

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	1. The Jury recommends the Board of Supervisors convene a hearing this calendar year to review the final report from the Mayor's Housing Task Force and ensure that policy recommendations improve the relationship between Market Rate and Affordable Housing to reflect the economic diversity of the City, and include annual monitoring of regional housing achievement numbers as defined by the Regional Housing Needs Allocation and the Housing Element.	Board of Supervisors	Will Be Implemented in the Future	At the Government Audit and Oversight Committee meeting on September 25, 2014, Supervisor London Breed submitted a hearing request to the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors for the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, the Office of Economic and Workforce Development, and the Planning Department to report on the efforts of the Mayor's Housing Working Group and evaluate how they will improve the relationship between Market Rate and Affordable Housing and track regional housing achievements.	Recommendation Implemented	At the Government Audit and Oversight Committee meeting on December 11, 2014, Supervisor Breed agendized a hearing matter in response to the 2013-2014 Civil Grand Jury's Recommendation No. 1 to hear the final report from the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development. The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development responded with various updates addressing the Civil Grand Jury's concerns. (File No. 141029)
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	1. The Jury recommends the Board of Supervisors convene a hearing this calendar year to review the final report from the Mayor's Housing Task Force and ensure that policy recommendations improve the relationship between Market Rate and Affordable Housing to reflect the economic diversity of the City, and include annual monitoring of regional housing achievement numbers as defined by the Regional Housing Needs Allocation and the Housing Element.	Mayors Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) Not required to respond on this item.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	MOHCD has coordinated with the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) and the Planning Department to provide a summary memo to the Mayor outlining the initial progress of the Mayor's Housing Working Group. The Mayor's Office and OEWD will work with the Board of Supervisors to schedule an informational hearing to report on both the recommendations of the Group, as well as the status and timeline for implementation of procedural, legislative, and programmatic changes intended to facilitate the production of housing affordable to a diverse group of San Franciscans.	**	
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	2. The Jury recommends that MOHCD articulate strategies to improve achievement of regional housing targets for Middle Income households and establish incremental targets by year. The Jury also recommends that MOHCD report annually to the Board of Supervisors on progress in achieving these targets and include best practice research from other municipalities about Middle Income policy solutions.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	Recommendation Implemented	MOHCD has been working with OEWD and the Mayor's Housing Working Group (HWG) to address the funding gap for middle-income housing in San Francisco, which is increasingly underserved by the condominium/ single-family home market and unable to access traditional affordable housing funding sources. Investigation of new funding streams, mixed-income development opportunities, local process improvements that promote middle-income housing, and best practices nationally is underway. MOHCD, OEWD, and the Planning Department will transmit a status report to the Mayor by September 2014, which will include progress toward the Mayor's tentative goal of creating 5,000 middle-income units. Middle income is defined by the HWG as housing serving households at and between 80% and 150% of AMI, in consideration of the fact that 150% AMI households face an affordability gap in many San Francisco neighborhoods. [Note: the Civil Grand Jury defines middle income as 50-120% AMI.]	**	
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	3. The Jury recommends that as Housing Trust Fund (HTF) funds are allocated to Housing Authority properties, MOHCD and the Mayor document a funding analysis for the allocation and the impact these disbursements may have on MOHCD Affordable Housing goals and programs to the Board of Supervisors and the public in the year of encumbrance. Reports should include annual updates on repayment.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The status of public housing's role as "housing of last resort," combined with the severity of the deferred maintenance conditions in San Francisco's public housing units makes their repair and preservation a critical component of our City's housing policy. If these units are lost due to uninhabitability, homelessness for public housing residents becomes a real threat. Stabilization of public housing fits squarely within the goals of the Housing Trust Fund and all other MOHCD funding sources that permit rehabilitation of low-income housing as an eligible use. MOHCD will provide a report regarding the uses of its Housing Trust Fund and other resources allocated to public housing at the end of the year of encumbrance. MOHCD will include in such reports all relevant information regarding repayments.	Recommendation Implemented	MOHCD's 2014-15 Annual Progress Report details Housing Trust Fund commitments to public housing and non-public housing projects. There were no repayments during FY 2014-15. Future reports will continue to report on uses of the Housing Trust Fund and repayment revenue.
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	4a. To keep the public and the Board of Supervisors informed on a timely basis, the Jury recommends that the MOHCD website be made much more user friendly with improved navigation and better public access to content.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	Recommendation Implemented	The revamping of MOHCD's website for more user-friendly access is underway. The starting point for this process has been tracking the frequency of calls MOHCD receives from people looking for information that can be found on the website. This information helps identify what information people are most interested in and what is most difficult to find. MOHCD has also reviewed the website's page view counts to determine which are most and least viewed. This research will inform the new, more navigable MOHCD homepage, scheduled to go live by October 2014. The full reorganization of MOHCD's website is anticipated to be complete by March 2015.	**	
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	4b. The Jury recommends that MOHCD immediately designate a website manager responsible for technical design and ease-of-use, plus content management including timely posting of documents and metrics reports that are in the public interest.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	Recommendation Implemented	MOHCD currently has a website manager who will manage website improvements. The deployment of a new content management system is anticipated in 2015, which will enable delegation of website updates directly to program staff, facilitating more timely posting of documents and news.	**	
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	5a. The Jury recommends MOHCD publish an Annual Report on their website by March of each year. This report should be oriented to a general audience and include information highlights and measures that communicate achievement towards City Affordable Housing program goals.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	MOHCD is in the process of producing an Annual Report that includes metrics through FY 2013/2014. While MOHCD is committed to producing an annual report, the intent is to publish it based on fiscal year metrics, which will result in a December publication date.	Recommendation Implemented	MOHCD's combined 2012-13 and 2013-14 Annual Report is available here: http://sfmohcd.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=8760 and the 2014-15 Annual Report is available here: http://sfmohcd.org/file/721
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	5b. The Jury recommends MOHCD publish a quarterly Affordable Housing Pipeline Report within a month of each quarter's closing. This may be done within the Planning Department's Quarterly Pipeline Report, but should also include quarterly Affordable Housing program progress highlights.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	MOHCD is working with the City's Chief Data Officer and the Planning Department to streamline reporting of pipeline projects, including 100% affordable projects, as well as projects developed through the City's Inclusionary Housing Program and the former Redevelopment Agency's Below Market Rate program. In order to align with the Planning Department's reporting, MOHCD will publish a semi- annual (rather than quarterly) pipeline report. The Planning Department currently produces a pipeline report which is available on its website; the information is also provided to SF Open Data. The Planning Department is committed to highlighting affordable housing projects within these reports. In addition, the Planning Director includes the pipeline report in his weekly written report to the Planning Commission	Recommendation Implemented	MOHCD collaborates with the Planning Department on the Quarterly Housing Balance Report, available here: http://sf-planning.org/housing-balance-report
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	5b. The Jury recommends MOHCD publish a quarterly Affordable Housing Pipeline Report within a month of each quarter's closing. This may be done within the Planning Department's Quarterly Pipeline Report, but should also include quarterly Affordable Housing program progress highlights.	Planning Department	Will Be Implemented in the Future	MOHCD is working with the City's Chief Data Officer and the Planning Department to streamline reporting of pipeline projects, including 100% affordable projects, as well as projects developed through the City's Inclusionary Housing Program and the former Redevelopment Agency's Below Market Rate program. In order to align with the Planning Department's reporting, MOHCD will publish a semi- annual (rather than quarterly) pipeline report. The Planning Department currently produces a pipeline report which is available on its website; the information is also provided to SF Open Data. The Planning Department is committed to highlighting affordable housing projects within these reports. In addition, the Planning Director includes the pipeline report in his weekly written report to the Planning Commission.	Recommendation Implemented	A Housing Data Coordination working group has been established by the City's Chief Data Officer to coordinate data points and reporting needs of various housing related agencies including: MOHCD, Planning, Housing & Permitting Divisions of the Department of Building Inspections and Rent Board. Pipeline reporting methodologies have been adjusted and continue to be refined based on the findings and recommendations of the working group.
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	6a. MOHCD needs to track and publish metrics with greater frequency using measures based on pipeline and HUD CAPER reporting that help the public to assess the progress of their new development and Housing Support Program efforts.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	MOHCD will track and publish housing measures based on pipeline and HUD CAPER reporting data on its website on a quarterly basis within a year.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	MOHCD has published this information on an annual basis in Annual Progress Reports. MOHCD's goal is to publish this data on a quarterly basis starting with the FY 2015-16 data available by September 30, 2016.
