from BAC is still in the works, a large-scale educational campaign will begin in 2016 with SF MTA in the lead. The SFPD continues to work with additional agencies to provide information to the public. DPH publishes a collision map on their public website, "Transbase," which includes the citywide high-injury locations. In addition, the SFPD maintains a strong partnership with the California Highway Patrol to provide educational resources to the community as well as participating in enforcement operations. The SFPD maintains a Twitter accounts, @SFTrafficsafety to keep the community apprised of traffic-related issues. Media outlets are invited to participate in "ride-alongs" with officers to demonstrate to the public how to be safe on our roadways. Additional outreach is conducted targeted more vulnerable populations including children, students, elderly, bicyclists, and pedestrians. The SFPD publishes our monthly statistics, including citations issued and collision totals, on our website.
2012-13	Are the Wheels Moving Forward?	4.2. Through collaboration with SFPD, BAC, and SFMTA the City should build an Enforcement Safety Campaign around the goals in Recommendation 10 and alert the public to the SFPD enforcement plan that will follow.	Bicycle Advisory Committee	--	Agency elected not to respond.	--	Agency elected not to respond.
2012-13	Are the Wheels Moving Forward?	4.2. Through collaboration with SFPD, BAC, and SFMTA the City should build an Enforcement Safety Campaign around the goals in Recommendation 10 and alert the public to the SFPD enforcement plan that will follow.	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The SFMTA is a partner in the Vision Zero Task Force, which is developing solutions to reducing the number of fatalities on San Francisco Streets to Zero. The SFMTA is a committed partner and is able to provide guidance on effective enforcement strategies. This effort will likely include enforcement recommendations to improve bicycle safety to be implemented by the SFPD.	Recommendation Implemented	In 2015, SFMTA, in partnership with SFPD, bicycle advocates and safety stakeholders launched new bicycle safety classes for adults and students at SFUSD Middle Schools and High Schools. A new outreach and education program that will reach cyclists of all availability was also developed. Additionally, training videos, geared toward training drivers of large vehicles, trucks, and passenger vehicles were released and have been viewed by thousands of individuals. SFMTA further deepened their partnership with SFPD around back-to-school safety and outlining an anti-speeding program that is fully funded and launching in 2016.
2012-13	Auditing the City Services Auditor: You Can Only Manage What You Measure	1.1 The CSA include department inputs measures in the APMR.	Controller	Recommendation Implemented	Continuous improvement in the use of performance data in the measurement and management of the City are key program goals. Each year, CSA works to bring additional input, output and unit cost measures into the APMR, with new measures added and removed each year. Over 80 input measures are currently tracked in the system. Further, it should be noted that the APMR is not the only tool used to provide this information to the public. During this past year, we also released an interactive website, SF OpenBook, that gives the public access to a large amount of the City's financial, economic, demographic, and performance information, with plans to expand and better integrate this data in the current and future fiscal years. We believe that, over time, this tool will become a better platform for providing performance, financial, and other information to the public than the APMR.	**	
2012-13	Auditing the City Services Auditor: You Can Only Manage What You Measure	1.2 The CSA include department per capita cost calculations in the APMR.	Controller	Recommendation Implemented	Per Capita Measures are not formally mandated or mentioned in Appendix F. As noted in the Grand Jury Report, "Reporting per capita costs for cities that may have different service levels (outputs) has the potential to be misleading." Similarly comparing departmental efficiency according to their per capita costs could be inaccurate when different types of services and costs are provided. We do believe, however, that per capita cost information, properly presented, can provide helpful information to both the public and City management, and have incorporated these high-level measures into our regular benchmarking reports. We will explore the incorporation of per capita cost calculations in other public reporting, potentially including the APMR, SF OpenBook, or other reporting formats.	**	
2012-13	Auditing the City Services Auditor: You Can Only Manage What You Measure	1.3 The CSA include department outputs measures in the APMR.	Controller	Recommendation Implemented	Continuous improvement in the use of performance data in the measurement and management of the City are key program goals. Each year, CSA works to bring additional input, output and unit cost measures into the APMR, with new measures added and removed each year. Over 100 output measures are currently tracked in the system. Further, it should be noted that the APMR is not the only tool used to provide this information to the public. During this past year, we also released an interactive website, SF OpenBook, that gives the public access to a large amount of the City's financial, economic, demographic, and performance information, with plans to expand and better integrate this data in the current and future fiscal years. We believe that, over time, this tool will become a better platform for providing performance, financial, and other information to the public than the APMR.	**	

(1) ***** Response not required: Recommendation has been fully implemented or abandoned.

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2014 Response	2014 Response Text	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2012-13	Auditing the City Services Auditor: You Can Only Manage What You Measure	1.4 The CSA report cost- output labor measures (cost per unit of output or the units of service provided per full time equivalent employee)	Controller	Recommendation Implemented	Continuous improvement in the use of performance data in the measurement and management of the City are key program goals. Each year, CSA works to bring additional input, output and unit cost measures into the APMR, with new measures added and removed each year. Currently, 16 departments now have labor efficiency measures tracked in the system. Further, it should be noted that the APMR is not the only tool used to provide this information to the public. During this past year, we also released an interactive website, SF OpenBook, that gives the public access to a large amount of the City's financial, economic, demographic, and performance information, with plans to expand and better integrate this data in the current and future fiscal years. We believe that, over time, this tool will become a better platform for providing performance, financial, and other information to the public than the APMR.	**	
2012-13	Auditing the City Services Auditor: You Can Only Manage What You Measure	2. The CSA continue to audit the accuracy of reported performance measures in the APMR to ensure an improved error rate that is acceptable to the Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee	Controller	Recommendation Implemented	We concur that continuous work to ensure and improve the accuracy of department-reported performance measures is an important component of the program. The referenced audit of performance measures from the APMR was only a small sample of CSA's work to improve the validity and relevance of performance measures included in the APMR. CSA has since completed our validation effort, which has included review of data from all city departments. CSA has also completed a follow up re-examining all the measures which failed to meet data accuracy standards and setting out an action plan for improving performance measure validity and relevance, and plan to perform continued validation work in the year ahead.	**	
2012-13	Auditing the City Services Auditor: You Can Only Manage What You Measure	2. The CSA continue to audit the accuracy of reported performance measures in the APMR to ensure an improved error rate that is acceptable to the Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee	Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee	Will Be Implemented in the Future	CGOBOC will work with the Controller's Office City Services Auditor to ensure that the performance measures provided by the Departments are as accurate and consistent as possible. We believe that more time is needed in order to better understand and provide feedback on quantifiable reporting. The Committee liaison(s) will review the Performance Measure integrity with the Controller's Office staff and provide helpful suggestions to CGOBOC on suggested improvements.	Recommendation Implemented	CSA's Performance Management program has an ongoing quality control effort that includes checks on the accuracy and source data for measures in the APMR on a sample basis. During FY16 the new Performance Scorecards project set up verification and updating of a selection of critical measures. Error rates overall are improved with these efforts. The CGOBOC liaisons have been briefed on these programs.
2012-13	Auditing the City Services Auditor: You Can Only Manage What You Measure	3. The CSA eliminate performance measures from department performance measurement reports that do not meet the GASB SEA qualitative characteristics (relevance, understandable, comparable) and are inconsistent with the legislative intent of Appendix F."	Controller	Will Not be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	CSA's performance programs includes updating department performance measure sets by working with every department to remove outdated and unused measures and to add new measures that more accurately reflect the work done by departments. The GASB SEA qualitative characteristics are a good starting point for the development of performance measures, but the GASB structure is not the only format that can be used for the development of performance measures. While CSA has the ability to influence department performance measure sets the departments are ultimately responsible for development of performance measures. In addition we believe that BPMS and other platforms should continue to be able to be used by departments to report a variety of types of measures.	**	
2012-13	Auditing the City Services Auditor: You Can Only Manage What You Measure	4.1 The CSA spend and staff to a level that will allow it to fulfill all of the requirements of Appendix F and remain within the dedicated source of revenue under Sec. F1.100(d)(9).	Controller	Recommendation Implemented	As noted above, we believe that we are fulfilling all Charter mandates. At the same time, we are filling vacancies in FY14 and additional staff hours will be made available for the performance program.	**	
2012-13	Auditing the City Services Auditor: You Can Only Manage What You Measure	4.2 The Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee monitor open positions and spending in the CSA to ensure the CSA has adequate staff and consultant resources to ensure that all of the requirements of Appendix F are being achieved.	Citizens' General Obligation Bond Oversight Committee	Recommendation Implemented	The Controller's Office has agreed to incorporate staff mg level and other resource data into their regular reports to CGOBOC so we can monitor this issue.	**	
2012-13	Auditing the City Services Auditor: You Can Only Manage What You Measure	5. The CSA utilize industry standard outputs measures when preparing benchmarking reports.	Controller	Recommendation Implemented	We have published benchmarking reports as follows: Streets and Roads, Jail Population, Library Services, Recreation and Park, Public Transportation. In each of these used industry standards and existing databases. Each benchmark report has been developed using research on industry standard measures. Benchmarks are subject to the availability and comparability of data.	**	
2012-13	Auditing the City Services Auditor: You Can Only Manage What You Measure	6. CSA benchmarking reports provide data that enable the reader to determine that peer cities in the report are providing comparable services (outputs) to San Francisco.	Controller	Recommendation Implemented	Each benchmarking report includes a detailed explanation of the methodology used to determine comparable jurisdictions, and in most cases a formal calculation of a "likeness score."	**	
2012-13	Auditing the City Services Auditor: You Can Only Manage What You Measure	7. Benchmarking reports prepared by the CSA report labor efficiency in the manner prescribed by Sec. F1.101(a)(2).	Controller	Recommendation Implemented	We also believe that unit cost measures are important and have included them in our benchmarking efforts, as possible and appropriate - It is not feasible to always include specific types of measures due to the variation in industry benchmarks and the availability of data. The Street Maintenance report included expenditures per road repavement mile and expenditures per street tree. The Jail report included cost per jail day. The Library report included cost per borrower and program attendees per \$1000 in expenditures. Other efficiency measures included Number of Potholes "Repaired Yearly (In Thousands per Pothole Crew FTE)", "Street Trees Pruned Annually per Tree Maintenance FTE", and other measures. We will continue to work to include efficiency measures in future benchmarking and other reporting. We concur that comparability is an important consideration in benchmarking work. Appendix F, Section 101 states that CSA shall review benchmarks and conduct comparisons of agencies performing similar functions. In each of CSA's published benchmarking reports similar services are compared. Where exceptions were found clarifying context is also researched and included in the report. Both the Jail and Library services reports provided general descriptions of the similarities and differences of the comparison cities, with similar information provided in all future reports.	**	
2012-13	Auditing the City Services Auditor: You Can Only Manage What You Measure	8. The CSA benchmark the City's general fund departments prior to benchmarking the City's enterprise departments.	Controller	Recommendation Implemented	While the majority of our recent and planned benchmarking reports have focused on General Fund operations, we believe that the funding source for a given service should be one consideration among many when setting benchmarking priorities. Benchmark reports planned for FY14 include parks and recreation, transportation, public safety, and financial and debt management, the majority of which are at least partially funded through the City's General Fund.	**	

(1) ***** Response not required: Recommendation has been fully implemented or abandoned.

Status of the Recommendations
by the Civil Grand Jury
2012-13

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2014 Response	2014 Response Text	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	1.1 The DBI management should retain a consultant to update the 2007 BPR findings and recommendations and present the findings to BIC and the DBI Director.	Building Inspection Commission (President)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Department agrees partially with Recommendation 1.1 with respect to providing an update on the implementation of the 2007 BPR recommendations to the BIC and DBI Director. Similarly, the Department agrees partially with Recommendation 1.2 with regard to the development of a detailed action plan with firm due dates for the implementation of those recommendations from the 2007 BPR that have not been fully implemented. The Director will convene the BPR Steering Committee before the end of this year to begin this process. The Department did explore the possibility of hiring a consultant immediately after the 2007 BPR was released in December 2007, but budgetary constraints caused by the severe economic recession made such a step impracticable. Therefore, the Department developed its implementation plan internally, and began to execute that plan in the first quarter of 2008. Responses from the 2008 Customer Satisfaction/Public Perception Survey (Exhibit C) demonstrated that these early implementation efforts were having the desired effect as survey participants indicated their ratings were higher than they would have been as little as six (6) to twelve (12) months prior. When the Department was forced to lay off more than 25 percent of its personnel, 130 professionals, in September of 2008, many of the BPR implementation efforts were put on hold. Nevertheless, the Department adapted to the budgetary and staffing shortages and continued to address the 2007 BPR recommendations to the greatest extent possible. As a result of these ongoing efforts, as of February 2013, the Department had fully implemented more than twenty-five (25) of the 2007 BPR recommendations and partially implemented another twenty (20). Approximately ten (10) of the partially implemented 2007 BPR recommendations will be fully implemented when the new Permit and Project Tracking System is fully tested, staff trained to use the new system, and the new system goes live in early 2014. Therefore, only about fifteen (15) partially implemented recommendations, and seven (7) fully unimplemented recommendations, will remain outstanding as of Quarter One 2014, each of which has been integrated into the Strategic Plan and will be addressed further throughout fiscal year 2013-2014. The Department believes significant progress is being made in implementing the 2007 BPR recommendations and it is committed to completing the implementation in the next fiscal year.	Recommendation Implemented	Pursuant to Charter, Section 2.114, the Non-Interference In Administration clause, the Board of Supervisors (Board) shall deal with administrative service or other functions only through the department head, elective or executive officer. On March 13, 2014, the Board held a hearing with Department of Building Inspection to investigate the recommendation and the departments position; and ultimately expressed support for the recommendation. The Board considers its responsibility required under the California Penal Code, Section 933.05(b) to " have been implemented" (corresponding language in the 2016 Action Plan column). The Board considers their response to have been sufficiently provided. The actual outcome of the implementation should be posed to the listed departments.
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	1.1 The DBI management should retain a consultant to update the 2007 BPR findings and recommendations and present the findings to BIC and the DBI Director.	Board of Supervisors	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Board of Supervisors reports that it has not implemented, but it will implement Recommendation 1.1 within six months of the publication of the Civil Grand Jury report, from July 2, 2013 to no later than January 2, 2014. (File No. 130687 Resolution No. 379-13)	Recommendation Implemented	Pursuant to Charter, Section 2.114, the Non-Interference In Administration clause, the Board of Supervisors (Board) shall deal with administrative service or other functions only through the department head, elective or executive officer. On March 13, 2014, the Board held a hearing with Department of Building Inspection to investigate the recommendation and the departments position; and ultimately expressed support for the recommendation. The Board considers its responsibility required under the California Penal Code, Section 933.05(b) to " have been implemented" (corresponding language in the 2016 Action Plan column). The Board considers their response to have been sufficiently provided. The actual outcome of the implementation should be posed to the listed departments.
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	1.2 The BIC and DBI Director should develop a detailed action plan with firm due dates for implementing BPR report recommendations that the consultant identifies as not completed.	Building Inspection Commission (President)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Department agrees partially with Recommendation 1.1 with respect to providing an update on the implementation of the 2007 BPR recommendations to the BIC and DBI Director. Similarly, the Department agrees partially with Recommendation 1.2 with regard to the development of a detailed action plan with firm due dates for the implementation of those recommendations from the 2007 BPR that have not been fully implemented. The Director will convene the BPR Steering Committee before the end of this year to begin this process. The Department did explore the possibility of hiring a consultant immediately after the 2007 BPR was released in December 2007, but budgetary constraints caused by the severe economic recession made such a step impracticable. Therefore, the Department developed its implementation plan internally, and began to execute that plan in the first quarter of 2008. Responses from the 2008 Customer Satisfaction/Public Perception Survey (Exhibit C) demonstrated that these early implementation efforts were having the desired effect as survey participants indicated their ratings were higher than they would have been as little as six (6) to twelve (12) months prior. When the Department was forced to lay off more than 25 percent of its personnel, 130 professionals, in September of 2008, many of the BPR implementation efforts were put on hold. Nevertheless, the Department adapted to the budgetary and staffing shortages and continued to address the 2007 BPR recommendations to the greatest extent possible. As a result of these ongoing efforts, as of February 2013, the Department had fully implemented more than twenty-five (25) of the 2007 BPR recommendations and partially implemented another twenty (20). Approximately ten (10) of the partially implemented 2007 BPR recommendations will be fully implemented when the new Permit and Project Tracking System is fully tested, staff trained to use the new system, and the new system goes live in early 2014. Therefore, only about fifteen (15) partially implemented recommendations, and seven (7) fully unimplemented recommendations, will remain outstanding as of Quarter One 2014, each of which has been integrated into the Strategic Plan and will be addressed further throughout fiscal year 2013-2014. The Department believes significant progress is being made in implementing the 2007 BPR recommendations and it is committed to completing the implementation in the next fiscal year.	Recommendation Implemented	Pursuant to Charter, Section 2.114, the Non-Interference In Administration clause, the Board of Supervisors (Board) shall deal with administrative service or other functions only through the department head, elective or executive officer. On March 13, 2014, the Board held a hearing with Department of Building Inspection to investigate the recommendation and the departments position; and ultimately expressed support for the recommendation. The Board considers its responsibility required under the California Penal Code, Section 933.05(b) to " have been implemented" (corresponding language in the 2016 Action Plan column). The Board considers their response to have been sufficiently provided. The actual outcome of the implementation should be posed to the listed departments.
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	1.2 The BIC and DBI Director should develop a detailed action plan with firm due dates for implementing BPR report recommendations that the consultant identifies as not completed.	Board of Supervisors	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Board of Supervisors reports that it has not implemented, but it will implement Recommendation 1.2 within six months of the publication of the Civil Grand Jury report, from July 2, 2013 to no later than January 2, 2014. (File No. 130687 Resolution No. 379-13)	Recommendation Implemented	Pursuant to Charter, Section 2.114, the Non-Interference In Administration clause, the Board of Supervisors (Board) shall deal with administrative service or other functions only through the department head, elective or executive officer. On March 13, 2014, the Board held a hearing with Department of Building Inspection to investigate the recommendation and the departments position; and ultimately expressed support for the recommendation. The Board considers its responsibility required under the California Penal Code, Section 933.05(b) to " have been implemented" (corresponding language in the 2016 Action Plan column). The Board considers their response to have been sufficiently provided. The actual outcome of the implementation should be posed to the listed departments.
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	2.1 The DBI management should update departmental policies and procedures.	Building Inspection Commission (President)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Department agrees with this finding and is already in the process of implementing Recommendation 2.1 and has begun to update departmental policies and procedure manuals. These actions will enhance the Department's ability to train new employees and ensure that departmental policies and procedures are applied consistently.	Recommendation Implemented	The Building Inspection Commission has reviewed this finding and determined that the Department has completed Recommendation 2.1 and all departmental policies and procedure manuals are now updated. These actions have enhanced the Department's ability to train new employees and ensure that departmental policies and procedures are applied consistently.

(1) "" Response not required: Recommendation has been fully implemented or abandoned.

Status of the Recommendations
by the Civil Grand Jury
2012-13

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2014 Response	2014 Response Text	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	2.1 The DBI management should update departmental policies and procedures.	Building Inspection Commission (President)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	<p>The Department also agrees with Civil Grand Jury Recommendation 2.1 and has already begun to update departmental policies and procedures. Likewise, the Department agrees with Civil Grand Jury Recommendation 2.2, and has made considerable progress in making departmental policies and procedures easily accessible online internally and, where appropriate, externally.</p> <p>While Civil Grand Jury Recommendation 2.1 has not been fully implemented, significant progress has been made and complete implementation is expected to be achieved by early 2014. DBI managers, line staff, MIS and Accela personnel are working diligently to update and define business rules and workflow processes to ensure that the new Accela Permit and Project Tracking System (Accela System) is a highly efficient, transparent and effective product.</p> <p>In addition, DBI has already generated seventeen (17) Code Information Sheets and made them available online (Exhibit D). By creating current Code Information Sheets and making them readily accessible online, DBI is making significant progress towards ensuring its employees are trained and that departmental policies and procedures are being consistently enforced.</p> <p>Also, as the Code Information Sheets (Exhibit D) demonstrate, these interpretation guidelines have been made accessible online to both internal and external users and feature links to the pertinent code sections so that interested parties can easily access relevant information.</p>	Recommendation Implemented	<p>The Building Inspection Commission agrees with Civil Grand Jury Recommendation 2.1 and the Department currently has some departmental policies and procedures which are accessible online internally and, where appropriate, externally.</p> <p>While Civil Grand Jury Recommendation 2.1 has not been fully implemented, significant progress has been made and complete implementation is expected to be achieved by 2016/2017. DBI managers, line staff, MIS and Accela personnel are working diligently to update and define business rules and workflow processes to ensure that the new Accela Permit and Project Tracking System (Accela System) is a highly efficient, transparent and effective product.</p> <p>In addition, DBI has already generated seventeen (17) Code Information Sheets and made them available online (Exhibit D). By creating current Code Information Sheets and making them readily accessible online, DBI is making significant progress towards ensuring its employees are trained and that departmental policies and procedures are being consistently enforced.</p> <p>Also, as the Code Information Sheets (Exhibit D) demonstrate, these interpretation guidelines have been made accessible online to both internal and external users and feature links to the pertinent code sections so that interested parties can easily access relevant information.</p>
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	2.2 The DBI should make all policies and procedures easily accessible online internally and, where appropriate, externally.	Department of Building Inspection (Director)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	<p>The Department also agrees with Civil Grand Jury Recommendation 2.1 and has already begun to update departmental policies and procedures. Likewise, the Department agrees with Civil Grand Jury Recommendation 2.2, and has made considerable progress in making departmental policies and procedures easily accessible online internally and, where appropriate, externally.</p> <p>While Civil Grand Jury Recommendation 2.1 has not been fully implemented, significant progress has been made and complete implementation is expected to be achieved by early 2014. DBI managers, line staff, MIS and Accela personnel are working diligently to update and define business rules and workflow processes to ensure that the new Accela Permit and Project Tracking System (Accela System) is a highly efficient, transparent and effective product.</p> <p>In addition, DBI has already generated seventeen (17) Code Information Sheets and made them available online (Exhibit D). By creating current Code Information Sheets and making them readily accessible online, DBI is making significant progress towards ensuring its employees are trained and that departmental policies and procedures are being consistently enforced.</p> <p>Also, as the Code Information Sheets (Exhibit D) demonstrate, these interpretation guidelines have been made accessible online to both internal and external users and feature links to the pertinent code sections so that interested parties can easily access relevant information.</p>	Recommendation Implemented	<p>In July 2015, the Department revamped its existing intranet and provided a new and improved intranet accessible by its staff. Through this intranet, updated division, program and policy information is available to staff, 24/7. A staff phonebook with staff pictures and quick division descriptions was developed in 2014 and is updated bi-annually. DBI continues to develop information sheets on new programs or ordinances affecting the department for both internal and external use. In January 2015, DBI developed a monthly e-newsletter, which the Department uses to feature new policy information for use by both internal staff and external stakeholders. Department has also given its external website a facelift by re-arranging pertinent info on its homepages to ensure easy access to most visited pages and key programs by using four box matrix to display the information; creation of key programs page along with respective new program pages that include a robust, built out Mandatory Soft Story Program page along with Unit Legalization, Unit Addition, Fire Safety and Emergency Preparedness and Building Safety Month offerings; providing greater access to operational information for the Plan Review and Permit Services, Inspections and Code Enforcement processes.</p>
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	3.1 The DBI should assess staff needs for leadership and communication training and develop department plans to strengthen areas of weakness.	Department of Building Inspection (Director)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	<p>While the Department continues to pursue additional leadership and communications training opportunities, overriding economic issues and technical code training demands have made full implementation of Recommendation 3.1 difficult to achieve. Also, the Civil Service System, which prohibits staff in one classification from performing the duties of staff in different classifications, makes full implementation of Recommendation 3.3 infeasible. Nevertheless, the Department will continue to explore and increase leadership, communications, technical code and cross-training opportunities by working with the Department of Human Resources to identify additional training opportunities provided within the City. We also will explore the possibility of rehiring an in-house Training Officer, and engage outside training providers where appropriate.</p>	Recommendation Implemented / Will Be Implemented in the Future	<p>DBI developed an Employee Satisfaction Survey to gauge employee work satisfaction, obtain feedback to improve working conditions and interest in training programs. DBI received over 50% participation rate from staff with positive feedback on internal communication efforts, work satisfaction and interest in training programs. Improvements to communication process has been ongoing; DBI has increased dissemination of pertinent program and service information to staff through the use of email notifications and team meeting presentations. Director Hui holds a bi-monthly senior management meeting to discuss key programs, announcements and updates as well as a quarterly DBI-stats meeting that focuses discussion and sharing of performance goal measures and progress. Director Hui also conducts a department-wide meeting annually in October to allow for greater communication and information sharing with all DBI staff. DBI has developed a five-year strategic plan with input and buy-in from line staff, senior managers and executive management team of the goals, measures and results over the next five-years. A full-time Communications Director was hired in August 2014 to help lead the Department's internal and external outreach efforts, goals and campaigns. An internal communications plan will be developed by December 2016 focusing on better information sharing, communication training for speaking and event engagements and will reflect feedback from staff on best internal communication and engagement practices.</p>
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	3.2 The DBI should assess technical skill deficiencies in the DBI staff and develop training plans to strengthen these areas.	Department of Building Inspection (Director)	Recommendation Implemented	<p>Overall, the Department has fully implemented Recommendation 3.2 because skill deficiencies are identified during the annual performance evaluation process for all staff. Strengthening the skills identified is an essential aspect of the staff performance plans for the following year, with specific trainings incorporated into each staff plan. As more resources become available, the Department will pursue additional technical code training opportunities.</p>	**	
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	3.3. DBI should cross-train specific staff members to allow the Department to better respond to fluctuating workloads.	Department of Building Inspection (Director)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	<p>The Department has not fully implemented Civil Grand Jury Recommendation 3.3, as noted above, because Civil Service prohibits staff in one classification from performing the responsibilities of staff in another classification. However, efforts to familiarize staff with the duties of those in the same classifications, but who work in another division within the Department, are under way. For example, the cross-training of Inspectors was addressed in a department-wide email from the Acting Director Tom Hui as recently as June 13, 2013 (Exhibit F). Acting Director Hui appointed Chief Building Inspector Patrick O'Riordan as Chair of the new Cross-Training Team, and identified Chief Building Inspectors Ron Tom and Tony Grieco as team members. In addition, the email explained that all of the Department's new building inspectors would receive cross-training in order to familiarize themselves with the complex functions performed across divisions within three (3) months. Cross-Training Team Chair O'Riordan also recently published a detailed schedule for inspection cross-trainings (Exhibit F). All staff are scheduled to have undergone cross-training by September 5, 2013. 7 Despite the ongoing efforts of the Department to cross-train staff to respond more effectively to fluctuating workloads, staff remains unable to perform duties of those in different Civil Service Classifications. Nevertheless, the Department will continue to explore additional cross-training opportunities, and remains dedicated to ensuring that staff is cross-trained to the greatest extent possible. In addition, DBI will explore the possibility of re-hiring an in-house Training Officer in the next budget, and will identify opportunities where engaging outside trainers would be appropriate.</p>	Recommendation Implemented	<p>Since 2014, DBI has implemented and is currently in the process of continuing a cross-training program for staff to get familiar with respective processes, services, programs and other pertinent information from different divisions and sections. DBI remains dedicated to ensuring that staff is cross-trained to the greatest extent possible to ensure increased training and education.</p>

(1) ***** Response not required: Recommendation has been fully implemented or abandoned.