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	6b. MOHCD should work with the Planning Department to formulate a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) specifying timing and responsibility for the preparation and publication of Affordable Housing pipeline data in the Quarterly Pipeline Report. A new report commonly referred to as The Dashboard should be completed. An effort to publish these reports on SF Open Data should be prioritized.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	While MOHCD is supportive of the idea of increased transparency in regular reporting of metrics, the publication of a Quarterly Pipeline Report does not require a formal MOU with the Planning Department. Separately, the "Dashboard" report is a legislated reporting requirement to be implemented by the Planning Department, and relates to the percentage of affordable units that have been entitled, rather than financed. Information to produce the Dashboard is based on data gathered and monitored by the Planning Department, not MOHCD	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	6b. MOHCD should work with the Planning Department to formulate a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) specifying timing and responsibility for the preparation and publication of Affordable Housing pipeline data in the Quarterly Pipeline Report. A new report commonly referred to as The Dashboard should be completed. An effort to publish these reports on SF Open Data should be prioritized.	Planning Department	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	While MOHCD is supportive of the idea of increased transparency in regular reporting of metrics, the publication of a Quarterly Pipeline Report does not require a formal MOU with the Planning Department. Separately, the "Dashboard" report is a legislated reporting requirement to be implemented by the Planning Department, and relates to the percentage of affordable units that have been entitled, rather than financed. Information to produce the Dashboard is based on data gathered and monitored by the Planning Department, not MOHCD	**	
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	6c. MOHCD should establish a metric for accounting public contributions per development project. This financing leverage measure should be reported in the MOHCD Annual Report by project type.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	MOHCD will include in its annual report the amount of City funds allocated to specific developments, the amount of external funds the City funds leveraged, and the ratio of City funds to each project's total development cost, so that the leveraging efficiency of City funds can be compared and measured.	Recommendation Implemented	This information is included in MOHCD's Annual Report.
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	7. The Jury recommends MOHCD use their website to post up-to-date housing development project information and provide access to key milestone documents as is done on the Boston Redevelopment Authority website.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Upon completion of its website redesign and reorganization, MOHCD plans to add functionality with development project information modeled on the Boston Redevelopment Authority's website as well as other similar examples. The anticipated completion date is June 2015.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	MOHCD faced some technical hurdles related to the migration of the department's website to a new content management system. An initial approach to displaying development project information designed by the Department of Technology was not deployed due to lack of user-friendliness. A second approach is near completion, pending finalization of the legal agreement with the vendor. We anticipate this will be available on our website by June 2016.
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	8a. The Jury recommends MOHCD provide developer partners with more comprehensive materials in the Marketing template, including model BMR program marketing plans, advertising samples, marketing templates in multiple languages, directories of approved consultant and public agency partners, and training materials including web delivered training videos, to set clearly understood minimum standards for outreach.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	As mentioned in the response to finding eight, each developer is provided with a six page step-by-step guide to marketing, lottery, and application requirements in addition to a list of approved community-based consultants that the developer may engage. The template outreach flyer will be translated and incorporated into the marketing template packet by January 2015. In an effort to improve the training of developers and their agents in the lease up and sales procedures of a BMR unit, MOHCD is in the process of redesigning its training curriculum to include video modules by June 2015. MOHCD is currently reviewing all marketing requirements across all housing programs in an effort to gain consistency around outreach and marketing procedures. One of the improvements already implemented is a new requirement of developer partners that they begin certain outreach activities at the beginning of construction (rather than closer to lease-up) thus providing San Franciscans with more time to establish their qualifications for the affordable housing opportunity.	Recommendation Implemented	Rather than developing video trainings for developers, we have implemented quarterly in-person trainings on the marketing process. This in-person approach allows us to understand the needs of the developers and answer their questions and concerns in real-time. Additionally, we have implemented individual meetings with each developer prior to marketing launch to ensure all parties are aware of the requirements and timelines. Finally, we have translated the template outreach flyers.
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	8b. The Jury recommends MOHCD implement regular evaluations of marketing effectiveness and marketing materials by surveying applicants to indicate source of notification by housing opportunity.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	MOHCD welcomes the suggestion to improve the evaluation of marketing effectiveness by surveying program participants and will incorporate that question in its applications upon the rollout of its new online application system.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The DAHLIA system is now available for listings only. Account creation and application submission for Inclusionary Rental projects is anticipated to be available by September 2016. We have also expanded the scope of the system beyond Inclusionary housing to include all MOHCD-funded projects, which will come online in FY 16-17. We have been working extensively with the developer and housing services provider communities to ensure an excellent system which meets the needs of all stakeholders.
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	9a. MOHCD should provide applicants clear, concise materials on the application process, and conduct and evaluate applicant feedback satisfaction surveys after each new major development project comes on-line.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	MOHCD has prioritized the completion of its Database of Affordable Housing Listings, Information, and Applications (DAHLIA) system. The Salesforce-based data system is due to launch this Fall. DAHLIA will allow Inclusionary BMR applicants to log on, create an account, and apply to multiple housing opportunities without having to recreate their entire application. The system will also be completely transparent, allowing developer and lending partners to track the lease/ sales process and enter information regarding the lottery in order to keep applicants better informed of the process through their individual account. Clear, concise information will outline the process. MOHCD welcomes the suggestion to evaluate applicant feedback satisfaction surveys through its new data system and will report on the creation and implementation of the new system in its Annual Report.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The DAHLIA system is now available for listings only. Account creation and application submission for Inclusionary Rental projects is anticipated to be available by September 2016. We have also expanded the scope of the system beyond Inclusionary housing to include all MOHCD-funded projects, which will come online in FY 16-17. We have been working extensively with the developer and housing services provider communities to ensure an excellent system which meets the needs of all stakeholders.
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	9b. MOHCD should prioritize the completion of their Single Family Program Data and Administration System. MOHCD should measure and report on the cost effectiveness of process improvements and efficiencies from implementation of this system in their Annual Report.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	MOHCD has prioritized the completion of its Database of Affordable Housing Listings, Information, and Applications (DAHLIA) system. The Salesforce-based data system is due to launch this Fall. DAHLIA will allow Inclusionary BMR applicants to log on, create an account, and apply to multiple housing opportunities without having to recreate their entire application. The system will also be completely transparent, allowing developer and lending partners to track the lease/ sales process and enter information regarding the lottery in order to keep applicants better informed of the process through their individual account. Clear, concise information will outline the process. MOHCD welcomes the suggestion to evaluate applicant feedback satisfaction surveys through its new data system and will report on the creation and implementation of the new system in its Annual Report.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The DAHLIA system is now available for listings only. Account creation and application submission for Inclusionary Rental projects is anticipated to be available by September 2016. We have also expanded the scope of the system beyond Inclusionary housing to include all MOHCD-funded projects, which will come online in FY 16-17. We have been working extensively with the developer and housing services provider communities to ensure an excellent system which meets the needs of all stakeholders.
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	10a. The Jury recommends MOHCD work to improve the ethnic diversity of residents in their BMR programs and monitor progress in mitigating any institutional barriers to fair housing choice. Data on representational statistics should be collected and evaluated at regular intervals, preferably every 2 years. Any statistical disparities should be reported to the Board of Supervisors.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	MOHCD is collecting statistical data on an ongoing basis and agrees with the suggestion to report statistical disparities of BMR residents to the Board of Supervisors beginning with its 2015 annual report.	Recommendation Implemented	We anticipate that the most recent BMR demographic information will be presented to the Board of Supervisors soon. We are currently scheduling the hearing, anticipated to be in May or June 2016. We plan to continue regular reporting of these statistics to the Board. Additionally, in FY 15-16, we have engaged a professional PR firm to specifically target underserved populations in our BMR portfolio. We anticipate a marketing campaign launch in late 2016.
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	10b. The Jury recommends MOHCD work with developer partners to standardize criteria used for BMR rental application denials. Strategies to reduce minimum down payment requirement denials for BMR ownership units should be given consideration..	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	Will Be Implemented in the Future	In the Board of Supervisor's next revision of the B:MR Procedures Manual, MOHCD plans to suggest the adoption of more specific and standardized marketing and rental eligibility requirements focusing on credit and criminal background and other screening criteria. MOHCD is currently targeting June 2015 for these updates. Additionally, underwriting criteria for all Down payment Assistance Loan Programs (DALP) has been modified to minimize barriers including reducing the amount of cash a household needs to have to purchase through DALP.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The BMR Procedures Manual is currently being revised. The update was delayed in order to incorporate the recently passed Neighborhood Resident Housing Preference ordinance. We are also waiting for the proposed inclusionary housing amendments to be finalized and potentially approved by the voters. While we are currently unable to update the Procedures Manual, we have already standardized the criteria for denials.