Status of the Recommendations
by the Civil Grand Jury
2012-13

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2014 Response	2014 Response Text	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	4.1 The DBI Director should conduct an ethical climate survey and use the results to identify areas where improved communication of ethical standards and monitoring of employee behavior are needed.	Department of Building Inspection (Director)	Requires Further Analysis	DBI partially agrees with this recommendation. Civil Grand Jury Recommendation 4.1 has not been fully implemented, but the Department is currently investigating the use of Ethical Climate surveys, such as those used by the City of Oakland, and as referenced in the 2007 BPR, to identify areas where improved communication of ethical standards and codes of professional conduct continue to be a top priority. Toward that end, the Department agrees there is merit to continually assessing public perceptions of its staff, and will go to bid for a new survey in fiscal year 2013-2014 in order to reassess public perceptions about the Department's services, including staff adherence to ethics.	Recommendation Implemented	DBI completed a four-part Customer Satisfaction Survey/Study of its stakeholders on its services, programs and customer service delivery. This study consisted of a 2-day focus group (one focusing on owners and another on contractors); 2-week online survey; over 1,000 in-depth telephone surveys and on-site office intercept surveys conducted in English, Spanish and Chinese. Nearly two-thirds of respondents (over 65%) were satisfied with DBI overall and Overall Respondents feedback received from public highly rated staff customer service delivery, acknowledgement of process and program improvements made over the last couple of years and recommendations on opportunities to continually improve customer service delivery; and improvement for process/program implementation. DBI developed an Employee Satisfaction Survey to gauge employee work satisfaction, obtain feedback to improve working conditions and interest in training programs. DBI received over 50% participation rate from staff with positive feedback on internal communication efforts, work satisfaction and interest in training programs. Improvements to communication process has been ongoing; DBI has increased dissemination of pertinent program and service information to staff through the use of email notifications and team meeting presentations. DBI staff is required annually to complete Form 700s and turn in to the Director's Office. As part of this packet, DBI staff is required to watch an Ethics Training video online to ensure compliance with Ethics training. Annually, staff is required to watch the Public Records video training provided online by the City Attorney's office.
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	5.1 The Board of Supervisors should hold a hearing within six months of the release of this report by the 2012-13 Jury to see if BIC has taken action on the issues raised.	Board of Supervisors	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Board of Supervisors reports that it has not implemented, but it will implement Recommendation 5.1 within six months of the publication of the Civil Grand Jury report, from July 2, 2013 to no later than January 2, 2014. (File No. 130687 Resolution No. 379-13)	Recommendation Implemented	Pursuant to Charter, Section 2.114, the Non-Interference In Administration clause, the Board of Supervisors (Board) shall deal with administrative service or other functions only through the department head, elective or executive officer. On March 13, 2014, the Board held a hearing with Department of Building Inspection to investigate the recommendation and the departments position; and ultimately expressed support for the recommendation. The Board considers its responsibility required under the California Penal Code, Section 933.05(b) to "have been implemented" (corresponding language in the 2016 Action Plan column). The Board considers their response to have been sufficiently provided. The actual outcome of the implementation should be posed to the listed departments.
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	6.1 The DBI should establish performance standards for resolving code violations within designated time frames (for example, closing 75 percent of Notices of Violation within six months and 95 percent within 12 months of when they are issued). The performance standards should be reviewed and approved by BIC in public session.	Building Inspection Commission (President)	Recommendation Implemented	The Department partially agrees with Civil Grand Jury Recommendation 6.1 and believes it has already been fully implemented. The Department utilizes "best practices" and historical data as benchmarks to ensure that staff remains in compliance. The Department's "best practices" adhere to the City Attorney's due process procedures in that they provide for specific periods of time within which the Department must respond to code violations in a well established, step-by-step, and well publicized code enforcement process. Specifically, when a property owner fails to correct cited code violation(s), staff has 30 days to issue a second NOV. If the property owner again fails to address the cited code violation(s) in the specified timeframe, staff has 30 days to prepare the property for a scheduled Director's hearing. DBI has doubled the number of Directors' Hearings in the past year, with Building Code violations heard every Tuesday, and Housing Code Violations held every Thursday. If the property owner fails to attend a Director's Hearing, or to correct the noticed code violation(s), the Department may place the property on the annual delinquent property list, which encumbers the property with the Tax Assessor and ensures the violation(s) are corrected and all penalties paid. The delinquent property list is reviewed and voted upon annually by the Board of Supervisors. At the July 30, 2013 Board Hearing, out of a total of 242 properties placed upon the delinquent list, 158 were placed on this year's list, or 65 percent of those properties notified. The "Complaints and NOVs" chart below illustrates the volume of complaints and NOVs the department has handled between fiscal years 2009-2010 and 2012-2013, and how many of those complaints reached a Director's Hearing and, ultimately, were placed on the Lien Property List. Further, the chart demonstrates that the Department was able to resolve a greater number of complaints than were filed in each of the last two (2) years, meaning that any existing backlog of cases is being reduced year over year. The dramatic decline from 6,030 to 4,040 --33 percent -- reflects DBI's increase in code enforcement staff resources addressing this issue. Historical data indicate that DBI staff has been largely in compliance with the above standards. Specifically, between 2000 and 2012 DBI responded to 135,000 complaints, and, as of the date of this response, approximately 95.5% of complaints have been abated. While about 6,000 of the 135,000 complaints received between 2000 and 2012, or 4.5%, remain open, DBI staff remains in compliance with established performance standards. In addition, managers are providing DBI Deputy Directors with weekly reviews and updates on numbers of complaints received and NOVs issued. Therefore, Civil Grand Jury Recommendation 6.1 has been fully implemented as performance standards do, in fact, exist for resolving code violations within designated time frames. In addition, as recommended, DBI performance standards are reviewed and approved by the BIC in public sessions. Beginning in August 2013, DBI placed a recurring item on the BIC agenda concerning the performance of Code Enforcement staff, which will ensure that performance standards for resolving code violations within designated time frames are being achieved. The Department believes its existing enforcement policies and practices do not create an unreasonably high volume of unresolved cases, and, given that some cases may be complicated, a small number of cases do require more time to resolve. Our goal remains to achieve code compliance and safer structures; it is not to penalize and punish a few owners who may be in difficult circumstances and in need of more time to comply. It also is worth noting that when you compare the professional services provided to property owners and tenants by cities throughout the United States, San Francisco's Building Inspection services provide a leadership model that is simply not found in other U.S. cities.	**	

(1) ***** Response not required: Recommendation has been fully implemented or abandoned.

Status of the Recommendations
by the Civil Grand Jury
2012-13

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2014 Response	2014 Response Text	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	6.1 The DBI should establish performance standards for resolving code violations within designated time frames (for example, closing 75 percent of Notices of Violation within six months and 95 percent within 12 months of when they are issued). The performance standards should be reviewed and approved by BIC in public session.	Department of Building Inspection (Director)	Recommendation Implemented	The Department partially agrees with Civil Grand Jury Recommendation 6.1 and believes it has already been fully implemented. The Department utilizes "best practices" and historical data as benchmarks to ensure that staff remains in compliance. The Department's "best practices" adhere to the City Attorney's due process procedures in that they provide for specific periods of time within which the Department must respond to code violations in a well established, step-by-step, and well publicized code enforcement process. Specifically, when a property owner fails to correct cited code violation(s), staff has 30 days to issue a second NOV. If the property owner again fails to address the cited code violation(s) in the specified timeframe, staff has 30 days to prepare the property for a scheduled Director's hearing. DBI has doubled the number of Directors' Hearings in the past year, with Building Code violations heard every Tuesday, and Housing Code Violations held every Thursday. If the property owner fails to attend a Director's Hearing, or to correct the noticed code violation(s), the Department may place the property on the annual delinquent property list, which encumbers the property with the Tax Assessor and ensures the violation(s) are corrected and all penalties paid. The delinquent property list is reviewed and voted upon annually by the Board of Supervisors. At the July 30, 2013 Board Hearing, out of a total of 242 properties placed upon the delinquent list, 158 were placed on this year's list, or 65 percent of those properties notified. The "Complaints and NOV's" chart below illustrates the volume of complaints and NOV's the department has handled between fiscal years 2009-2010 and 2012-2013, and how many of those complaints reached a Director's Hearing and, ultimately, were placed on the Lien Property List. Further, the chart demonstrates that the Department was able to resolve a greater number of complaints than were filed in each of the last two (2) years, meaning that any existing backlog of cases is being reduced year over year. The dramatic decline from 6,030 to 4,040 -33 percent -- reflects DBI's increase in code enforcement staff resources addressing this issue. Historical data indicate that DBI staff has been largely in compliance with the above standards. Specifically, between 2000 and 2012 DBI responded to 135,000 complaints, and, as of the date of this response, approximately 95.5% of complaints have been abated. While about 6,000 of the 135,000 complaints received between 2000 and 2012, or 4.5%, remain open, DBI staff remains in compliance with established performance standards. In addition, managers are providing DBI Deputy Directors with weekly reviews and updates on numbers of complaints received and NOV's issued. Therefore, Civil Grand Jury Recommendation 6.1 has been fully implemented as performance standards do, in fact, exist for resolving code violations within designated time frames. In addition, as recommended, DBI performance standards are reviewed and approved by the BIC in public sessions. Beginning in August 2013, DBI placed a recurring item on the BIC agenda concerning the performance of Code Enforcement staff, which will ensure that performance standards for resolving code violations within designated time frames are being achieved. The Department believes its existing enforcement policies and practices do not create an unreasonably high volume of unresolved cases, and, given that some cases may be complicated, a small number of cases do require more time to resolve. Our goal remains to achieve code compliance and safer structures; it is not to penalize and punish a few owners who may be in difficult circumstances and in need of more time to comply. It also is worth noting that when you compare the professional services provided to property owners and tenants by cities throughout the United States, San Francisco's Building Inspection services provide a leadership model that is simply not found in other U.S. cities.	**	
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	6.1 The DBI should establish performance standards for resolving code violations within designated time frames (for example, closing 75 percent of Notices of Violation within six months and 95 percent within 12 months of when they are issued). The performance standards should be reviewed and approved by BIC in public session.	Board of Supervisors	Recommendation Implemented	Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation 6.1 has been implemented. (File No. 130687 Resolution No. 379-13)	**	
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	6.2 The DBI should develop monthly management reports for BIC that monitor the Department's performance against BIC-approved performance standards for resolving building code violations.	Building Inspection Commission (President)	Recommendation Implemented	The Department agrees with Recommendation 6.2 with respect to developing monthly management reports for BIC to monitor the Department's performance in continuing to resolve building code violations, especially with the dramatic increase in building projects currently under way throughout San Francisco. The first of these new monthly Code Enforcement Updates was on the August 21, 2013 BIC Agenda. The BIC and the Department also agree to review the Notice of Violation (NOV) process, and to make recommendations for improvements. In addition, we will take additional steps to ensure that customers are aware of our Code Enforcement Outreach Program, where non-profits with multilingual, multicultural and extensive experience in working cooperatively with both tenants and property owners, work closely with the Department to achieve mutually agreeable resolutions of code and habitability issues. The Department already funds these programs with budgetary allocations of more than \$2 million per year, and we will continue to recommend these services to those in situations that would benefit from CEOP 10 assistance. These services are unique to San Francisco; no other U.S. major urban center offers all of these types of services.	**	
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	6.2 The DBI should develop monthly management reports for BIC that monitor the Department's performance against BIC-approved performance standards for resolving building code violations.	Department of Building Inspection (Director)	Recommendation Implemented	The Department agrees with Recommendation 6.2 with respect to developing monthly management reports for BIC to monitor the Department's performance in continuing to resolve building code violations, especially with the dramatic increase in building projects currently under way throughout San Francisco. The first of these new monthly Code Enforcement Updates was on the August 21, 2013 BIC Agenda. The BIC and the Department also agree to review the Notice of Violation (NOV) process, and to make recommendations for improvements. In addition, we will take additional steps to ensure that customers are aware of our Code Enforcement Outreach Program, where non-profits with multilingual, multicultural and extensive experience in working cooperatively with both tenants and property owners, work closely with the Department to achieve mutually agreeable resolutions of code and habitability issues. The Department already funds these programs with budgetary allocations of more than \$2 million per year, and we will continue to recommend these services to those in situations that would benefit from CEOP 10 assistance. These services are unique to San Francisco; no other U.S. major urban center offers all of these types of services.	**	
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	6.2 The DBI should develop monthly management reports for BIC that monitor the Department's performance against BIC-approved performance standards for resolving building code violations.	Board of Supervisors	Recommendation Implemented	Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation 6.2 has been implemented. (File No. 130687 Resolution No. 379-13)	**	

(1) ***** Response not required: Recommendation has been fully implemented or abandoned.

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2014 Response	2014 Response Text	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	7.1 The DBI should review and expand its criteria for using the Building Code's Demolition and Repair Fund to achieve actual abatement of unsafe building conditions.	Department of Building Inspection (Director)	Will Not be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	Recommendation 7.1 will not be implemented because it is not warranted as the Department believes it to be based on an error. Specifically, the 2012-2013 Grand Jury Report contains an error on pages 21-22, in that it states: "...In 2010, the Board transferred \$738,240 from the defunct Code Enforcement and Rehabilitation Fund (CERF) to DBI 'to support code enforcement activities.'" However, DBI receives no General Fund money, and, in this particular instance, DBI actually transferred funds to the Mayor's Office of Housing (the General Fund) to enable that agency to fulfill the earlier-established State requirements for the fund. In fact, the State of California terminated the fund a number of years ago, with the Department having received its last such funding during fiscal year 2003-2004. With the CERF Fund eliminated, reviewing and expanding the criteria for using the funds contained therein to achieve actual abatement of unsafe building conditions is infeasible and no longer germane. In FY 2009-2010, the Board of Supervisors approved a transfer of \$344,331 from the Code Enforcement and Rehabilitation Fund (DBI) to the Mayor's Office of Housing for MOH's Hardship Loan Program. The ordinance authorized the transfer of the funding so that MOH, instead of DBI, would be responsible for the entire program, including the reuse of the Hardship Loan payments to grant additional loans. There is a separate fund, the Building Code's Demolition and Repair Fund, which is subject to the Director's determination of an "emergency" situation. This is defined as a structure being a public safety hazard, and in danger of imminent collapse, as verified by an engineer's inspection, and where a property owner has refused to act as required by law. The Controller's Office issued a report in April 2013 on the Department of Building Inspection Reserves Analysis. It stated that after funding is set aside for an economic stabilization reserve, DBI should designate the remaining fund balance for one-time capital expenditures. The amount that was recommended for the Repair and Demolition Fund Transfer was \$1,000,000. This transfer was approved by the BOS in the FY 2013-14 budget. Upon completion of the transfer, the balance in the Repair and Demolition Fund will be \$1,200,000. Please note that the use of Repair and Demolition funds to cover the costs of an irresponsible property owner is very rare. In the overwhelming majority of "emergency" situations, property owners do act responsibly and follow the directions provided by the Building Official. There was a case at the end of 2012 and resolved in February 2013 where the owner refused to act and the Department went to bid and had the work done in order to address the public safety hazard. The owner was then billed in both March and April, 2013, to recover the City costs expended. As of this writing, the owner has yet to pay and most likely the property will go on the 2014 delinquent property list. While this action will encumber the property, in the Department's experience it is very difficult to recover departmental costs in such cases until City Attorney litigation is successful – an outcome that may take years and which more frequently than not fails to achieve DBI cost recovery.	**	
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	7.2 The Abatement Appeals Board should abide by the Building Code's limits on continuances during the NOV process.	Department of Building Inspection (Director)	Recommendation Implemented	The Department has fully implemented Recommendation 7.2, given that the Abatement Appeals Board voted in April 2013 to limit the number of continuances granted during the NOV and code enforcement process (Exhibit L). This will ensure compliance with the Building Code's limits on continuances during the NOV process.	**	
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	7.3 The Board of Supervisors should review the administrative procedures in the Building Code and consider enacting a process that provides for stronger penalties at the administrative level.	Department of Building Inspection (Director)	Recommendation Implemented	The Department partially agrees with this Recommendation because it can, and does, impose a 9X Penalty for failures to respond and/or cure cited code violations, where work was done without a permit or where work exceeded the permit's scope. While San Francisco's Building Code's 9X penalty is the highest in the State, note that owners appeal this penalty to the Board of Appeals and in more than 99 percent of such appeals, the 9X penalty is reduced to a 2X penalty (Exhibit M). Recommendation 7.3, as noted above, has already been fully implemented. However, since the primary goal is to ensure building safety through code compliance, inspectors try to provide property owners with sufficient time to achieve compliance before resorting to use of the 9X Penalty, which can actually hinder compliance due to its severity. Therefore, a 2X Penalty is commonly imposed since it promotes a positive working relationship while also delivering a firm message to the property owner that compliance must occur. Nevertheless, the Department will explore the viability of using stronger penalties to achieve increased code compliance, and will consult with the BIC and its Code Advisory Committee for concrete recommendations in this area during the current fiscal year.	**	
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	8.1 All DBI enforcement units should use the monetary tools in the Building Code to encourage abatement and to fund enforcement operations.	Building Inspection Commission (President)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Department agrees with Recommendation 8.1. While it has not yet been fully implemented, the Department is continuing to explore ways to best utilize the monetary tools available under the Building Code to encourage abatement and fund enforcement operations. The Department is attempting to strike a reasonable and achievable balance between the enforcement and/or collection of fees and penalties available under the Building Code and working with property owners to achieve compliance. Toward that end, as the chart below illustrates, there is ample reason for the Department to continue working with property owners to achieve compliance rather than seeking the maximum amount available under the Building Code. This is particularly clear when you consider that FY 2012-2013 revenues increased by \$16,808,809, or 30%, from FY 2011-2012 and \$26,441,457, or 57%, from FY 2010-2011. In addition, with revenues trending upwards over the past two years, the Department will have additional staff resources available to encourage abatement and further enforcement activities. Toward that end, the Department has already used some of these increased revenues to triple its Code Enforcement personnel over the past several months, and to double its weekly Code Enforcement Director's Hearings. Overall, the department agrees that more consistent enforcement and/or collection of the fees and penalties available under the Building Code would result in additional resources that could be devoted to enforcement activities. However, as the primary purpose of Code Enforcement is to achieve building safety through compliance where violations have been verified, the Department's field experiences prove that showing some leniency with respect to the assessment and/or collection of fees and penalties is often a superior means to achieving compliance than levying substantially punitive fees and then having to ask the City Attorney to litigate. Even if litigation succeeds, it is often very difficult, if not impossible, to collect the owed penalties and assessments of costs – and such cases take many years to litigate and/or to resolve. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Department will continue to explore opportunities to increase revenues and to use available tools to work with property owners to obtain building safety code compliance.	Recommendation Implemented	DBI has implemented monetary tools to encourage abatement and to fund enforcement operations uniformly across code enforcement divisions that include Code Enforcement Section (CES) and Housing Inspection Services. These tools include the use of a monthly monitoring fee for properties receiving a Notice of Violation from CES, which also have include penalties for working without a permit or work exceeding scope of permit. All code enforcement cases are applied an assessment of costs throughout the life of the code enforcement case processed by CES and HIS. These tools are used to incentivize property owners to comply early on in the code enforcement process and ultimately, help to ensure safe and habitable building and property conditions are maintained.

(1) ***** Response not required: Recommendation has been fully implemented or abandoned.

Status of the Recommendations
by the Civil Grand Jury
2012-13

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2014 Response	2014 Response Text	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	8.1 All DBI enforcement units should use the monetary tools in the Building Code to encourage abatement and to fund enforcement operations.	Department of Building Inspection (Director)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Department agrees with Recommendation 8.1. While it has not yet been fully implemented, the Department is continuing to explore ways to best utilize the monetary tools available under the Building Code to encourage abatement and fund enforcement operations. The Department is attempting to strike a reasonable and achievable balance between the enforcement and/or collection of fees and penalties available under the Building Code and working with property owners to achieve compliance. Toward that end, as the chart below illustrates, there is ample reason for the Department to continue working with property owners to achieve compliance rather than seeking the maximum amount available under the Building Code. This is particularly clear when you consider that FY 2012-2013 revenues increased by \$16,808,809, or 30%, from FY 2011-2012 and \$26,441,457, or 57%, from FY 2010-2011. In addition, with revenues trending upwards over the past two years, the Department will have additional staff resources available to encourage abatement and further enforcement activities. Toward that end, the Department has already used some of these increased revenues to triple its Code Enforcement personnel over the past several months, and to double its weekly Code Enforcement Director's Hearings. Overall, the department agrees that more consistent enforcement and/or collection of the fees and penalties available under the Building Code would result in additional resources that could be devoted to enforcement activities. However, as the primary purpose of Code Enforcement is to achieve building safety through compliance where violations have been verified, the Department's field experiences prove that showing some leniency with respect to the assessment and/or collection of fees and penalties is often a superior means to achieving compliance than levying substantially punitive fees and then having to ask the City Attorney to litigate. Even if litigation succeeds, it is often very difficult, if not impossible, to collect the owed penalties and assessments of costs – and such cases take many years to litigate and/or to resolve. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Department will continue to explore opportunities to increase revenues and to use available tools to work with property owners to obtain building safety code compliance.	Recommendation Implemented	DBI has implemented monetary tools to encourage abatement and to fund enforcement operations uniformly across code enforcement divisions that include Code Enforcement Section (CES) and Housing Inspection Services. These tools include the use of a monthly monitoring fee for properties receiving a Notice of Violation from CES, which also have include penalties for working without a permit or work exceeding scope of permit. All code enforcement cases are applied an assessment of costs throughout the life of the code enforcement case processed by CES and HIS. These tools are used to incentivize property owners to comply early on in the code enforcement process and ultimately, help to ensure safe and habitable building and property conditions are maintained.
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	9.1 The DBI should ensure that management has clearly defined the business rules and workflow processes for the new Accela system.	Building Inspection Commission (President)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Department partially agrees with Recommendation 9.1. While it has not yet been fully implemented, DBI managers, line staff, MIS and Accela personnel have been holding regular technical meetings focused on clearly defining the business rules and workflow processes so as to ensure the Accela system is an efficient, transparent, accurate and reliable product. DBI staff has made considerable progress in satisfying this Recommendation. The 'go live' projection for the first quarter of 2014 will not be actualized without difficulty as Accela had fallen behind as of July 2013 due to its failure to dedicate enough skilled resources to accomplish the agreed-upon tasks. In addition, parts of the analysis and configuration has been incomplete and/or flawed, which has required substantial reworking by implementation team members. However, the CCSF implementation team communicated concerns about the lack of skilled resources and flawed and/or incomplete deliverables to the vendor team, and Accela is in the process of adding additional skilled resources to the project. The Accela System will only be fully implemented after receiving approval from Department management, staff is adequately trained and, ultimately, it is adopted by users and customers.	Recommendation Implemented / Will Be Implemented in the Future	Due to a significant number of defects and failures of the vendor's PPTS software product under simulated daily core business transaction tests, DBI's Director requested a third party IT expert team audit. The Department of Technology awarded this audit contract in February 2016, and findings/recommendations are expected by the end of the current fiscal year (June 2016). Once DBI has these audit results, we will then know whether or not the vendor's product will perform all core DBI business transactions, including these improvements in affordable housing data prioritizations. A further update to provide implementation of this Grand Jury recommendation will be given by September, 2016. During the third-party review, SMEs have been meeting from Monday to Friday, during the morning hours (9am – 12pm) to review, develop and test scripts ensure adequate integration of business processes and requirements in the launched PPTS. At the end of this integrated process, the Department will have a robust and defined accounting of its business rules/requirements and workflow processes to be integrated in the launched PPTS.
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	9.1 The DBI should ensure that management has clearly defined the business rules and workflow processes for the new Accela system.	Department of Building Inspection (Director)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Department partially agrees with Recommendation 9.1. While it has not yet been fully implemented, DBI managers, line staff, MIS and Accela personnel have been holding regular technical meetings focused on clearly defining the business rules and workflow processes so as to ensure the Accela system is an efficient, transparent, accurate and reliable product. DBI staff has made considerable progress in satisfying this Recommendation. The 'go live' projection for the first quarter of 2014 will not be actualized without difficulty as Accela had fallen behind as of July 2013 due to its failure to dedicate enough skilled resources to accomplish the agreed-upon tasks. In addition, parts of the analysis and configuration has been incomplete and/or flawed, which has required substantial reworking by implementation team members. However, the CCSF implementation team communicated concerns about the lack of skilled resources and flawed and/or incomplete deliverables to the vendor team, and Accela is in the process of adding additional skilled resources to the project. The Accela System will only be fully implemented after receiving approval from Department management, staff is adequately trained and, ultimately, it is adopted by users and customers.	Recommendation Implemented / Will Be Implemented in the Future	Due to a significant number of defects and failures of the vendor's PPTS software product under simulated daily core business transaction tests, DBI's Director requested a third party IT expert team audit. The Department of Technology awarded this audit contract in February 2016, and findings/recommendations are expected by the end of the current fiscal year (June 2016). Once DBI has these audit results, we will then know whether or not the vendor's product will perform all core DBI business transactions, including these improvements in affordable housing data prioritizations. A further update to provide implementation of this Grand Jury recommendation will be given by September, 2016. During the third-party review, SMEs have been meeting from Monday to Friday, during the morning hours (9am – 12pm) to review, develop and test scripts ensure adequate integration of business processes and requirements in the launched PPTS. At the end of this integrated process, the Department will have a robust and defined accounting of its business rules/requirements and workflow processes to be integrated in the launched PPTS.
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	9.2 The DBI "subject matter experts" assigned to the Accela implementation team should be given adequate time to respond to consultant questions not addressed by department documentation and to fully assist in system acceptance testing prior to going live.	Building Inspection Commission (President)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Department agrees with this Recommendation. While it has not yet been fully implemented, measures have been taken to ensure that Department "subject matter experts" are provided adequate time to respond to consultant questions throughout the implementation process. Department "subject matter experts" have ten (10) business days to review and provide feedback on the deliverable documents. In addition, there have been many instances where the ten (10)-day period has been extended to provide "subject matter experts" with adequate time to evaluate the deliverable documents and respond. Further, the Department fully expects to participate in system acceptance testing prior to going live, which will consist of three rounds of user acceptance testing with both vendor and internal technical staff team members fully involved. In summation, DBI agrees with Recommendations 9.1 and 9.2, and both goals are on schedule be fully implemented once the Accela System goes live in the first quarter of 2014. Although Recommendations 9.1 and 9.2 will not be fully implemented until early 2014, each has been implemented to the greatest extent possible with management clearly defining the business rules and workflow processes and implementation team members being provided with adequate time to respond to consultant questions not addressed by department documentation as well as being provided with an opportunity to fully assist in system acceptance testing.	Recommendation Implemented / Will Be Implemented in the Future	While the Permit and Project Tracking System (PPTS) has not yet been fully implemented, measures have been taken to ensure that Department "subject matter experts" (SMEs) are provided adequate time to respond to consultant questions throughout the implementation and evaluation process. Department "subject matter experts" have ten (10) business days to review and provide feedback on the deliverable documents. In addition, there have been many instances where the ten (10)-day period has been extended to provide "subject matter experts" with adequate time to evaluate the deliverable documents and respond. During the third-party review, SMEs have been meeting from Monday to Friday, during the morning hours (9am – 12pm) to review, develop and test scripts ensure adequate integration of business processes and requirements in the launched PPTS. The Department fully expects to participate in system acceptance testing prior to going live with the PPTS, which will consist of a minimum of three rounds of user acceptance testing with both vendor and internal technical staff team members fully involved.
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	9.2 The DBI "subject matter experts" assigned to the Accela implementation team should be given adequate time to respond to consultant questions not addressed by department documentation and to fully assist in system acceptance testing prior to going live.	Department of Building Inspection (Director)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Department agrees with this Recommendation. While it has not yet been fully implemented, measures have been taken to ensure that Department "subject matter experts" are provided adequate time to respond to consultant questions throughout the implementation process. Department "subject matter experts" have ten (10) business days to review and provide feedback on the deliverable documents. In addition, there have been many instances where the ten (10)-day period has been extended to provide "subject matter experts" with adequate time to evaluate the deliverable documents and respond. Further, the Department fully expects to participate in system acceptance testing prior to going live, which will consist of three rounds of user acceptance testing with both vendor and internal technical staff team members fully involved. In summation, DBI agrees with Recommendations 9.1 and 9.2, and both goals are on schedule be fully implemented once the Accela System goes live in the first quarter of 2014. Although Recommendations 9.1 and 9.2 will not be fully implemented until early 2014, each has been implemented to the greatest extent possible with management clearly defining the business rules and workflow processes and implementation team members being provided with adequate time to respond to consultant questions not addressed by department documentation as well as being provided with an opportunity to fully assist in system acceptance testing.	Recommendation Implemented / Will Be Implemented in the Future	While the Permit and Project Tracking System (PPTS) has not yet been fully implemented, measures have been taken to ensure that Department "subject matter experts" (SMEs) are provided adequate time to respond to consultant questions throughout the implementation and evaluation process. Department "subject matter experts" have ten (10) business days to review and provide feedback on the deliverable documents. In addition, there have been many instances where the ten (10)-day period has been extended to provide "subject matter experts" with adequate time to evaluate the deliverable documents and respond. During the third-party review, SMEs have been meeting from Monday to Friday, during the morning hours (9am – 12pm) to review, develop and test scripts ensure adequate integration of business processes and requirements in the launched PPTS. The Department fully expects to participate in system acceptance testing prior to going live with the PPTS, which will consist of a minimum of three rounds of user acceptance testing with both vendor and internal technical staff team members fully involved.

(1) """" Response not required: Recommendation has been fully implemented or abandoned.