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	11. The Jury recommends that the Planning Department and the Department of Building Inspection make internal process changes to improve the accuracy of data tagged as a new Affordable Housing project under the Inclusionary Housing Program.	Planning Department	Will Be Implemented in the Future	MOHCD is working with Planning's Housing Ombudsperson, as well as with OCH's Housing Program manager, to improve the quality and accuracy of data reported to MOHCD related to fees and requirements of the Inclusionary Housing Program. This includes a more efficient means to track the number and location of required units, as well as automatic indexing of required fees. Planning and OCH provide this data to DBI when applicable affordable housing projects are route to DBI for the review of building permits and structural, and mechanical plans. Once verified by Planning or OCH, such affordable and inclusionary housing projects are assigned DBI priority designation, moved to the top of the plan review queue, and tracked on DBI's Priority Housing Project list. The new Permit and Project Tracking System, scheduled to go live in the second quarter of FY 2014-15, will significantly improve DBI's ability to quickly and accurately identify projects that qualify for priority designation. Thus the Grand Jury's recommendation is anticipated to be fully met by the third quarter of FY 2014-15.	Recommendation Implemented	MOHCD is considering the automatic indexing of fees. The Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection both instituted Priority Processing Programs for reviewing affordable housing projects. The new Permit and Project Tracking System has been partially implemented. The Planning Department has been live on the new system as of October 2014 providing Planning the ability to track affordable units on building permits that are routed to Planning for review. Establishing linkage between Planning records and Building permit records is pending Department of Building Inspections' future integration with the new system. DBI tracking of units and fees continues to be captured in DBI's existing Permit Tracking System.
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	11. The Jury recommends that the Planning Department and the Department of Building Inspection make internal process changes to improve the accuracy of data tagged as a new Affordable Housing project under the Inclusionary Housing Program.	Dept. Building Inspection	Will Be Implemented in the Future	MOHCD is working with Planning's Housing Ombudsperson, as well as with OCH's Housing Program manager, to improve the quality and accuracy of data reported to MOHCD related to fees and requirements of the Inclusionary Housing Program. This includes a more efficient means to track the number and location of required units, as well as automatic indexing of required fees. Planning and OCH provide this data to DBI when applicable affordable housing projects are route to DBI for the review of building permits and structural, and mechanical plans. Once verified by Planning or OCH, such affordable and inclusionary housing projects are assigned DBI priority designation, moved to the top of the plan review queue, and tracked on DBI's Priority Housing Project list. The new Permit and Project Tracking System, scheduled to go live in the second quarter of FY 2014-15, will significantly improve DBI's ability to quickly and accurately identify projects that qualify for priority designation. Thus the Grand Jury's recommendation is anticipated to be fully met by the third quarter of FY 2014-15.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	While DBI, Planning and the Mayor's Office of Housing have improved internal data applicable to affordable housing, as well as contribute to the current 2016 Weekly Dashboard that tracks accurately affordable housing and total housing unit metrics, the Permit and Project Tracking System that was expected to go live last year is still being implemented. 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.
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	R1a: The City's policy for limited-time temporary disability payments should be followed for the Sheriff's Department, thereby eventually moving any work injury claim to permanent disability status and financial closure of those claims, opening positions for new hires.	Sheriff's Department	Requires Further Analysis	The Sheriff's department welcomes this recommendation and has taken steps with Workers' Compensation director and San Francisco Retirement System representatives to discuss the problem and to streamline the process, including the possibility of pursuing shorter terms of disability status before retirement. Further, the department has requested, through the budget process, additional positions to address the deputy shortage due to the number of deputies on workers' compensation. Although 14 deputy positions were approved during this process, no additional funding was allotted for the additional positions. Therefore, the department is prevented from hiring those positions and remains powerless to hire additional deputies and ease the negative effects of overtime costs and increased workloads. Partly in response to a reduced in custody population, the sheriffs department closed the housing portion of County Jail #3 in November 2013. This closure resulted in the redistribution of sworn staff and provided some mitigation to current staffing constraints. However, the benefits are only temporary and a long term plan is needed to correct the problem. Further, it is important to note that approximately one third of department sworn staff is assigned to non-custody duties. Staffing shortages persist in those assignments.	Recommendation Implemented	Approximately 85% of the Sheriff's Department staff is comprised of sworn peace officers, for whom these issues are governed by the provisions of California Labor Code Section 4850. The remaining 15% are non sworn, for whom these issues are governed by City policy. The Sheriff's Department complies with the requirements and procedures of both Labor Code Section 4850 and City policy.
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	R1b: The Board of Supervisors should request an audit conducted by the Budget and Legislative Analyst of payments made on behalf of the Sheriff's Department for workers compensation claims and related overtime costs.	Board of Supervisors	Recommendation Implemented	At the Government Audit and Oversight Committee meeting on September 25, 2014, Supervisor London Breed requested the Budget and Legislative Analyst to prepare a report on the payments made on behalf of the Sheriffs Department for the workers compensation claims and related overtime costs during the last several years. As the Department of Human Resources notes, it and the Sheriffs Department may be able to correlate workers compensation claims with increases in overtime costs and quantify the impact.	**	
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	R1c: The Sheriff's Department should review its safety programs with the Workforce Development Division, analyze the cause of worker injuries, and update safety education programs for both staff and inmates.	Sheriff's Department	Requires Further Analysis	The department continually reviews and updates its safety programs in order to reduce worker injuries and improve safety for all personnel and inmates in department facilities. Specifically, the department's safety committee reviews hazards and makes recommendations regarding safety issues and related training. This department addresses safety and training through such programs as safety videos, the existence of an anonymous safety hotline to report safety issues in the workplace, and an injury and illness prevention program. The sheriff's department has begun an evaluation of workers' compensation injuries sustained in the first six months of 2014 as compared to injuries for the first six months of 2013 to determine the cause and types of injuries so that a more thorough understanding of safety issues can be determined and addressed. Additionally, there is continuing review of department plant and facility design and maintenance issues that will address safety and training in these areas. Recent examples of repairs that have been made to reduce workplace injuries and improve safety include new correctional rated cell doors including food and cuff ports, new correctional shower doors, retrofitting exit signs, implementation of an earthquake anchoring program for all cabinets over 5' tall, installation of a water tank by-pass system at CJ#5 to gain access to additional water in an emergency, and an updated design for the ADA ward. The Workforce Development Division will be contacted to review this information.	Recommendation Implemented	The Sheriff's Department continually updates its safety programs and procedures to reflect advances in workplace safety and to address specific safety issues.
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	R1c: The Sheriff's Department should review its safety programs with the Workforce Development Division, analyze the cause of worker injuries, and update safety education programs for both staff and inmates.	Department of Human Resources	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The DHR Workers' Compensation Division (as opposed to the Workforce Development Division) is well-suited to work with the Sheriff's Department on analysis of worker injuries and development of safety education programs for staff. The DHR Workers' Compensation Division will further analyze the cause of worker injuries and proactively assist the Sheriff's Department with this analysis. Neither the DHR Workers' Compensation Division, nor the Workforce Development Division have the necessary expertise in the specialized area of inmate health and safety to assist the Sheriff's Department in reviewing and updating safety education programs for inmates.	Recommendation Implemented / Requires Further Analysis	As noted in DHR's 2014 response, recommendations regarding inmate health and safety are not within the expertise of DHR Workers' Compensation Division nor the Workforce Development Division. The action plan is limited to working with the Sheriff's department on identification of injury trends and communications regarding those trends. The DHR-Workers' Compensation Division continues to analyze the causes of injuries for all departments, including the Sheriff's Department. Analyses are projected to be in place and distributed biannually in 2017.

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	R1d: Communication between the Sheriff's Department and the appropriate City personnel in the Worker's Compensation Division who adjust workers' compensation claims should occur on a regular basis to review ongoing status of all outstanding claims.	Sheriff's Department	Requires Further Analysis	This department communicates with and will continue to communicate with the Workers' Compensation Division and the Department of Human Resources regarding these issues.	Recommendation Implemented	The Sheriff's Department is in constant communication with the Workers' Compensation Division and the Department of Human Resources regarding these issues.