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2014 Response	2014 Response Text	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	10.1 The DBI should conduct a methodical review of all major business processes to ensure that they are designed to achieve the department objectives and that they include time or due date criteria that can be monitored by information systems.	Building Inspection Commission (President)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Department partially agrees with this Recommendation. Recommendation 10.1 has not yet been fully implemented, but DBI has been conducting a methodical review of all its business processes as part of the implementation process for the new Accela System. In doing so, the Department is ensuring that its business processes are designed to achieve Departmental objectives. The major business processes captured include key attributes comprising performance metrics for monitoring and reporting within the system. The attributes also include time and due date criteria and features recommended in the 2007 BPR. The Department wholly agrees with Finding No. 10 and has engaged in a concerted effort to improve departmental effectiveness through the implementation of the well-designed Accela System. As such, Recommendation 10.1 cannot be said to be fully implemented solely because implementation of the Accela System has been a complex and lengthy process, which is not scheduled to be completed until the first quarter of 2014. However, significant progress has been implementing Recommendation 10.1, and it will become fully implemented once the Accela System goes live.	Recommendation Implemented / Will Be Implemented in the Future	DBI has been conducting a methodical review of all its business processes as part of the implementation process for PPTS, which has been paused to allow for an evaluation by a third-party of current processes and progress in addition to staff evaluation and development of business process and system documents. In doing so, the Department is ensuring that its business processes are designed to achieve Departmental objectives. The major business processes captured include key attributes comprising performance metrics for monitoring and reporting within the system. The attributes also include time and due date criteria and features recommendations in the 2007 BPR. DBI is making a concerted effort to improve departmental effectiveness through the implementation of a robust PPTS.
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	10.1 The DBI should conduct a methodical review of all major business processes to ensure that they are designed to achieve the department objectives and that they include time or due date criteria that can be monitored by information systems.	Department of Building Inspection (Director)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Department partially agrees with this Recommendation. Recommendation 10.1 has not yet been fully implemented, but DBI has been conducting a methodical review of all its business processes as part of the implementation process for the new Accela System. In doing so, the Department is ensuring that its business processes are designed to achieve Departmental objectives. The major business processes captured include key attributes comprising performance metrics for monitoring and reporting within the system. The attributes also include time and due date criteria and features recommended in the 2007 BPR. The Department wholly agrees with Finding No. 10 and has engaged in a concerted effort to improve departmental effectiveness through the implementation of the well-designed Accela System. As such, Recommendation 10.1 cannot be said to be fully implemented solely because implementation of the Accela System has been a complex and lengthy process, which is not scheduled to be completed until the first quarter of 2014. However, significant progress has been implementing Recommendation 10.1, and it will become fully implemented once the Accela System goes live.	Recommendation Implemented / Will Be Implemented in the Future	DBI has been conducting a methodical review of all its business processes as part of the implementation process for PPTS, which has been paused to allow for an evaluation by a third-party of current processes and progress in addition to staff evaluation and development of business process and system documents. In doing so, the Department is ensuring that its business processes are designed to achieve Departmental objectives. The major business processes captured include key attributes comprising performance metrics for monitoring and reporting within the system. The attributes also include time and due date criteria and features recommendations in the 2007 BPR. DBI is making a concerted effort to improve departmental effectiveness through the implementation of a robust PPTS.
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	11.1 The DBI should ensure that all field inspectors and supervisors are fully trained and supported in both the use of the mobile equipment and the mobile Accela application being implemented as part of the Permit and Project Tracking System.	Building Inspection Commission (President)	Recommendation Implemented	The Department agrees with this Recommendation. In an effort to create an environment of efficiency and transparency, the Department has recently assigned new phone devices to 65 field inspectors. The devices provide inspectors the ability to schedule, review and document inspections in real time from the field. Each Smart Phone also has the capability to integrate inspection schedules and inspection results into Department databases, eliminating additional clerical tasks and data entry delays. As Exhibit N evinces, training on the new phone devices is currently under way, and is focused on device functionality with respect to current technologies. In addition, training on the devices and their functionality with respect to the new Accela System will be ongoing at least six (6) weeks prior to going live so as to ensure that users are adequately trained.	**	
2012-13	Building a Better Future at the Department of Building Inspection	11.1 The DBI should ensure that all field inspectors and supervisors are fully trained and supported in both the use of the mobile equipment and the mobile Accela application being implemented as part of the Permit and Project Tracking System.	Department of Building Inspection (Director)	Recommendation Implemented	The Department agrees with this Recommendation. In an effort to create an environment of efficiency and transparency, the Department has recently assigned new phone devices to 65 field inspectors. The devices provide inspectors the ability to schedule, review and document inspections in real time from the field. Each Smart Phone also has the capability to integrate inspection schedules and inspection results into Department databases, eliminating additional clerical tasks and data entry delays. As Exhibit N evinces, training on the new phone devices is currently under way, and is focused on device functionality with respect to current technologies. In addition, training on the devices and their functionality with respect to the new Accela System will be ongoing at least six (6) weeks prior to going live so as to ensure that users are adequately trained.	**	
2012-13	Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population	1. The City should formalize a system to gather information on the characteristics of GGP dwellers and why they live in the Park.	Recreation and Parks	Recommendation Implemented	The City has in place the Coordinated Case Management Services System (CCMS), which provides cross-departmental encounter data on high risk homeless individuals, including park dwellers.	**	
2012-13	Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population	1. The City should formalize a system to gather information on the characteristics of GGP dwellers and why they live in the Park.	Department of Public Health	Recommendation Implemented	CCMS is a web-based database designed to function as an electronic charting, reporting, and communication tool for City teams working with homeless clients served across multiple systems of care. CCMS has data input from SFDPH, SFFD, DPH-Jail Health Services, DPH-Direct Access to Housing, the HOT-Engagement Specialist Team and other systems. The CCMS is used to gather information on the homeless population as a whole as well as special populations, such as Golden Gate Park dwellers. CCMS aggregate reports resulted in more information specific to the population.	**	
2012-13	Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population	1. The City should formalize a system to gather information on the characteristics of GGP dwellers and why they live in the Park.	Mayor	Recommendation Implemented	CCMS is a web-based database designed to function as an electronic charting, reporting, and communication tool for City teams working with homeless clients served across multiple systems of care. CCMS currently has data imputed from DPH, Fire, Jail Health Services, Direct Access to Housing, and the Engagement Specialist Team. This system is used to gather information on the homeless population as a whole and can be used to enter specific information on individuals in Golden Gate Park. Aggregate information, such as profiles of the population, can be developed through CCMS.	**	
2012-13	Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population	2. Information about GGP dwellers should be used to tailor support services to specific populations whose age and circumstances affect their needs and acceptance of services.	Recreation and Parks	Recommendation Implemented	DPH has assigned two 0.5 FTE case managers to Golden Gate Park. These case managers were selected for their ability to provide culturally competent social service outreach to GGP dwellers. Information gained from this dedicated outreach team is used to tailor specific services to the GGP homeless population, which frequently includes high numbers of transgender individuals and transitional age youth, many of whom struggle with substance abuse issues.	**	
2012-13	Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population	2. Information about GGP dwellers should be used to tailor support services to specific populations whose age and circumstances affect their needs and acceptance of services.	Department of Public Health	Recommendation Implemented	With the additional information gleaned from the outreach of the Engagement Specialist Team (EST), 0.5 FTE of two Homeless Outreach Team (HOT) case managers were assigned to GGP. The case managers were selected for cultural competency with the typically younger, often substance and/or alcohol dependent dwellers in Golden Gate Park; including a high frequency of transgender clients, Transition Age Youth (TAY), and individuals with Significant Mental Illness (SMI).	**	
2012-13	Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population	2. Information about GGP dwellers should be used to tailor support services to specific populations whose age and circumstances affect their needs and acceptance of services.	Mayor	Recommendation Implemented	Currently two case managers, working at half time each, have been responding to park rangers, SFPD, and other sourcing for clients specifically from Golden Gate Park. The two case managers were selected for cultural competency with the typically younger, often substance involved and alcohol dependent community. So far, there has been a high frequency of transgender clients, youth aged 18-24, and a few people with severe mental illness who have completed intake and are in service with SFHOT as a result of this outreach. The background information gleaned from case managers helps tailor client services.	**	
2012-13	Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population	3. The City should establish a system to track its outreach efforts among park dwellers and use the information to evaluate effectiveness in reducing the number of park dwellers.	Recreation and Parks	Recommendation Implemented	Golden Gate Park homeless outreach teams will continue to update case management records in CCMS and continue to use CCMS to monitor service-utilization levels by GGP dwellers.	**	
2012-13	Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population	3. The City should establish a system to track its outreach efforts among park dwellers and use the information to evaluate effectiveness in reducing the number of park dwellers.	Department of Public Health	Recommendation Implemented	Continued use of CCMS to monitor service utilization by high-risk individuals, accessing multiple City services. New information is updated in CCMS and shared with the larger HOT team. Interventions and services responses get tailored for individual park dwellers and tracked over time; including, further evaluations of case management needs.	**	

(1) ***** Response not required: Recommendation has been fully implemented or abandoned.

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2014 Response	2014 Response Text	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2012-13	Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population	3. The City should establish a system to track its outreach efforts among park dwellers and use the information to evaluate effectiveness in reducing the number of park dwellers.	Police Department	Will Not be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	Original response remains unchanged pertaining to the Police Department's access to confidential information. Due to HIPPA concerns, the Police Department does not have access to any tracking system in regard to outreach efforts and services provided.	**	
2012-13	Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population	3. The City should establish a system to track its outreach efforts among park dwellers and use the information to evaluate effectiveness in reducing the number of park dwellers.	Mayor	Will Not be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	Instead of establishing a new system to track outreach, CCMS will continue to be used to monitor service utilization by high-risk individuals accessing multiple City services. The information collected will be shared with the larger SFHOT so that the individual's record is updated in CCMS and a support services response, including a further evaluation of the need for case management, can then be tailored to individual park dwellers and tracked over time.	**	
2012-13	Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population	4. The EST should conduct in-person, proactive outreach to park dwellers at different times of the day and night in order to maximize their efforts.	Recreation and Parks	Recommendation Implemented	The Department of Public Health's Engagement Specialist Team has changed its policy to dedicate at least one outreach worker to conduct in-person, proactive outreach to GGP dwellers in tandem with SFPD and/or RPD Park Patrol.	**	
2012-13	Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population	4. The EST should conduct in-person, proactive outreach to park dwellers at different times of the day and night in order to maximize their efforts.	Department of Public Health	Recommendation Implemented	EST outreach workers conduct ongoing, as-needed, and until needed, proactive outreach to GGP dwellers, often in tandem with SFPD and/or Rec & Park security.	**	
2012-13	Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population	5. The SFPD and Park Patrol should expand their outreach to GGP encampments to more areas of the Park and should vary the time.	Recreation and Parks	Recommendation Implemented	RPD has expanded its GGP outreach in conjunction with SFHOT and varied its contact times.	**	
2012-13	Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population	5. The SFPD and Park Patrol should expand their outreach to GGP encampments to more areas of the Park and should vary the time.	Recreation and Parks Commission	Recommendation Implemented	RPD has expanded its GGP outreach in conjunction with SFHOT and varied its contact times.	**	
2012-13	Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population	5. The SFPD and Park Patrol should expand their outreach to GGP encampments to more areas of the Park and should vary the time.	Police Department	Will Not be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	Although the Police Department and Park Police work in concert to patrol the Park, the original response remains unchanged in relation to expanding the hours of patrol in the Park. The Police Department continues to work with Park Patrol, beginning as early as 4:00 am. However, due to lighting conditions and staffing levels that have an impact on officer safety, the Police Department does not plan to patrol earlier in order to provide outreach services.	**	
2012-13	Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population	6. References to the Park's closure time on all park signs, brochures and City websites should be made consistent with the Park Code and Rec & Park Commission resolutions.	Recreation and Parks	Will be Implemented in the Future	Installation of new park signage reflecting GGP's opening and closing hours--consistent with the Park Code and Rec & Park Commission resolutions--will be complete by July 2014. The Department's brochures and website have been updated.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	15-20 closure time signs out of the over 500 already placed throughout park system remain to be installed. These signs will be placed in the natural areas zones and are scheduled to be completed by late summer 2016.
2012-13	Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population	6. References to the Park's closure time on all park signs, brochures and City websites should be made consistent with the Park Code and Rec & Park Commission resolutions.	Recreation and Parks Commission	Will be Implemented in the Future	Installation of new park signage reflecting GGP's opening and closing hours--consistent with the Park Code and Rec & Park Commission resolutions--will be complete by July 2014. The Department's brochures and website have been updated.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	15-20 closure time signs out of the over 500 already placed throughout park system remain to be installed. These signs will be placed in the natural areas zones and are scheduled to be completed by late summer 2016.
2012-13	Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population	7. The San Francisco Park Code should ban shopping carts in GGP in order to discourage living in the Park and to reduce litter.	Recreation and Parks	Will Not be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	Current policy already does not allow shopping carts in the park. Amending the Park Code is unnecessary; SFPD has a standing order regarding shopping carts which is enforced in all City parks. In addition, Park Patrol removes all abandoned property, including shopping carts, from park premises.	**	
2012-13	Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population	7. The San Francisco Park Code should ban shopping carts in GGP in order to discourage living in the Park and to reduce litter.	Recreation and Parks Commission	Will Not be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	Current policy already does not allow shopping carts in the park. Amending the Park Code is unnecessary; SFPD has a standing order regarding shopping carts which is enforced in all City parks. In addition, Park Patrol removes all abandoned property, including shopping carts, from park premises.	**	
2012-13	Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population	7. The San Francisco Park Code should ban shopping carts in GGP in order to discourage living in the Park and to reduce litter.	Mayor	Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	Current policy already does not allow shopping carts in the park. Amending the park code is unnecessary; SFPD has a standing order regarding shopping carts which is enforced in all City parks. In addition, Park Patrol removes all abandoned property, including shopping carts, from park premises.	**	
2012-13	Log Cabin Ranch: Planning for the Future	1.1 Continue current efforts to develop Log Cabin Ranch as a viable disposition option for youthful offenders.	Juvenile Probation	Recommendation Implemented	The JPD has continued to support the operations of LCR as a disposition option for the juvenile court. The facility has been inspected by the Board of State and Community Corrections during 2013 with no findings of non-compliance. With Funding from a Federal Second Chance Act grant, the Juvenile Collaborative Reentry Unit services are now extended to LCR youth, enhancing the availability of clinicians, case managers, social workers, and probation officers to develop comprehensive reentry plans with the youth and families for implementation upon their return to the community. The JPD will continue efforts to improve LCR's viability as a disposition for juvenile wards.	**	
2012-13	Log Cabin Ranch: Planning for the Future	1.1 Continue current efforts to develop Log Cabin Ranch as a viable disposition option for youthful offenders.	District Attorney	Recommendation Implemented	This recommendation was implemented before the Civil Grand Jury Report and we continue to recommend Log Cabin Ranch as a viable disposition option.	**	
2012-13	Log Cabin Ranch: Planning for the Future	1.1 Continue current efforts to develop Log Cabin Ranch as a viable disposition option for youthful offenders.	Public Defender	Recommendation implemented	The efforts are being implemented to develop LCRS as a possible disposition option for youthful offenders. The Juvenile Probation Department along with its partners in the Juvenile Collaborative Reentry Unit have expanded its reentry services, planning, and resources to youth graduating from LCRS with the hope of reducing recidivism. By providing intensive reentry planning, wrap services, and court monitoring, Ranch graduates will be less likely to reoffend, improve their educational and vocational outcomes and become productive members of their communities.	**	

(1) ***** Response not required: Recommendation has been fully implemented or abandoned.

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2014 Response	2014 Response Text	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2012-13	Log Cabin Ranch: Planning for the Future	1.2 Expand educational and vocational training for residents to prepare them for post-release success.	Juvenile Probation	Will Be Implemented in the Future	This item requires the input of a comprehensive needs analysis and master plan. The JPD has received a draft needs analysis which needs further refinement. However, this document serves as a good foundation for a more detailed master plan. Such a document will inform the JPD and the City regarding the continued need and utility of LCR. JPD included \$300K in its 2013-14 budget to fund the master plan and has continued the request in its 2014-15 budget submission.	Recommendation Implemented	The work related to this recommendation is ongoing. A workgroup has been convened to review the essential elements of a master plan for the department. In December, 2014, the Department in collaboration with the City Performance Unit of the Controller's office completed a Juvenile Probation population forecast analysis, including population growth estimates and factors influencing trends in juvenile justice practice. Our LCR comprehensive needs analysis is ever-evolving given some recent changes in state law. Assembly Bill 167 has resulted in a larger number of youths becoming eligible for a high school diploma and thus resulted in a larger percentage of H.S. graduates at LCR. AB-12 resulted in the introduction of eligibility criteria for foster care benefits that are unavailable for most youths committed to LCR and therefore has impacted the number of commitments to the facility in favor of preserving eligibility for these important state benefits. Current programming has been enhanced to include enrollment in college Online courses. The Occupational Therapy and Training Program (OTTP) provides both vocational and educational assessments and onsite assistance to youths in their efforts to determine employment options best aligned with their interests and skills. Construction and landscape training is provided by the San Francisco Conservation Corps (SFCC), including training in soft skills. The juvenile justice stakeholders have met and discussed the use of LCR as a dispositional option and will engage in a workgroup to develop recommendations and priorities for the site. Presently, a land analysis has been requested from the Department of Real Estate to help determine the various financially viable options for use of the land on which LCR and Hidden Valley presently sit.
2012-13	Log Cabin Ranch: Planning for the Future	1.3 Increase involvement of DCYF-funded CBOs providing services at the Ranch.	Juvenile Probation	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The next cycle of CBO requests for proposals through the Violence Prevention Joint Funders plan is scheduled to occur during the 2015-16 budget year. At that time, the JPD will raise the increased involvement of CBO's at LCR as a priority for violence prevention programs.	Recommendation Implemented	The violence prevention Request for Proposals (RFP) process has been postponed by the Department of Children Youth and Their Families (DCYF) until fiscal year 2017. However, the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council in partnership with the DCYF has voted to align the local action plan with the Children's fund allocations and fiscal priorities. This will allow for a more coordinated request for programs and services designed to meet the needs of all youth, inclusive of those involved with the juvenile justice system. The Local Action Plan is a requirement of state law associated with the county's acceptance of Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act funding. In the interim, SFJPD has implemented a Departmental Initiative consisting of Trauma Informed Systems (TIS). This initiative is recognized as an evidence based practice (EBP) to support reductions in violence and identify treatment modalities to best support violence prevention and serve our youthful offenders as it relates to trauma. Substance abuse specific treatment has been added as delivered by the Asian American Recovery Services, delivering the evidence-based model of Seeking Safety. The Imagine Bus Project provides services to the youths at LCR and is a community based organization that provides transformative interventions to youth through arts education and community partnerships, with specific focus on reentry of youths returning to communities following incarceration. Most recently, a new curriculum was added. This program is known as Boys Council and is a promising practice introduced by the One Circle Foundation and jointly facilitated by both LCR counselors and therapists for the Health Department's Special Programs for Youth. We continue to deliver the Cognitive Behavioral Treatment (CBT) program - Aggression Replacement Therapy as each youth is required to complete this program prior to release from LCR.
2012-13	Log Cabin Ranch: Planning for the Future	1.3 Increase involvement of DCYF-funded CBOs providing services at the Ranch.	Department of Children, Youth and Families	Will be implemented in the future	The next cycle of CBO requests for proposals through the Violence Prevention Joint Funders plan is scheduled to occur during the 2015-16 budget year. At that time, the JPD will raise the increased involvement of CBO's at LCR as a priority for violence prevention programs.	Recommendation Implemented	DCYF funded 4 agencies to provide services at Log Cabin Ranch (Each One Reach One, Special Services for Groups, Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice and Sunset youth Services). DCYF is leading the development of the Local Action Plan with the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council. This Multiagency Plan identifies resources and strategies for providing a continuum of responses for the prevention, intervention, supervision, treatment, and incarceration of juvenile offenders. An assessment of service needs at Log Cabin will be included in the plan.
2012-13	Log Cabin Ranch: Planning for the Future	1.4 Enhance training for all Ranch staff.	Juvenile Probation	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Over the course of the 2014-15 fiscal year, additional training in the LCR intervention model will be provided to all LCR staff and agency partners. During the current fiscal year, all Juvenile Probation Officers were provided with an overview of the programs and services at LCR.	Recommendation Implemented	From 2014 to present, all LCR Staff participated in Ethics Training, Missouri Youth Services Institute (MYSI) Refresher Training, Trauma Informed Care Training, Motivational Interviewing/Evidence Based Practices and Sexually Exploited Victims Training. Supervisory staff attended PREA Investigative Training, Peace Officer Bill of Rights (POBR) training as well as Personnel Investigation Training. Other training attended consisted of Train the Trainer PREA instructor training (Supervisor), Facilitator Training (Director and Supervisor) and upcoming scheduled trainings in May and June of 2016 consist of Suicide Prevention Training and Managing Aggressive Behavior Training for all LCR staff.
2012-13	Log Cabin Ranch: Planning for the Future	2. Develop tracking systems for post-probationary youth in collaboration with the Adult Probation Department that will provide data to evaluate programs both at the Ranch and after release.	Juvenile Probation	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Both JPD and APD are in the process of developing electronic case management systems that will enhance the capacity of these two departments to share information regarding individuals with records held by both agencies. It is anticipated that the system development will take at least 12-18 months for the JPD system alone. In the interim, JPD and APD have the ability to query other systems such as the California Law Enforcement Tracking System (CLETS) to determine if graduates of LCR have contact with other California law enforcement agencies.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Our Department is currently implementing our Case Management System (Augustus). The current implementation plan is underway through the development of a needs assessment for the Case Management System (CMS) - completed, identifying team members from each division that will become "Train the Trainers" within their respective divisions - completed, the next phase was just recently completed where SFJPD Probation Officers were recently trained in the newest version of the Augustus Case Management System for tracking for post-probationary youth. Log Cabin Ranch has provided recommendations as to enhancing the Case Management system as to tracking, documentation and outcome measures. The next phases consist of identifying enhancements and internal problems, implementation of departmental forms, and the training of institution staff at LCR and JJC. Originally, the Departments had planned to use the same vendor and maximize efficiencies in the technological platform, database structure, and functionality. However, due to contract complications experienced by APD, they decided to seek a different vendor and JPD did the same. We also recognize that the persons in the juvenile and adult justice systems, travel across county lines and the coordination with various county and state databases is even less feasible. While the sharing of data across systems is a laudible goal, it is less than practical at this time. In the meantime, the APD and JPD have opened lines of communication to determine ways to better coordinate involvement in both juvenile and criminal justice systems. This may include sharing data files that can be compared against the various digital systems.
2012-13	Log Cabin Ranch: Planning for the Future	2. Develop tracking systems for post-probationary youth in collaboration with the Adult Probation Department that will provide data to evaluate programs both at the Ranch and after release.	Adult Probation	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Both JPD and APD are in the process of developing electronic case management systems that will enhance the capacity of these two departments to share information regarding individuals with records held by both agencies. It is anticipated that the system development will take at least 12-18 months for the JPD system alone. In the interim, JPD and APD have the ability to query other systems such as the California Law Enforcement Tracking System (CLETS) to determine if graduates of LCR have contact with other California law enforcement agencies.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	APD continues to be in the development process of our new case management system, which will enhance our ability to share information regarding individuals with records in both agencies. While in this development process, APD staff continues to communicate with JPD staff to obtain and share information. Further, information is available through other systems such as the California Law Enforcement Tracking System (CLETS) to determine if graduates of LCR have contact with other law enforcement agencies.

(1) "" Response not required: Recommendation has been fully implemented or abandoned.

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2014 Response	2014 Response Text	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2012-13	Log Cabin Ranch: Planning for the Future	3. Fund a master plan for Log Cabin Ranch to determine the programmatic and capital requirements for a viable facility.	Mayor	Recommendation Implemented	The Juvenile Probation Department sought a master plan in its FY 2012-13 budget and was provided funding for a portion of that master plan - a needs assessment intended to identify the needs of San Francisco's youth as an input to a master plan to address those needs. The needs analysis was conducted and a preliminary draft plan developed. However, at this time, due to the complexity of the project and departmental turnover the needs assessment is still incomplete. A completed needs assessment will inform the development of the master plan, which is currently funded as part of the base FY 2014-15 budget. The City Services Auditor has expressed an interest in assisting the Juvenile Probation Department with completion of the needs assessment. The City and County of San Francisco FY 2014-15 and FY 2015-16 budget will officially be adopted July, 2014.	**	
2012-13	Log Cabin Ranch: Planning for the Future	3. Fund a master plan for Log Cabin Ranch to determine the programmatic and capital requirements for a viable facility.	Board of Supervisors	Requires Further Analysis	Board of Supervisors reports that it requires further analysis for Recommendation 3 for reasons as follows: the Board will work with the appropriate departments and offices to explore establishing a process for drafting a master plan for the Log Cabin Ranch; and conduct this within six months of the publication of the Civil Grand Jury report, from June 26, 2013 to no later than December 26, 2013. (File No. 130608 Resolution No. 361-13)	Recommendation Implemented	Pursuant to Charter, Section 2.114, the Non-Interference In Administration clause, the Board of Supervisors (Board) shall deal with administrative service or other functions only through the department head, elective or executive officer. On March 13, 2014, the Board held a hearing with Juvenile Probation Department to investigate the recommendations and the departments position; and ultimately expressed support for the recommendation. The Board considers its responsibility required under the California Penal Code, Section 933.05(b) to " have been implemented" (corresponding language in the 2016 Action Plan column). The Board considers their response to have been sufficiently provided. The actual outcome of the implementation should be posed to the listed departments.
2012-13	Log Cabin Ranch: Planning for the Future	4.1 Explore possibilities with community organizations and charitable foundations to further the development of Log Cabin Ranch and Hidden Valley Ranch, with the objective of supporting both high-risk and at-risk youth of San Francisco and their families.	Mayor	Recommendation Implemented	The department has discussed this issue with the Juvenile Probation Commission and an adhoc subcommittee will be developed later this fall, to work directly with the department to identify and further develop additional partnerships with community organizations, charitable foundations and others interested in supporting the mission of the Juvenile Probation Department.	**	
2012-13	Log Cabin Ranch: Planning for the Future	4.1 Explore possibilities with community organizations and charitable foundations to further the development of Log Cabin Ranch and Hidden Valley Ranch, with the objective of supporting both high-risk and at-risk youth of San Francisco and their families.	Board of Supervisors	Recommendation Implemented	Board of Supervisors reports that it has implemented Recommendation 4.1 as follows: the Department has discussed this issue with the Juvenile Probation Commission and an ad hoc subcommittee will be developed later this fall to work directly with the Department to identify and further develop additional partnerships with community organizations, charitable foundations and others interested in supporting the mission of the Juvenile Probation Department. (File No. 130608 Resolution No. 361-13)	**	
2012-13	Log Cabin Ranch: Planning for the Future	4.2 Examine collaboration with regional counties to develop programs to address the needs of high-risk and at-risk youth.	Mayor	Recommendation Implemented	In recent years, the JPD has reached out to former Probation Chiefs in both Alameda and San Mateo Counties regarding regional strategies designed to work with high-risk offenders.1. Discussions with other counties have been initiated to explore the possibility of joint initiatives supported by intergovernmental agreements. While these discussions are in their infancy, preliminarily they have been positive and fruitful. San Mateo County maintains and operates a ranch for adjudicated minors about a half mile from Log Cabin Ranch. The two facilities coordinate sporting events together and have extended mutual aid in past years. This aid has included allowing LCR to use shower facilities and LCR allowing Camp Glenwood to utilize its gymnasium. In those instances where youth have AWOL'd from either facility, communications between the two have helped increase awareness, vigilance and cooperation between the two sites. The ability to share a single physical location could prove mutually beneficial to both counties and lead to overall fiscal efficiency for these two Bay area counties and the youths and families they serve. Efforts to explore possible agreements will continue.	**	
2012-13	Log Cabin Ranch: Planning for the Future	4.2 Examine collaboration with regional counties to develop programs to address the needs of high-risk and at-risk youth.	Board of Supervisors	Requires Further Analysis	Board of Supervisors reports that it requires further analysis for Recommendation 4.2 for reasons as follows: the Board will work with the appropriate departments and offices to explore the collaboration with other counties; and conduct this within six months of the publication of the Civil Grand Jury report, from June 26, 2013 to no later than December 26, 2013. (File No. 130608 Resolution No. 361-13)	Recommendation Implemented	Pursuant to Charter, Section 2.114, the Non-Interference In Administration clause, the Board of Supervisors (Board) shall deal with administrative service or other functions only through the department head, elective or executive officer. On March 13, 2014, the Board held a hearing with Juvenile Probation Department to investigate the recommendation and the departments position; and ultimately expressed support for the recommendation. The Board considers its responsibility required under the California Penal Code, Section 933.05(b) to " have been implemented" (corresponding language in the 2016 Action Plan column). The Board considers their response to have been sufficiently provided. The actual outcome of the implementation should be posed to the listed departments.
2012-13	Optimizing the Use of Publicly-Owned Real Estate	1.1 The web-based San Francisco Property Information Map currently used to display Planning and Building Inspection Department information should be integrated with and further developed by other departments to convey complete information about City properties. The Department of Technology and the Planning Department should work with and provide database access to all City departments enabling them to maintain the information on their properties.	Department of Technology	Recommendation Implemented	The Department of Technology worked with the Planning Dept and the Real Estate Dept to provide City Owned Property information to a publically available map. The URL is www.sf-planning.org . Click on the small map entitled San Francisco Property Information Map; search for a property address (e.g., 1 Dr Carlton b. Goodlett Pl). Click on the "City Properties" link to view information such as Jurisdiction, Agency, Status and Vacancy.	**	
2012-13	Optimizing the Use of Publicly-Owned Real Estate	1.1 The web-based San Francisco Property Information Map currently used to display Planning and Building Inspection Department information should be integrated with and further developed by other departments to convey complete information about City properties. The Department of Technology and the Planning Department should work with and provide database access to all City departments enabling them to maintain the information on their properties.	Planning Department	Recommendation Implemented	Regarding the Civil Grand Jury Recommendation below, our Department considers this item to be complete. The Planning Department has added the requested data, including information on public properties from the Real Estate Department, to DataSF. We have included a link to this information to our Property Information Map, available to the public at http://propertymap.sfplanning.org/ This website also includes the capacity for public uses to click on a link for easy connections to the Real Estate Department for further information and/or reporting errors.	**	
2012-13	Optimizing the Use of Publicly-Owned Real Estate	1.1 The web-based San Francisco Property Information Map currently used to display Planning and Building Inspection Department information should be integrated with and further developed by other departments to convey complete information about City properties. The Department of Technology and the Planning Department should work with and provide database access to all City departments enabling them to maintain the information on their properties.	Real Estate Department	Recommendation implemented	REIS (Real Estate Information System) database information has been integrated with the Property Information Map (PIM), and all necessary links between the two system are complete. Access to inputting data into the database continues to be limited to key staff at Planning, Dept of Technology, Real Estate and Capital Planning, to ensure we maintain the integrity of the data.	**	

(1) ***** Response not required: Recommendation has been fully implemented or abandoned.