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	R1d: Communication between the Sheriff's Department and the appropriate City personnel in the Worker's Compensation Division who adjust workers' compensation claims should occur on a regular basis to review ongoing status of all outstanding claims.	Department of Human Resources	Recommendation Implemented	Over the last year the DHR Workers' Compensation Division revamped its claims team for the Sheriff's Department and implemented a close communications process. The DHR Workers' Compensation Division claims team communicates on a weekly basis with the assigned staff at the Sheriff's Department to review ongoing status of outstanding claims, and regularly conducts claim reviews to ensure claims are being brought to closure.	**	
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	2.a The Sheriff's Department should review and update all policies and procedures for conducting daily activities, and planning and preparing for emergencies every 2 years.	Sheriff's Department	Recommendation Implemented	The sheriff s department reviews and updates all recommended policies and procedures every two years as required by Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) and Title 15. This department currently meets or exceeds the requirements of Title 15 in related policies. In the last BSCC biennial facility inspection in July, 2013, BSCC reviewed the San Francisco Sheriff s Department Policy and Procedure Manual, the San Francisco Sheriffs Department Custody Division Manual, facility specific manuals, the Jail Psychiatric Services (JPS) Manual and the Jail Health Services Manual. BSCC found that the manuals were easy to use and that there were no findings of noncompliance with the Title 15 Regulations. Further, BSCC found that "the sheriff s custody policy and procedure manual is constantly reviewed and updated to ensure best practices in the custody setting".	**	
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	2.b Inmates admitted to general wards at San Francisco General Hospital must be guarded. Procedures for both nighttime and daytime staffing should be immediately reviewed and all policy and procedure documents updated.	Sheriff's Department	Recommendation Implemented	All inmates admitted to general wards of San Francisco General Hospital are guarded, with rare exceptions, such as those situations provided for pursuant to Penal Code Section 4011.7 and 4011.9. Policy and procedures are reviewed and updated every two years as required by BSCC and Title 15. All inmates admitted to locked jail wards of San Francisco General Hospital (Wards 70 and 7L) are under the supervision of the sheriff s department personnel. A designated sheriff s sergeant is assigned to these wards and is in continuous contact with SFGH administration to determine and implement staffing and policy needs. However, Ward 70 does not always remain open. For the period of February - August, 2014, Ward 70 was only open for 16 days. During the times when 7D is closed, as determined by the Department of Public Health (DPH), inmates are moved to other open hospital wards for medical care. A minimum of one deputy is assigned to guard each inmate. Additional deputies are required to guard an inmate when the inmate has been determined to pose an increased public safety risk. When the jail ward is closed, the cost of the deputies to guard inmates in the open wards is usually paid on overtime, due to the changed staffing needs that this assignment requires. County Jail #5 is the newest jail facility for San Francisco inmates and houses a medical unit that is not adequately utilized. Additional medical services should be administered through this facility which would reduce the number of inmates requiring transport to, and supervision at SFGH. Providing enhanced services at the facility level would mitigate the staffing challenges required to transport an inmate to SFGH. As the BSCC confirmed in their July 2013 inspection, "with staffing levels very low it becomes challenging to carry out everyday duties when staff is called upon unexpectedly to transport inmates."	**	
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	2.b Inmates admitted to general wards at San Francisco General Hospital must be guarded. Procedures for both nighttime and daytime staffing should be immediately reviewed and all policy and procedure documents updated.	Department of Public Health	Recommendation Implemented	Per SFGH Administrative policies 6.06 Care of Custody/Forensic patients at SFGH Acute Care Units and 16.22 Prisoner/Patient: Treatment and transport through SFGH, SFGH has specified policies and procedures in place for ensuring patients in custody are always guarded by the arresting agency or SFSD. (SFGH Administrative policies 6.06 and 16.22 were attached to response)	**	
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	2.c Inmates are transferred between SFPD stations and when necessary, to San Francisco General Hospital. Procedures for any transfers should be clarified and established as a Policy & Procedure document.	Sheriff's Department	Recommendation Implemented	Recent policy and procedures regarding inmates being transferred between SFPD stations and SFGH have been updated and implemented in coordination with the Station Transfer Unit program commenced in July, 2014. The Station Transfer Unit program is a pilot program between the San Francisco Police Department and the sheriff's department for the sheriff to provide inmate transportation from the police station to the sheriff s intake facility or to SFGH, when needed. The pilot program includes transfers from Mission Station and Tenderloin Station. The pilot program runs through 2014. Further, the department is in the process of preparing the Emergency Room Forensic Patient Policy for how individuals in custody are safely transported to SFGH emergency room from a custody facility or police station. This policy is expected to be finalized in October, 2014.	**	
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	2.c Inmates are transferred between SFPD stations and when necessary, to San Francisco General Hospital. Procedures for any transfers should be clarified and established as a Policy & Procedure document.	San Francisco Police Department	Recommendation Implemented	The San Francisco Sheriff s Department (SFSD) and the SFPD entered into a Letter of Agreement (LOA) for a six-month pilot project that began July 19, 2014, for district station transportation services at two stations, Tenderloin and Mission. Section 1.4 "Scope of Service" of the LOA sets out the parameters under which the SFSD assumes responsibility for SFPD custodies from Mission and Tenderloin stations. Until SFSD personnel assume responsibility for a custody, SFPD members are required to adhere to all established SFPD policies, procedures and protocols relating to booking, detention and handling of inmates.	**	
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	2.c Inmates are transferred between SFPD stations and when necessary, to San Francisco General Hospital. Procedures for any transfers should be clarified and established as a Policy & Procedure document.	Department of Public Health	Recommendation Implemented	Per SFSD Standing Procedure Hospital Transport/Deputy Protocol there is a specified procedure for ensuring patients in custody are safely transported between SFGH and the county jail. In addition, the Inpatient Forensic Psychiatric Unit has specific guidelines they follow when transferring patients back to the county jail that includes a clinical handoff to Jail Psychiatric Services staff prior to transfer. These guidelines are documented in SFGH Administrative policies 6.03 Jail Health Services: Emergency Psychiatric Evaluation and Treatment of Prisoner/Patients and 6.04 Forensic Service: Admission of the Prisoner/Patient to the 7L Psychiatric Unit at San Francisco General Hospital Medical Center. SFGH Administrative policies 6.03 and 6.04 are attached. The SFSD and SFPD are in the process of developing a policy and procedure to address the specific recommendation regarding how people in custody are safely transported between SFPD stations and when necessary to SFGH. This pending policy is in draft form and is expected to be finalized October, 2014.	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	2.d During transfers, inmates may be intoxicated or needing minor medical care. Procedures for handling this situation should be clarified with the Department of Health to establish a policy and procedure document.	Sheriff's Department	Recommendation Implemented	This department communicates with DPH regarding the need for medical or psychiatric care upon transfer to SFGH. DPH has their own policy and procedure regarding treatment of these individuals. Individuals may be transferred directly to SFGH from the police station or may be transferred from the sheriff's department booking facility once the need for treatment is determined. Prior to booking an individual into the county jail, every individual is medically triaged by a DPH nurse. The triage process includes a medical and mental health review to determine suitability for jail housing or transport to SFGH for further treatment. Many of the individuals requiring transport to SFGH required services to treat mental illness and psychiatric conditions. Sheriff's department personnel are in communication with psychiatric emergency services at SFGH and Jail Psychiatric Services in the jails.	**	
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	2.d During transfers, inmates may be intoxicated or needing minor medical care. Procedures for handling this situation should be clarified with the Department of Health to establish a policy and procedure document.	Department of Public Health	Recommendation Implemented	Policy and Procedure No. 111 of SFDPH's Jail Health Services section identifies patients who have medical conditions that could put them at risk, including the withdrawal from alcohol. Nurses follow standardized procedure for alcohol detoxification. Additionally, Policy and Procedure No. 302 addresses inmates needing minor medical care. Arrestees entering the County Jail for booking and/or housing are seen and evaluated by Jail Health Services staff before being housed in any area of the jails. Arrestees who have medical problems beyond the scope of the facility's medical staff to manage safely are referred to San Francisco General Hospital Medical Center. (Policy and Procedure Nos. 111 and 302 were attached to response).	**	
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	3.a The Sheriff's Department should review and revise its written Orientation Guide for incoming inmates regarding safety, behavior standards, and daily routines.	Sheriff's Department	Requires Further Analysis	The lieutenant of the Custody Division has been assigned to review and update the current general orientation booklet. The San Francisco Sheriffs Department is home to a one of a kind facility, the Reentry Pod. The Reentry Pod is a facility for local inmates and inmates transported from state prison who are to be released into the community, following their sentences. In collaboration with the San Francisco Adult Probation Department, the Reentry Pod provides a myriad of reentry services and counseling for those individuals soon to be released into the community. In response to AB 109 - Realignment, the Reentry Pod furthers the goal of reducing prison populations, providing services for reentry and reducing recidivism. The inmates housed in this pod also receive an orientation guide specific to reentry services. This guide was recently prepared specifically for the Reentry Pod.	Recommendation Implemented	The Custody Division worked with the Five Keys Charter School to rewrite the orientation guide to the appropriate reading level.
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	3.b Appropriate reading level should be ascertained and applied to the guidelines in Recommendation 3a.	Sheriff's Department	Requires Further Analysis	The lieutenant of the Custody Division has been assigned to coordinate efforts to determine the appropriate reading level of the orientation guide. Education professionals will be included in this evaluation and update of the orientation guide.	Recommendation Implemented	The Custody Division worked with the Five Keys Charter School to rewrite the orientation guide to the appropriate reading level.