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2014 Response	2014 Response Text	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2012-13	Optimizing the Use of Publicly-Owned Real Estate	1.1 The web-based San Francisco Property Information Map currently used to display Planning and Building Inspection Department information should be integrated with and further developed by other departments to convey complete information about City properties. The Department of Technology and the Planning Department should work with and provide database access to all City departments enabling them to maintain the information on their properties.	Director of Capital Planning	Recommendation implemented	REIS (Real Estate Information System) database information has been integrated with the Property Information Map (PIM), and all necessary links between the two system are complete. Access to inputting data into the database continues to be limited to key staff at Planning, Dept of Technology, Real Estate and Capital Planning, to ensure we maintain the integrity of the data.	**	
2012-13	Optimizing the Use of Publicly-Owned Real Estate	1.2 The online database of all properties owned by SFUSD and all City departments, including revenue-generating enterprise departments, needs to include information required by Chapter 23A of the Administrative Code.	Mayor's Office	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The City Administrator's Office, through the Director of Property, intends to present a legislative clean-up to Chapter 23A of the Administrative Code for Board and Mayor consideration.	Recommendation Implemented	Chapter 23 amendments have been codified and voter approved. Consistent with the amended Chapter 23 code provisions, Real Estate and the City Administrator provided the Board of Supervisors with a list of surplus properties on March 1, 2016, which is posted on the Real Estate website. Other reporting requirements under the amended code are being met.
2012-13	Optimizing the Use of Publicly-Owned Real Estate	1.2 The online database of all properties owned by SFUSD and all City departments, including revenue-generating enterprise departments, needs to include information required by Chapter 23A of the Administrative Code.	City Administrator	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The City Administrator's Office, through the Director of Property, intends to present a legislative clean-up to Chapter 23A of the Administrative Code for Board and Mayor consideration. That legislation awaits further input from the community engagement process now being led by City Planning, OEWD, MOHCD and others relative to public site development.	Recommendation Implemented	Chapter 23 amendments have been codified and voter approved. Consistent with the amended Chapter 23 code provisions, Real Estate and the City Administrator provided the Board of Supervisors with a list of surplus properties on March 1, 2016, which is posted on the Real Estate website. Other reporting requirements under the amended code are being met.
2012-13	Optimizing the Use of Publicly-Owned Real Estate	1.2 The online database of all properties owned by SFUSD and all City departments, including revenue-generating enterprise departments, needs to include information required by Chapter 23A of the Administrative Code.	Superintendent of Schools	Will Not be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable. The "Surplus City Property Ordinance" does not apply to school district properties. The definitions in the ordinance state that the term "Property" shall mean any real property owned by the City and County of San Francisco, excluding land and buildings reserved for open space or parks purposes, or any land dedicated for public right-of-way purposes, or any land used or reserved for transit lines, or public utility rights-of-way, or any publicly dedicated streets or rights-of-way. 'Property' shall not include any real property owned by or on behalf of the San Francisco Unified School District." (SF Admin. Code 23.A.4 (t) (Emphasis added)). The San Francisco Unified School District maintains a comprehensive list of all properties owned, leased or occupied by the District. This comprehensive list is organized by assessor's parcel number and includes property information, including but not limited to, the property by address, name, use, lot area, building area, number of classrooms, programs and whether the property is leased to non-SFUSD users or tenants. In 2007, 2009 and 2010 this comprehensive property list, with yearly updates, was included as an integral part of the District's published and Board of Education approved "10 Year Capital Plan" This was a public document and was posted on the District Website accessible to all members of the public who are interested. The property inventory is updated regularly to reflect the current status and use of all District owned and leased properties and the District anticipates an update to the 10 Year Capital Plan within the next year.	**	
2012-13	Optimizing the Use of Publicly-Owned Real Estate	1.3 City departments, commissions and agencies should be directed to maintain and update their departmental real estate database, which appears in the Real Estate Division Map of Real Property and Property Book.	Mayor's Office	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Pursuant to the requirements of Chapter 23A of the Administrative Code, as amended, this will be accomplished.	Recommendation Implemented	A memorandum was provided to all city departments in January of 2016, to ensure compliance with the voter-approved Chapter 23 amendments regarding reporting requirements.
2012-13	Optimizing the Use of Publicly-Owned Real Estate	1.3 City departments, commissions and agencies should be directed to maintain and update their departmental real estate database, which appears in the Real Estate Division Map of Real Property and Property Book.	City Administrator	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Pursuant to the requirements of Chapter 23A of the Administrative Code, as amended, this will be accomplished. In the meantime, departments have been requested to come into conformance with the existing code provisions by July 1, 2014.	Recommendation Implemented	Memorandum was provided to all city departments in January of 2016, to ensure compliance with the voter-approved Chapter 23 amendments regarding reporting requirements.
2012-13	Optimizing the Use of Publicly-Owned Real Estate	1.4 The Director of Real Estate should be required to review the list annually to confirm that all departments have made a complete report on their properties, including surplus and underutilized properties, in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 23A of the Administrative Code; and the City Administrator should be required to report annually to the Board of Supervisors regarding the City's real property assets.	Mayor's Office	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The City Administrator's Office, through the Director of Property, continues to draft amendments to Administrative Code Chapter 23A. While amendments are being drafted, the Real Estate Division plans on reporting back based on the current requirements of the code. However, the annual report to the Board of Supervisors relative to the City's real property assets will be contained within the overall Capital Plan documents provided to the Board annually, as recommended by the City's Capital Planning Committee.	Recommendation Implemented	Chapter 23 amendments have been codified and voter approved. Consistent with the amended Chapter 23 code provisions, Real Estate and the City Administrator provided the Board of Supervisors with a list of surplus properties on March 1, 2016, which is posted on the Real Estate website. Other reporting requirements under the amended code are being met.
2012-13	Optimizing the Use of Publicly-Owned Real Estate	1.4 The Director of Real Estate should be required to review the list annually to confirm that all departments have made a complete report on their properties, including surplus and underutilized properties, in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 23A of the Administrative Code; and the City Administrator should be required to report annually to the Board of Supervisors regarding the City's real property assets.	City Administrator	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The City Administrator's Office, through the Director of Property, continues to draft amendments to Administrative Code Chapter 23A. While those amendments are being drafted, the Real Estate Division plans on reporting based on the current code requirements. However, the annual report to the Board of Supervisors relative to the City's real property assets will be contained within the overall Capital Plan documents provided to the Board annually, as recommended by the City's Capital Planning Committee.	Recommendation Implemented	Chapter 23 amendments have been codified and voter approved. Consistent with the amended Chapter 23 code provisions, Real Estate and the City Administrator provided the Board of Supervisors with a list of surplus properties on March 1, 2016, which is posted on the Real Estate website. Other reporting requirements under the amended code are being met.
2012-13	Optimizing the Use of Publicly-Owned Real Estate	1.4 The Director of Real Estate should be required to review the list annually to confirm that all departments have made a complete report on their properties, including surplus and underutilized properties, in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 23A of the Administrative Code; and the City Administrator should be required to report annually to the Board of Supervisors regarding the City's real property assets.	Real Estate Department	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The City Administrator's Office, through the Director of Property, continues to draft amendments to Administrative Code Chapter 23A. While those amendments are being drafted, the Real Estate Division plans on reporting based on the current code requirements. However, the annual report to the Board of Supervisors relative to the City's real property assets will be contained within the overall Capital Plan documents provided to the Board annually, as recommended by the City's Capital Planning Committee.	Recommendation Implemented	Chapter 23 amendments have been codified and voter approved. Consistent with the amended Chapter 23 code provisions, Real Estate and the City Administrator provided the Board of Supervisors with a list of surplus properties on March 1, 2016, which is posted on the Real Estate website. Other reporting requirements under the amended code are being met.

(1) ***** Response not required: Recommendation has been fully implemented or abandoned.

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2014 Response	2014 Response Text	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2012-13	Optimizing the Use of Publicly-Owned Real Estate	2. The City and SFUSD should activate their respective Surplus Property Advisory Committees because the meetings of these committees provide a public forum in which to discuss best uses of publicly- owned real estate and each committee should be charged with monitoring uses of public property and making sure that there is ongoing accountability with respect to surplus and underutilized properties.	City Administrator	Will Not be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	All surplus assets of the City are currently posted on the Real Estate Division's website, and have been for at least two years. With the upcoming Administrative Code changes, and more robust discussion of property in the City's annual Capital Plan, accountability and transparency will be adequately addressed.	**	
2012-13	Optimizing the Use of Publicly-Owned Real Estate	2. The City and SFUSD should activate their respective Surplus Property Advisory Committees because the meetings of these committees provide a public forum in which to discuss best uses of publicly- owned real estate and each committee should be charged with monitoring uses of public property and making sure that there is ongoing accountability with respect to surplus and underutilized properties.	Superintendent of Schools	Will Not be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable at this time. There currently are no additional properties "not being used for educational purposes" within the District that should be reclassified or declared surplus under the conditions of the Education Code to be designated surplus and subject to possible sale. However, the District recognizes that should conditions change and the reactivation of this committee becomes necessary, the District will do so.	**	
2012-13	Optimizing the Use of Publicly-Owned Real Estate	3. The Board of Supervisors should amend Chapter 23A of the Administrative Code to include an incentive for City Departments to identify and dispose of surplus and underutilized properties and to broaden the purposes for which surplus and underutilized properties may be used.	Mayor	Will Not be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	Since this recommendation is directed to the Board of Supervisors it cannot be implemented by the Mayor. Legislative clean up of Chapter 23A of the Administrative Code is awaiting input from the community engagement process now being led by City Planning, the Office of Economic and Workforce Development and the City Administrator's Real Estate Division relative to public site development. Any proposed changes beyond legislative clean up must be reviewed and approved by the Board of Supervisors. Current City policy directs surplus property to be developed as affordable housing.	**	
2012-13	Optimizing the Use of Publicly-Owned Real Estate	3. The Board of Supervisors should amend Chapter 23A of the Administrative Code to include an incentive for City Departments to identify and dispose of surplus and underutilized properties and to broaden the purposes for which surplus and underutilized properties may be used.	Board of Supervisors	Requires Further Analysis	Board of Supervisors reports that it requires further analysis for Recommendation 3 for reasons as follows: the Board will work with our City departments, such as the Real Estate Division, to examine amending Chapter 23A of the Administrative Code within six months of the publication of the Civil Grand Jury report, from June 13, 2013 to no later than December 13, 2013. (File No. 130604 Resolution No. 339-13)	Recommendation Implemented	Pursuant to Charter, Section 2.114, the Non-Interference In Administration clause, the Board of Supervisors (Board) shall deal with administrative service or other functions only through the department head, elective or executive officer. On March 13, 2014, the Board held a hearing with City Administrator's Real Estate Division, Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development, and Planning Department to investigate the recommendations and the departments position; and ultimately expressed support for the recommendation. The Board considers its responsibility required under the California Penal Code, Section 933.05(b) to " have been implemented" (corresponding language in the 2016 Action Plan column). The Board considers their response to have been sufficiently provided. The actual outcome of the implementation should be posed to the listed departments.
2012-13	Optimizing the Use of Publicly-Owned Real Estate	4. The Board of Supervisors and the SF Board of Education should each adopt rules which limit the length of time property may remain on their respective surplus list without action and which address consequences for such inaction.	Board of Supervisors	Requires Further Analysis	Board of Supervisors reports that it requires further analysis for Recommendation 4 for reasons as follows: the Board will work with SFUSD and other City departments to examine what should be considered within six months of the publication of the Civil Grand Jury report, from June 13, 2013 to no later than December 13, 2013. (File No. 130604 Resolution No. 339-13)	Recommendation Implemented	Pursuant to Charter, Section 2.114, the Non-Interference In Administration clause, the Board of Supervisors (Board) shall deal with administrative service or other functions only through the department head, elective or executive officer. On March 13, 2014, the Board held a hearing with the listed City departments to investigate the recommendation and the departments position; and ultimately expressed support for the recommendation. The Board considers its responsibility required under the California Penal Code, Section 933.05(b) to " have been implemented" (corresponding language in the 2016 Action Plan column). The Board considers their response to have been sufficiently provided. The actual outcome of the implementation should be posed to the listed departments.
2012-13	Optimizing the Use of Publicly-Owned Real Estate	4. The Board of Supervisors and the SF Board of Education should each adopt rules which limit the length of time property may remain on their respective surplus list without action and which address consequences for such inaction.	Board of Education	Will Not be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable. The District will comply with Education Code requirements for declaring properties as surplus and for disposing of surplus properties. The educational program and administrative facility requirements for the District are fluid and the District must remain flexible with regard to the disposition and use of school sites and properties in order to respond to these changing needs, as explained in response to Finding #3 above.	**	
2012-13	Optimizing the Use of Publicly-Owned Real Estate	5.1 The SFUSD needs to designate someone, who is given appropriate authority, whose time and energy is devoted solely to optimizing use of surplus and under-utilized real estate through its development or disposition. That person should work with the City's Capital Planning Policy Committee and Surplus Property Advisory Committee to incorporate surplus and underutilized property into SFUSD's and City's respective 10-year rolling capital plans.	Superintendent of Schools	Will Not be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable. Previously, the District had a full time Director of Real Estate position. That position was eliminated two years ago due to District-wide budget reductions and as District leadership determined that a restructuring and more effective strategy was required in the District's approach to their property assets and management of those assets. Therefore, a "Real Estate Working Group" was established, including the Chief Facilities Officer, Deputy Superintendent of Policy and Operations, General Counsel, Chief Financial Officer, a consultant Real Estate/property lease and transaction specialist and several others to optimize the use of surplus and under-utilized real estate through its development or disposition within the overall fluid education needs of the District. This group meets regularly and jointly commissions studies, evaluates property transaction or lease proposals, negotiates pending transactions and makes all recommendations to the Board of Education. This group has had great success since its establishment 2 years ago. They concluded a successful \$11.1 million dollar surplus property sale to San Francisco State University, are in process of negotiating a long term lease for use of district property that will generate millions of dollars of additional revenue to the district general fund over the next 10-12 years and are in process of concluding a multi-property sale and exchange with the Mayor's Office of Housing. The District believes that this leadership strategy has been highly effective in producing positive results that are also sensitive to the overall District academic strategic plan and project growth expectations.	**	
2012-13	Optimizing the Use of Publicly-Owned Real Estate	5.2 The Capital Planning Policy Committee of the San Francisco Capital Planning Program should be made responsible for overseeing the publicly owned surplus and underutilized property list for the City and for assuring that clear plans for the disposition or repurposing of such properties are generated and incorporated into the 10 year rolling capital plan of the Capital Planning Program.	City Administrator	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Director of Property intends to collaborate more frequently with the Capital Planning Committee, and the Capital Plan will contain a section in the future relative to status of surplus and underutilized City assets.	Recommendation Implemented	Consistent with the schedule contained in the amended Chapter 23, Capital Planning input will occur in the fall of 2016, following the date of first publication of the surplus list (March 1, 2016).

(1) **** Response not required: Recommendation has been fully implemented or abandoned.

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2014 Response	2014 Response Text	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2012-13	Optimizing the Use of Publicly-Owned Real Estate	6. The entire complex of historic buildings at 135 Van Ness / 170 Fell Street, including Nourse Auditorium, should be put to productive use by, for example, converting the complex into the School for the Arts.	Board of Education	Recommendation Implemented	The recommendation has been implemented, but still requires significant further work and capital development. The Superintendent has rolled out a number of District strategic initiatives that are critical to closing the achievement gap and raising the education bar to the highest levels possible. Paramount in those initiatives are programs for STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math) and the Arts, of which a key component is the relocation of the Ruth Asawa School of the Arts from the McAteer Campus to the 135 Van Ness block, located in the heart of the San Francisco arts civic center district. Currently, the District has retained a new architect to refresh the program and design for the school and that work is now in progress. The District recognizes that significant obstacles still remain to fund the now estimated \$235 million project design and construction costs, but with the improving economy and significant private sector benefactors for the arts, the District is now more optimistic that a significant private capital campaign, coupled with other funding sources can successfully be put together to bring this long anticipated project to reality.	**	
2012-13	Optimizing the Use of Publicly-Owned Real Estate	6. The entire complex of historic buildings at 135 Van Ness / 170 Fell Street, including Nourse Auditorium, should be put to productive use by, for example, converting the complex into the School for the Arts.	Superintendent of Schools	Recommendation Implemented	Over the past 6 months a significant amount of work has been done to realize the goal of moving the Ruth Asawa School of the Arts to the arts corridor in Civic Center. On December 10, 2013 a resolution was introduced by the Superintendent of Schools to the School District Board of Education to formally endorse "Creating a World-Class Arts Education Center to be located in the center of the Civic Center artistic Hub at the 135 Van Ness block site." On January 7, 2014 the resolution was taken up in a broad discussion of the issues, challenges, project goals, costs and funding strategies at a special public hearing convened by the Board of Education. On Tuesday, January 14, 2014 the Board of Education unanimously approved the resolution. Currently, District staff are in the process of developing a strategic plan based on the goals of the resolution to bring the project forward to reality, recognizing that there are still enormous challenges in funding a project that is currently estimated to cost \$240 million and has significant historic preservation, seismic safety and other issues. While the challenges are great and many, the Superintendent has placed moving forward with the renovation of the 135 Van Ness block for the Ruth Asawa School of the Arts as a priority.	**	
2012-13	Use of Nonprofit Community-Based Organizations	1. To ensure adequate public awareness, access to CBO grant and contract information should be more explicitly communicated to the public. For example, the Mayor should consider specifically highlighting during the budget process that this dollar amount is devoted to grant and contract awards to CBOs to provide services the City/County believes to be critical.	Mayor	Recommendation Implemented	Total budgeted departmental City grant spending is listed in the character summary in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance, (character 038). This document is adopted by the Board of Supervisors and is posted online for viewing by members of the public. Additionally, the Mayor's Proposed Budget Book provides the amount budgeted for "Aid Assistance/Grants" in each department section. Information on specific vendors is not listed in budget documents because the City cannot budget at the vendor level, as all vendors must go through a competitive process to be granted budgeted funds. The public has been able to view and download current and historical vendor payments including payments made to all community based organizations for many years. In addition, the Controller's Office recently launched SF OpenBook, a web portal designed to provide easy access to a number of interactive tools, reports and other content to shed light on the City's economy, finances, and operational performance.	**	
2012-13	Use of Nonprofit Community-Based Organizations	2.1 The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should take the important step of developing an overarching strategy, as recommended by the San Francisco Community-Based Organizations Task Force in 2009, for evaluating the long-term effect of services provided by CBOs and use the results of that examination to set priorities and eliminate ineffective (or wasteful) programs.	Mayor	Recommendation Implemented	With respect to ensuring that CBO's are performing, and that ineffective or wasteful programs are eliminated, the City has taken several steps in response to the recommendations to the 2009 Community Based Organizations Task-Force. For example, the Controller's Office City Services Auditor Division, as part of its Citywide Nonprofit Monitoring and Capacity Building Program, coordinated the development and implementation of a Citywide Joint Fiscal and Compliance Monitoring Protocol, where agencies funded by two or more City departments are reviewed utilizing the same protocol by a joint City team. This practice to standardizes procedures across departments, eliminates duplication of efforts for both contractors and City departments, and promotes nonprofit sustainability. The following departments participated in Fiscal Year 2012-13: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children and Families Commission (CFC) • Department of Children, Youth & Families (DCYF) • Department on the Status of Women (DOSW) • Department of Public Health (DPH) • Department of Technology (DT) • Human Services Agency (HSA) • Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) • Mayor's Office of Housing (MOH) • Sheriff (SHF) <p>Many departments have also implemented the same protocol for organizations that are not jointly funded to ensure standardization in fiscal and compliance monitoring among all contractors. The Fiscal and Compliance Monitoring protocol is typically accompanied by a programmatic performance monitoring protocol conducted by each department that has been tailored to the unique services delivered by that department.</p> <p>If an agency performs poorly in a category of its standard Fiscal and Compliance Monitoring, or Programmatic Monitoring, it has an opportunity through that process to remediate the problem. However, if the problem becomes more serious, or remains unaddressed, City departments now utilize a standardized Corrective Action Policy process and model to address concerns. Nonprofits with multiple or repeated findings that they are not in compliance with City standards can be deemed ineligible for new or renewed City funding. Nonprofits that fail to perform for program-related reasons will be less competitive in RFP scoring processes. Additional information can be found in the Controller's "Citywide Fiscal and Compliance Nonprofit Monitoring Guidelines, August 2011."</p>	**	
					In addition to utilizing the Corrective Action Policy guidelines, departments granting funds to nonprofit contractors regularly hold Request for Proposal (RFP) processes for the purpose of ensuring that the City is utilizing the most effective providers and offering the highest quality services within the available resources.		
					While many departments follow the corrective action policy guidelines for underperforming nonprofit contractors, each department also individually and collectively monitors the effectiveness of contracted services based on program-specific needs and funding agency requirements. The flexibility to adapt performance metrics to program area is necessary given the diversity of services required to achieve large, overarching outcomes. For example, DCYF's tri-annual, charter mandated Children's Services Allocation Plan currently targets twenty-nine strategies in six different service areas, all geared at improving outcomes for children and youth. However, the specific metrics measured for providers working on the "Ensure Access to High-Quality Child Care" strategy are understandably distinct from those measured from those working on the "Aftercare/Reentry" strategy.		
					The City has undertaken a number of initiatives to develop a comprehensive strategy around nonprofit service-provider effectiveness, particularly with regard to serving the neediest populations. Examples of these initiatives include the Crisis Response Network, the Health Services Master Plan, and HopeSF. However, the City also acknowledges that the populations served, type of service rendered, and objectives of services rendered by nonprofit contractors vary immensely, which leads to the need for distinct strategies and outcome monitoring as established by individual program or service areas.		

(1) ***** Response not required: Recommendation has been fully implemented or abandoned.

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2014 Response	2014 Response Text	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2012-13	Use of Nonprofit Community-Based Organizations	2.1 The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should take the important step of developing an overarching strategy, as recommended by the San Francisco Community-Based Organizations Task Force in 2009, for evaluating the long-term effect of services provided by CBOs and use the results of that examination to set priorities and eliminate ineffective (or wasteful) programs.	Board of Supervisors	Recommendation Implemented	Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation 2.1 has already been implemented: There is currently a citywide joint fiscal monitoring protocol in place that produces corrective action policies, and currently, the City has formal Requests for Proposal processes for ensuring the City utilizes the most effective providers. (File No. 130610 Resolution No. 394-13)	**	
2012-13	Use of Nonprofit Community-Based Organizations	2.1 The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should take the important step of developing an overarching strategy, as recommended by the San Francisco Community-Based Organizations Task Force in 2009, for evaluating the long-term effect of services provided by CBOs and use the results of that examination to set priorities and eliminate ineffective (or wasteful) programs.	Controller	Will Not be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	Our nonprofit monitoring program is a comprehensive approach to fiscal and compliance matters and quality control of services provided. Coupled with the program monitoring performed by City agencies, and other program evaluation, planning and grant review activities, these measures provide adequate assurance that the services are effective.	**	
2012-13	Use of Nonprofit Community-Based Organizations	2.2 The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should consider taking a percentage of the total monies devoted to the provision of services by CBOs and use it to engage professional assistance to conduct this evaluation.	Mayor	Will Not be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	This recommendation would be duplicative and unwarranted. As mentioned in the response to recommendation 2.1, professional staff continually monitor the performance of community-based organizations.	**	
2012-13	Use of Nonprofit Community-Based Organizations	2.2 The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should consider taking a percentage of the total monies devoted to the provision of services by CBOs and use it to engage professional assistance to conduct this evaluation.	Board of Supervisors	Will Not be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	Board of Supervisors reports that it will not implement Recommendation 2.2 for reasons as follows: Professional staff currently continually monitor the performance of community-based organizations. (File No. 130610 Resolution No. 394-13)	**	
2012-13	Use of Nonprofit Community-Based Organizations	2.2 The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should consider taking a percentage of the total monies devoted to the provision of services by CBOs and use it to engage professional assistance to conduct this evaluation.	Controller	Will Not be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	Our nonprofit monitoring program is a comprehensive approach to fiscal and compliance matters and quality control of services provided. Coupled with the program monitoring performed by City agencies, and other program evaluation, planning and grant review activities, these measures provide adequate assurance that the services are effective.	**	
2012-13	Use of Nonprofit Community-Based Organizations	3. The Department should provide additional resources to bring the Avatar system to a level that fully supports the Department's performance objective program. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should ensure that sufficient resources are available to implement this recommendation.	Department of Public Health	Recommendation Implemented	<p>DPH - Behavioral Health Information Systems has been diligently providing ongoing support to end users. Within the last year, an additional IS Manager, an IS Business Analyst, and a Senior IS Business Analyst have been hired. Additionally, DPH is in the process of hiring an IS Principal Programmer Analyst.</p> <p>Since being hired, the IS Manager, IS Business Analyst, and Senior IS Business Analyst have made significant improvements to and in support of the Avatar system including: implementing on line training videos, developing widgets that allow providers to track due dates for clinical documents, and improving and creating new reports to assist programs. As a part of the larger DPH IT Department re-organization, the IS Principal Programmer Analyst will be hired to work on integration between the Electronic Health Records across DPH. The re-organization has better positioned the DPH IT Department, as a whole, and these changes will provide increased efficiencies and access to additional resources. In addition, each Department has identified a Chief Medical Information Officer that will improve the use of clinical information across DPH.</p> <p>Points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff to adequately support the application have been hired and trained. • DPH is developing an Informatics Department with CMIOs as well as clinical informaticists to make sure system functionality matches the needs of the clinicians • DPH IT reorganized to support the needs across DPH in a STANDARDIZED way that allows teams to surge with the activity of any particular application 	**	
2012-13	Use of Nonprofit Community-Based Organizations	3. The Department should provide additional resources to bring the Avatar system to a level that fully supports the Department's performance objective program. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should ensure that sufficient resources are available to implement this recommendation.	Mayor	Recommendation Implemented	Since being hired, the IS Manager, IS Business Analyst, and Senior IS Business Analyst have made significant improvements to and in support of the Avatar system including: implementing on line training videos, developing widgets that allow providers to track due dates for clinical documents, and improving and creating new reports to assist programs. As a part of the larger DPH IT Department re-organization, the IS Principal Programmer Analyst will be hired to work on integration between the Electronic Health Records across DPH. The re-organization has better positioned the DPH IT Department, as a whole, and these changes will provide increased efficiencies and access to additional resources. In addition, each Department has identified a Chief Medical Information Officer that will improve the use of clinical information across DPH.	**	
2012-13	Use of Nonprofit Community-Based Organizations	3. The Department should provide additional resources to bring the Avatar system to a level that fully supports the Department's performance objective program. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should ensure that sufficient resources are available to implement this recommendation.	Board of Supervisors	Requires Further Analysis	Board of Supervisors reports that it requires further analysis for Recommendation 3 for reasons as follows: The Department of Public Health will report to the Board on the hiring of necessary staff to support the Avatar system within six months of the publication of the Civil Grand Jury report, from June 27, 2013, to no later than December 27, 2013. (File No. 130601 Resolution No. 394-13)	Recommendation Implemented	Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation No. 3 has been implemented, as reported by the Office of the Mayor and the Department of Public Health (File No. 130609 Motion No. M14-062)

(1) **** Response not required: Recommendation has been fully implemented or abandoned.