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	4.a An Advisory Committee of educators and industry professionals should be organized to advise each Five Keys program on further development of goals and practices to expand student attendance, academic studies, and job preparation.	Sheriff's Department	Requires Further Analysis	The Five Keys Charter School has a board of directors, including the sheriff and community members, who develop the program including the development of goals and practices to expand student attendance, academic studies, and job preparation. Other programs have their own advisory committees. As an example, The Women's Resource Center, which provides services to women post release, is advised by the Gender Responsive Blueprint. In addition to the varied educational programming offered by the Five Keys Charter School, the department is home to the following educational and newly implemented vocational programs: Solar Design and Installation Training - participants learn solar design and installation techniques. The curriculum teaches information allowing participants to study for and eventually take the North American Board of Certified Energy Practitioners Exam and offers job placement assistance. Digital Arts Training - participants learn digital media tools, including HD video cameras. All participants receive a one year membership to the Bay Area Video Coalition, allowing access to variety of technology and art classes. Cisco Academy - participants receive computer networking essentials and instruction in computer troubleshooting, repair and installation. The curriculum teaches information allowing participants to eventually take the Cisco Networking Essentials Certification exam. San Francisco City College - City College, in a pilot program in collaboration with Five Keys Charter School, began offering two college courses in the Spring 2014. Current courses are prerequisites for their Drug and Alcohol Counseling and Prison Health Worker Certification programs. Roots of Success - a new job readiness curriculum offered by Five Keys is being implemented which increases students' academic, professional, and leadership skills. This program is specifically designed for students who have barriers to employment and provides information about employment and social enterprise opportunities and provides training to increase job related search and interview skills. Construction Training - a program is being created to provide training and a direct link to construction employment opportunities. Culinary Arts - currently, the Serve Safe certification program is offered to male and female inmates. A student is provided training to take the exam to become a state certified food handler. A program is being created to further provide vocational training and supported employment opportunities for women, post release. This program will be located in the Women's Resource Center, a resource facility focused on assisting women post release. Urban Gardening - a program combining classroom study and on-hands gardening experience at the sheriff's San Bruno property. NoVA - No Violence Alliance. This program is an individual intensive case management program for males providing education, employment counseling, substance abuse counseling, therapy, and housing support. NoVA is offered at 70 Oak Grove, the post release facility for men. Further analysis and discussion is needed in order to determine whether an advisory board would be an effective tool to further the accomplishments already being made by Five Keys, this department and the varied community partners.	Recommendation Implemented	The Five Keys Charter School is an independent non-profit that collaborates with the Sheriff's Department to provide in-custody and post-release education and vocational programming as well as case management, cognitive behavior programming and reentry services to prisoners and ex-offenders. The Sheriff is one member of the Five Key Board of Directors. The school and the department continually seek to expand programming in scope and in numbers of students.
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	4.b Further outreach into the community should be accomplished to incorporate more and varied job opportunities for graduates of Five Keys after their release.	Sheriff's Department	Requires Further Analysis	The programs described in Recommendation 4a and the Five Keys Charter School continually seek the support of community based businesses and agencies to provide job opportunities to the graduates of Five Keys and the students of all the other programs offered by the San Francisco Sheriff's Department. These efforts have resulted in the continued success of the Five Keys Charter School programs and the many educational and vocational programs now offered and being created for inmates and former inmates. This outreach is ongoing. As Sheriff, I welcome the input and attention the Civil Grand Jury has provided to this department in this report. The Civil Grand Jury's independent review has focused on several very important and timely issues facing the sheriff's department. All of the findings and recommendations relate to the everyday operations and responsibilities of the sheriff's department. However, not all of the noted concerns have an easy or quick remedy.	Recommendation Implemented	The Five Keys Charter School is an independent non-profit that collaborates with the Sheriff's Department to provide in-custody and post-release education and vocational programming as well as case management, cognitive behavior programming and reentry services for prisoners and ex-offenders. The Sheriff is one member of the Board of Directors. Outreach to potential employers is continuous and on-going.

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	1. The Port Commission should be restructured to reflect more public interest. The Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors seek necessary changes in state law to allow a charter amendment to be submitted to the public for revision of the current five-member Port Commission appointed by the Mayor to a Port Commission with three mayoral appointees and two by the Board of Supervisors. We recommend that this change be put before the voters in 2015.	Board of Supervisors	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	Such an effort is well beyond the Board of Supervisors' jurisdiction, requiring both State legislative change as well as San Francisco voter approval. San Francisco's state representatives are the more appropriate officials to undertake this effort. Further, there is a process for how Port Commissioners are selected that goes through the Board of Supervisors; when the Mayor nominates a Commissioner, that nomination is subject to Board of Supervisors' approval and a public hearing is held by the Board's Rules Committee.	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	1. The Port Commission should be restructured to reflect more public interest. The Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors seek necessary changes in state law to allow a charter amendment to be submitted to the public for revision of the current five-member Port Commission appointed by the Mayor to a Port Commission with three mayoral appointees and two by the Board of Supervisors. We recommend that this change be put before the voters in 2015.	Mayor (not required to respond; submitted response)	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	This recommendation is unnecessary and there appears to be no perceivable benefit. First, the Board of Supervisors already approves Mayoral appointments to the Port Commission. If they so choose, a Supervisor has the ability to vote against any Port Commission appointment. Second, state law would need to be revised for voters to even consider this recommendation. Such an effort would be an unproductive use of City lobbying efforts in Sacramento.	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	2a. Costs and benefits to repair and maintain these piers should be evaluated and weighed against the cost and benefits of not doing so. It may be possible that the sacrifice of some piers will reduce maintenance costs, thereby freeing monies for repair of more significant structures and create more open space.	Port of San Francisco	Recommendation Implemented	This recommendation already represents the Port's current practice. The Port does NOT have a policy of attempting to repair all existing piers and related structures. The Port initiated its 10 year Capital Plan in 2006 and noted "the goal of this 10 year Capital Plan is to provide a basis for pursuing public funding and public/private partnerships to address the Port's critical capital needs, and to prioritize spending based on public safety, fiscal responsibility, and the Port's mission. The Plan will help identify facilities and/or piers that the Port may need to close... In short, the Port will be faced with the possibility of closing up to seven piers that have the largest currently unfunded needs." The Port has updated its 10 Year Capital Plan annually for the purpose of cataloguing pier repair costs. This repair cost estimation is not a policy statement, however, but rather the calculation of cost necessary to conduct cost benefit analyses. As a part of the Plan's annual update, the Port prioritizes its scarce funding across its facilities using criteria that include cost benefit analyses.	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	2b. Other sources of revenue should be expanded. Maritime and industrial use in the Southern Waterfront has great potential. The Port is actively pursuing growth in this area and should continue to improve infrastructure and search for new tenants.	Port of San Francisco	Recommendation Implemented	Expansion of maritime industrial activities is a major objective of the Port. Maritime industrial activities provide family wage jobs in the City where blue collar employment is eroding. Port initiatives to install shore power and to expand the port dry-docks at Pier 70 have resulted in a 50% increase in revenue at our ship repair operation and hundreds of thousands of additional man hours of employment since 2008. The Port currently handles approximately 1.4 million metric tons of import bulk aggregates annually at Pier 94. The Port is working to develop an adjacent bulk export terminal at Pier 96 for cargoes such as iron ore. Feasibility and engineering design studies are underway and the Port is upgrading cargo rail connectivity to the cargo terminals funded by a Federal Railway Administrative grant. This initiative could triple bulk cargo volumes at the Port with corresponding significant growth in maritime revenue. The Port is collaborating with Union Pacific Railroad to develop these and other rail served cargo opportunities. This includes containerized bulk exports that could be loaded onto bulk vessels at the Pier 80 Omni cargo terminal. The Port continues to handle break bulk (noncontainerized) cargo and project cargoes at Pier 80 which are slowly rebounding after a prolonged slump brought on by the financial downturn.	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	3. Proposed variances from the Plan should receive increased public scrutiny prior to the issuance of an RFP.	Port of San Francisco	Recommendation Implemented	The Port agrees that projects that require an amendment to the Waterfront Land Use Plan need to be highlighted for public review. Furthermore, the Port actively engages the public in review of these variances. Where this is known before the Port solicits development partners, the Port does conduct public review process to directly address this need. The pre RFQ/P public planning efforts for Seawall Lot 337 and the Pier 70 Waterfront Site were designed specifically to engage public input and guidance to define the project objectives and priorities prior to soliciting development partners. Even in non RFP situations, such as the Golden State Warriors' proposal for Piers 30 32 & Seawall Lot 330, the public process made clear from the outset that such projects would require amendments to both the Port's Waterfront Land Use Plan and to City zoning, in particular regarding project heights. Public comments and concerns regarding these amendment requirements received a high degree of public review and debate.	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	3. Proposed variances from the Plan should receive increased public scrutiny prior to the issuance of an RFP.	Planning Department	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	We agree that the waterfront is of critical importance to the City of San Francisco. We disagree that public input is limited and only includes members of the CAC. The Port provides public notification and the CA C's meetings follow all requirements, including the Brown Act, for public meetings. Opportunities for early public input are provided through venues beyond the CAC, including during the Planning Department's CEQA review process. During CEQA, facts and data are gathered to improve understanding of a project's potential impacts on land, water, air, noise, historic resources, living creatures, aesthetics, and resources both cultural and natural. It is during this review that multiple iterations of the project are explored and vetted for public consideration through highly prescriptive and process-oriented regulations such that every public comment is considered and given a written response. We agree that public scrutiny is critical to the review process and that adherence to the Plan and the City's zoning laws are achieved through the ultimate project. While variances should be limited to those which are determined to be necessary for a project that better meets public needs, variances are typically minor exceptions to existing law. As such, the need for these variances would not be known at issuance of the RFP and would likely only be identified after the project has been developed in more detailed renderings.	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	4a. The Port should immediately begin an assessment and update of the Waterfront Land Use Plan, to be renamed the Waterfront Maritime and Land Use Plan to meet current and future requirements for Port development. This should be completed and adopted in a relatively short time span of one to two years.	Port of San Francisco	Will Be Implemented in the Future	While the successes are many, the Waterfront Land Use Plan is a living document that must strive to improve and adapt. On August 11, 2014, Port staff issued an initial report to the Port Commission and public that presents an assessment of projects, activities and public discourse over the 17 year life of the Waterfront Land Use Plan. It seeks to surface new ideas and concepts that might be woven into the Waterfront Land Use Plan. The Port staff analysis in this report grapples with the highest level set of issues, including uses of the port area, historic rehabilitation, open space, waterfront development, urban design, transportation, sea level rise and public process, including preliminary recommendations in each of these areas. These recommendations are offered to the public, the Port Commission, the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor in the spirit of keeping the Waterfront Land Use Plan as relevant today as it was when it was adopted, and responsive enough to successfully guide the next generation of waterfront improvements. The Port welcomes public comment on these recommendations through September 30, 2014; Port staff will finalize this report in October 2014 as the 2014 Waterfront Land Use Plan Review.	Recommendation Implemented	In 2015, the Port Commission and Port staff initiated a process to update the Waterfront Land Use Plan through a public process, and the Port Director appointed an advisory group with 35 members representing a broad diversity of expertise and interests to advise the Port Commission regarding potential amendments to the Waterfront Land Use Plan. The public process started in January 2016. The following link provides information about the planning process including links to videos of public meetings and the schedule of forthcoming meetings: http://sfport.com/waterfront-plan-update

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	4b. The Port should ensure that changes or variances to the existing Waterfront Land Use Plan or the City's General Plan should have extensive public input before implementation.	Port of San Francisco	Recommendation Implemented	All Port development projects undergo a robust public review and vetting process, particularly those that require amendments to the Waterfront Land Use Plan and City General Plan.	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	4b. The Port should ensure that changes or variances to the existing Waterfront Land Use Plan or the City's General Plan should have extensive public input before implementation.	Planning Department	Recommendation Implemented	<p>The current planning construct incorporates careful professional staff and other review of many issues to balance multiple public benefit and policy objectives, including land use density and compatibility, historic preservation, transportation, public open space, urban form and architectural design. This multi-layered review grew in response to articulated public values and the City's changing economic needs and design goals over the years and is tailored to the issues and needs raised by a particular project. The multiple public hearings provide ample opportunity for public input to shape development projects.</p> <p>Any change to the City's General Plan fall under the responsibility of the Planning Commission. Under existing law and practice the Commission demands that professional planning feed data and analysis to the Commission in a transparent and public process that provides holistic assessment of the proposed change and its potential effect on the City. Beginning with CEQA review, facts and data are gathered to improve understanding of a project's potential impacts on land, water, air, noise, historic resources, living creatures, aesthetics, and resources both cultural and natural. Next, the Planning Department provides an interpretation of the data; evaluating the project against the City's adopted policies. This professional analysis provides additional information for members of the public to respond to and evaluate for themselves whether the project meets planning goals and ensures that decisions are rooted both in adopted policies and contemporary best practices. Finally, local law requires multiple hearings with associated public noticing before public boards, commissions, and committees to make transparent the professional analysis so that the public may test both the underlying data and the conclusions. At each hearing, the general public and advocates can directly address decision-makers with their concerns and opinions. Fully-informed decision makers then can seek to mold the project that not only meets City laws and policies but also leverages public benefits to best meet the adopted vision for the waterfront.</p>	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	4b. The Port should ensure that changes or variances to the existing Waterfront Land Use Plan or the City's General Plan should have extensive public input before implementation.	Board of Supervisors	Recommendation Implemented	As noted in the Port's response, "all Port development projects undergo a robust public review and vetting process"	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	5. SFMTA should incorporate current and future transit needs, taking into consideration not only increased capacity requirements from individual projects, but the cumulative effect of multiple projects added to existing passenger loads. SFMTA must address reliability and increased capacity that will be required for all modes of transportation, especially the T-Line and motor coach lines connecting to the Pier 70 site. The VETAG system should be maintained to operate at maximum efficiency.	Port of San Francisco	Recommendation Implemented	While this recommendation is not directed to the Port, the Port notes that the Port and SFMTA have partnered with extraordinarily close coordination and thoughtful planning over the last four years. The successes of this partnership are many and have been enjoyed by the 23 million people who visited the Port's waterfront in 2013 alone. Without careful management by the SFMTA and the Port, the priority for reuniting San Francisco with its waterfront would not be realized. The efforts of this partnership with respect to the 34th America's Cup and proposed development projects are well known. Additionally, the Port and SFMTA have partnered in addressing transportation issues in numerous locations, including at the Ferry Building, Fisherman's Wharf, the James R. Herman Cruise Terminal and along Cargo Way, Terry Francois Blvd. and Illinois Street.	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	5. SFMTA should incorporate current and future transit needs, taking into consideration not only increased capacity requirements from individual projects, but the cumulative effect of multiple projects added to existing passenger loads. SFMTA must address reliability and increased capacity that will be required for all modes of transportation, especially the T-Line and motor coach lines connecting to the Pier 70 site. The VETAG system should be maintained to operate at maximum efficiency.	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority	Recommendation Implemented	<p>Had been implemented prior to the original report's release.</p> <p>All SFMTA transportation planning is premised on current and future transportation needs in San Francisco for all modes. The Waterfront Transportation Assessment (the "Assessment") was scoped to evaluate the current and planned transportation network (the transportation "pipeline") in the face of cumulative future development through 2040. The guiding principles of the Assessment have been "capacity, safety, reliability and flexibility," and were established by SFMTA in coordination with the Port, other city departments and regional transit providers, with oversight by community stakeholders.</p> <p>The Assessment was structured around three major development proposals on Port properties: the Warriors Arena at Piers 30-32 and SWL 330 (now relocated to non-Port property in Mission Bay), SWL 337 - the Giants Mission Rock, and Pier 70 (Forest City). The SFMTA and the Waterfront Transportation Assessment have worked closely with the Port, Environmental Planning and OEWD to ensure that project transportation management plans were being conceived of in a framework of the comprehensive waterfront transportation network, along with growth anticipated through 2040. In light of the status of these major proposals, this work must be on-going to inform, and be informed, by the development proposals as they advance. Though no longer on Port property, the Warriors Arena in Mission Bay is the most active project that will impact the waterfront transportation network, and SFMTA continues to closely track and coordinate its transportation plans.</p> <p>The Waterfront Transportation Assessment is anticipated to continue into early 2015, and will not only help the city and SFMTA in evaluating, prioritizing, planning and funding for transportation investments along key waterfront corridors such as Third Street, and it will also help to inform improvements related to development proposals along the waterfront, on both city and Port-owned properties, such as Pier 70, as their own transportation plans are developed and/or mitigations identified.</p> <p>In addition to the Waterfront Transportation Assessment, the following are several of many examples of major transportation capacity and service improvements that are currently under way and that will increase safety, capacity, reliability and flexibility for all modes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Muni Forward", SFMTA's multi-year short range plan to expand and improve service, which includes a 12% service increase, transit-only lanes, a complete replacement of Muni's rail and bus fleet, and engineering tools such as VETAG (signal priority) to allow for better management and transit priority throughout the city; - The 2014 SFMTA Fleet Management Plan, which details the addition of 40 LRVs to the Muni system (including the T Third) by 2021, 424 40' and 60' motor coaches, and 100 trolley coaches by 2018; - Central Subway, which is served by the T Third and is anticipated to carry 65,000 riders by 2030; - 16th Street Multimodal Corridor, which will extend the Muni Rapid Network 22-Fillmore to Mission Bay along separated, transit-only lanes. - Embarcadero Enhancement Project that will include a recommended design for the Embarcadero Bikeway to be completed by Fall 2015. 	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	6. The City should immediately begin lobbying for modifications to the Passenger Vessel Services Act of 1886 to allow foreignflagged vessels easier access to the City as a pilot program. This lobbying effort should be in conjunction with other U.S. passenger port destinations including those in Alaska, Hawaii, Oregon, and Washington.	Port of San Francisco	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	<p>The Port was a founding member of the "Cruise America" coalition of U.S. West Coast Ports and other tourism interests who, in 1998, sought a legislative exception of the Passenger Vessel Services Act (PVSA). This effort gained support in Congress under the leadership of Senator John McCain (R AZ), then chairman of the Commerce Science and Transportation Committee. Senator McCain led the legislative effort in congress by sponsoring the United States Cruise Tourism Act which would allow foreign oceangoing passenger ships to serve multiple destinations along U.S. Coasts while protecting U.S. based companies.</p> <p>This 1998 effort to modify the PVSA encountered fierce opposition from some segments of organized labor, including unions that represented employees of other Port maritime tenants. While theoretically an exception to the PVSA could provide additional work for land based maritime unions, other unions representing seafaring workers feared that granting exceptions or weakening the PVSA would irrefutably harm the nation's shipbuilding and merchant marine industry. Ultimately the bill did not gain traction and the effort was shelved.</p> <p>Ironically, the cruise industry is not advocating any change to this law. Cruise lines, through their International Association, think that while a reformed PVSA might add some new U.S. ports to cruise itineraries, it would not be a significant amount, especially in light of the restrictions that likely would be attached.</p> <p>Rather than lead the charge to modify the PVSA, the Port believes a better strategy is to continue to monitor possible legislative developments for exemptions or modification of the PVSA and work through the American Association of Port Authorities (AAPA), the industry's leading trade association, for any effort to alter current law.</p> <p>AAPA's members include every cruise port in Canada, Central and South America and the Caribbean. AAPA has openly supported legislation to permit non U.S. flag cruise ships to operate on the U.S. coastwide trade where there is no large U.S. flag cruise ship in service. AAPA staff work regularly with members of Congress and monitor legislative efforts that impact the port industry. The Port actively serves on the AAPA Cruise committee and believes that it would be more effective to join a wider effort to gain possible legislative exception. This strategy will use the collective power of the U.S. cruise port industry, thus not singling out San Francisco. This strategy will likely ensue over a 2 year period.</p>	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	6. The City should immediately begin lobbying for modifications to the Passenger Vessel Services Act of 1886 to allow foreignflagged vessels easier access to the City as a pilot program. This lobbying effort should be in conjunction with other U.S. passenger port destinations including those in Alaska, Hawaii, Oregon, and Washington.	Mayor	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	<p>Senator John McCain's 1998 legislation to allow foreign oceangoing passenger ships to serve multiple destinations along U.S. coasts was unsuccessful due to opposition from organized labor. Seafaring unions feared that weakening the Passenger Vessel Services Act (PVSA) would harm the nation's shipbuilding and merchant marine industry.</p> <p>Rather than lead the charge to modify the PVSA, the Port believes a better strategy is to continue to monitor possible legislative developments for possible exemptions or modification of the PVSA and work through the American Association of Port Authorities (AAPA), the industry's leading trade association, for any effort to alter current law. AAPA's members include every cruise port in Canada, Central and South America and the Caribbean. AAPA has supported legislation to permit non-U.S. flag cruise ships to operate where there is no large U.S. flag cruise ship in service.</p>	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	6. The City should immediately begin lobbying for modifications to the Passenger Vessel Services Act of 1886 to allow foreignflagged vessels easier access to the City as a pilot program. This lobbying effort should be in conjunction with other U.S. passenger port destinations including those in Alaska, Hawaii, Oregon, and Washington.	Board of Supervisors	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	<p>The Board of Supervisors is not the appropriate City body to spearhead such an effort; however, the Board of Supervisors encourages the Port to advocate and pursue any amendments to or exemptions from the Passenger Vessel Services Act (PVSA) that could benefit the Port and the City. The Board will support the Port in this effort however it can.</p>	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	7. The Port should consider alternatives to fund the cost of rehabilitating Piers 30-32. The sale of Seawall Lot 330 could supply a large portion of \$68 M needed to strengthen the substructure for light use. The Jury recommends that the Port actively investigate alternative light uses for Piers 30-32. In addition to general park usage, sports fields for soccer, tennis, basketball, or other sports could be provided. Temporary venues for entertainment companies such as Teatro ZinZanni, Cirque de Soleil, and Cavalia would also not require an extensive substructure. Although not light use, the Port might also consider placement of a major marine research institute to fully utilize the unique characteristics of this site.	Port of San Francisco	Will Be Implemented in the Future	<p>The structures atop Piers 30 32 were destroyed by fire in 1984. Since that time, the Port has continued to analyze alternatives to rehabilitate Piers 30 32, including both public and private investments. The Golden State Warriors proposal represented the 6th proposed rehabilitation since the 1980s.</p> <p>Subsequent to the decision of the GSW not to pursue Piers 30 32, Port staff has analyzed alternatives such as general park usage, sports fields, cruise berthing, etc. Such analysis is published more completely in an August 7, 2014 Memorandum to the Port Commission. Any permanent change in use resulting in an increase in the volume of public users must consider major rehabilitation including a seismic upgrade. The total cost of a substructure rehabilitation including seismic strengthening will depend on the type and size of these improvements and is expected to be around \$100 million.</p> <p>Temporary uses or events lasting 180 days or less are acceptable. However, they must consider structural load limits currently in place.</p> <p>The construction of a major marine research institute will likely trigger a major rehabilitation effort including seismic strengthening. The project cost of building such a facility will require further analysis and study.</p>	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The planning process to update the Waterfront Land Use Plan will include focused land use planning in the South Beach neighborhood, including examination of use opportunities for Piers 30-32. The Port Commission is scheduled to review staff generated ideas and options for Piers 30-32 at its June 14, 2016 Port Commission meeting.

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	8a. All major events at the Port, like the America's Cup, must be approved by the Port Commission and the Board of Supervisors.	Port of San Francisco	Recommendation Implemented	Indeed, all major events at the Port, like the 34th America's Cup, are approved by the Port Commission and the Board of Supervisors. The Port Commission held 39 separate hearings to publicly review, comment and vote on the activities of the 34th America's Cup from March 2009 through September 2013. This included 16 informational presentations and 23 approval requests submitted for Port Commission consideration and action. Similarly, the Board of Supervisors also held 31 hearings to publicly review, comment and vote on activities of the 34th America's Cup from April 2010 through October 2013. The hearings pertained to activities of the 34th America's Cup including, but not limited to, the (1) Host and Venue Agreement, (2) Final Environmental Impact Report and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, (3) MOU with the Port, (4) America's Cup Workforce Development Plan, (5) budget appropriation ordinances, and (6) Lease Disposition Agreement. Of these 31 hearings, 16 were hearings before the full Board of Supervisors and 15 were committee hearings including 12 before the Budget and Finance Committee and subject to review and report by the Budget Analyst to the Board of Supervisors.	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	8a. All major events at the Port, like the America's Cup, must be approved by the Port Commission and the Board of Supervisors.	Board of Supervisors	Recommendation Implemented	"Major" is a subjective term, but if it is taken to mean an event similar to the 34th America's Cup, this recommendation has been implemented. As the Port's response notes, the America's Cup was extensively vetted and approved by both the Port Commission and the Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	8a. All major events at the Port, like the America's Cup, must be approved by the Port Commission and the Board of Supervisors.	Mayor	Recommendation Implemented	The Port Commission held hearings to publicly review, comment, and vote on the activities of the 34th America's Cup that took place on or affected Port property. From March 2009 through September 2013, the Port Commission heard 39 separate items regarding activities of the 34th America's Cup, including 16 informational presentations and 23 approval requests submitted for Port Commission consideration and action. Similarly, the Board of Supervisors also held hearings to publicly review, comment and vote on activities of the 34th America's Cup. From April 2010 through October 2013, the Board of Supervisors held 31 hearings regarding activities of the 34th America's Cup including, but not limited to, (1) the Host and Venue Agreement, (2) Final Environmental Impact Report and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, (3) Memorandum of Understanding with the Port, (4) America's Cup Workforce Development Plan, (5) budget appropriation ordinances, and (6) Lease Disposition Agreement. Of these 31 hearings, 16 were hearings before the full Board of Supervisors and 15 were committee hearings including 12 before the Budget and Finance Committee and subject to review and report by the Budget Analyst to the Board of Supervisors. Finally, the Board of Supervisors voted unanimously to approve the entire transaction three separate times: once in approving the Host and Venue Agreement in December 2010, once to approve the project after the completion of CEQA in March 2012, and again in September 2012 when the security arrangements that were first approved had to be restructured.	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	8b. Prior to approval, the City should require a validated cost proposal using fair market rental rates, revenue sharing with the Port, marquee billing for the City, full post-event accounting, and posting of all event financials on the Port website within one month after completion of the event. Said report shall include an itemization of: o The amount and source of all revenue generated by the event. o The amount, payor, and payee of each cost incurred for the event. o The name of each event cancelled, if any, as a result of the approval of the event and the amount of revenue lost as a result of the cancellation.	Port of San Francisco	Recommendation Implemented	The analysis that Port staff provided to the Board of Supervisors for its initial approval of America's Cup agreements was intended to provide a detailed quantitative and qualitative analysis of the prospective regatta as was known at the time. Port staff briefed the Port Commission on an ongoing basis as more facts of the regatta and the projected outcomes were known. In responding to future unique waterfront opportunities the public and the Port Commission should expect a thorough analysis of the opportunity and the expected impact on public use and enjoyment of the waterfront as well as operating and capital costs. With respect to marquee billing, the City and Port required the America's Cup Event Authority to optimize the association of the City with the Event, recognizing the value and global reach of Event media coverage. The Port aggressively asserted its rights to accelerate part of the Cruise Terminal project schedule so that the "Port of San Francisco" sign atop it was installed prior to the start of racing and thus captured in international broadcasts that aired repeatedly in 130 countries worldwide. Physical signage in camera shots is the most valuable form of advertising, as superimposed digital imagery must be removed prior to rebroadcast in most countries.	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	8b. Prior to approval, the City should require a validated cost proposal using fair market rental rates, revenue sharing with the Port, marquee billing for the City, full post-event accounting, and posting of all event financials on the Port website within one month after completion of the event. Said report shall include an itemization of: o The amount and source of all revenue generated by the event. o The amount, payor, and payee of each cost incurred for the event. o The name of each event cancelled, if any, as a result of the approval of the event and the amount of revenue lost as a result of the cancellation.	Board of Supervisors	Recommendation Implemented	The Port's response indicates that it has and will continue implementing this recommendation, which the Board of Supervisors fully supports.	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	8b. Prior to approval, the City should require a validated cost proposal using fair market rental rates, revenue sharing with the Port, marquee billing for the City, full post-event accounting, and posting of all event financials on the Port website within one month after completion of the event. Said report shall include an itemization of: o The amount and source of all revenue generated by the event. o The amount, payor, and payee of each cost incurred for the event. o The name of each event cancelled, if any, as a result of the approval of the event and the amount of revenue lost as a result of the cancellation.	Mayor	Recommendation Implemented	When responding to future unique waterfront opportunities the Port Commission, Board of Supervisors, and members of the public should expect a thorough analysis of the opportunity and the expected impact on public use and enjoyment of the waterfront as well as operating and capital costs. During the initial approval of America's Cup agreements, the Board of Supervisors was provided a detailed quantitative and qualitative analysis of the prospective regatta as was known at the time by City staff. The America's Cup Organizing Committee engaged an outside economics firm to validate assumptions related to event-related tax revenues. Port staff briefed the Port Commission on an ongoing basis as more facts of the regatta and the projected outcomes were known. Furthermore, the Board of Supervisors Budget and Legislative Analyst performed a detailed analysis of the event costs before the approvals in 2010 and 2012. Both of these estimates proved to be well in excess of the costs that were actually incurred. San Francisco received "marquee billing" while hosting the America's Cup. The host agreement specifically noted the City's desire for San Francisco exposure. The official logo included the words "San Francisco." Most dramatically, the television broadcast of the event spectacularly showcased the City's waterfront venue to an international audience. When all America's Cup costs were accounted for after the event, City staff provided another detailed presentation to the Board of Supervisors and the Budget and Legislative Analyst issued another report. The recommendation to post online all event financials one month after the event will not be implemented. For example, one month after the America's Cup was not enough time to complete "event financials" as the permits for the event required a number of post-event remediations and improvements.	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	9a. The Port should ensure ongoing community input be maintained until an acceptable compromise is reached on the final plans.	Port of San Francisco	Recommendation Implemented	The Port and its developer will continue to solicit public input until final adoption of the project by the Port Commission and the Board of Supervisors. The Port will continue to solicit feedback from the public through meetings of the Central Waterfront Advisory Group, as well as through items before the Port Commission, the Planning Commission, BCDC and ultimately the Board of Supervisors. The developer has implemented an extensive community outreach program since development rights were awarded in April 2011. Additionally, the developer has placed a measure before the San Francisco electorate for the November 2014 election seeking public approval of its proposed project heights.	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	9a. The Port should ensure ongoing community input be maintained until an acceptable compromise is reached on the final plans.	Planning Department	"Should and Should Not be Implemented"	This recommendation should be implemented in that ongoing community input should be maintained. This recommendation should not be implemented in that it is the responsibility of the various duly appointed and elected decision makers to determine the project that best meets public needs.	Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	While the recommendation for the Port to gather community input is reasonable, the recommendation provides no direction to the Planning Department. That said, the Department is committed to working to ensure community engagement efforts affecting land use and planning.
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	9a. The Port should ensure ongoing community input be maintained until an acceptable compromise is reached on the final plans.	Department of Public Works	Recommendation Implemented	The Department of Public Works agrees with this recommendation especially that community input usually generates comments and ideas that benefit projects and ensures that final plan reflect community needs and concerns. The Department of Public Works worked closely with the Port in providing information and input on all matters related to Pier 70 Master Plan that are under Public Works jurisdiction. The Department of Public Works implemented a similar extensive outreach process for its projects and will continue to implement such a process in the future.	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	9a. The Port should ensure ongoing community input be maintained until an acceptable compromise is reached on the final plans.	Recreation and Parks Department	This recommendation should be implemented in that community input should be maintained	The ongoing community input must be maintained, but it is the responsibility of the appointed and elected decision makers to determine the project that meets the public needs	Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The Recreation and Park Department does not have jurisdiction over port properties and sites, but has and will continue to partner on a variety of projects with The Port
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	9b. The Jury neither supports nor opposes the development of Pier 70 but we strongly endorse the extensive public outreach and community input as part of the design and development process of the Pier 70 Master Plan. We recommend that the Port follow this model as a template for all major developments on Port lands.	Port of San Francisco	Recommendation Implemented	The Port Commission established the development parameters for the Waterfront Site, authorized a developer qualifications solicitation process, and on August 30, 2010, the Port issued the Pier 70 Waterfront Site Request for Qualifications. On April 17, 2011, after a public hearing the Port Commission awarded development rights to the waterfront site to Forest City. That action, awarding the development opportunity to Forest City, began a process of defining a project for the Waterfront Site and the development concepts envisioned in the Master Plan and the RFQ. After selection Forest City began an extensive community outreach program. This extra level of planning work was required to address numerous conditions specific to Pier 70, to determine whether there was a viable economic strategy that had community support to save its historic resources and allow sufficient development capacity to pay for new infrastructure, environmental improvement and new public open space, while maintaining compatibility with continued ship repair operations. Single phase development sites, such as those that have been improved to date in the northern half of the waterfront, are more straight forward development opportunities. While every development opportunity must undergo thorough public review, not every project will require the steps that were conducted for the Pier 70 Preferred Master Plan.	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	9b. The Jury neither supports nor opposes the development of Pier 70 but we strongly endorse the extensive public outreach and community input as part of the design and development process of the Pier 70 Master Plan. We recommend that the Port follow this model as a template for all major developments on Port lands.	Planning Department	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	This recommendation will not be implemented for all projects. This three-year process was appropriate for the large, 68 acre site of Pier 70 but may be excessive for most projects.	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	9b. The Jury neither supports nor opposes the development of Pier 70 but we strongly endorse the extensive public outreach and community input as part of the design and development process of the Pier 70 Master Plan. We recommend that the Port follow this model as a template for all major developments on Port lands.	Department of Public Works	Recommendation Implemented	The Department of Public Works agrees with this recommendation. We work closely with the Port of San Francisco on many small and large projects and we collaborate on public outreach and coordination with all affected agencies. However, while every development opportunity must undergo thorough public review, not every project will require the steps that were conducted for the Pier 70 Preferred Master Plan. The Department of Public Works implemented a similar extensive outreach process for its projects, and will continue to implement such a process in the future.	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	9b. The Jury neither supports nor opposes the development of Pier 70 but we strongly endorse the extensive public outreach and community input as part of the design and development process of the Pier 70 Master Plan. We recommend that the Port follow this model as a template for all major developments on Port lands.	Recreation and Parks Department	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	This three-year public outreach and community input process was needed to address the numerous conditions specific to the 68 acre site of Pier 70. While every development opportunity must undergo thorough public review, the input process for Pier 70 may be excessive for most project	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	10. The Jury recommends increased publicity and outreach so that an acceptable compromise can be reached on the scope of this development.	Port of San Francisco	Recommendation Implemented	The Port, City and the Mission Rock developer will continue an ongoing, robust public outreach program to advisory and regulatory bodies and to community groups, neighborhood and merchants' associations, and residents potentially affected by this project. Additionally, the Port Commission and the Board of Supervisors will continue to hold public hearings on this project which can be viewed on SFGovTV at any time. Port staff will continue to publish staff memorandums regarding this project which are available to the public through the Port Commission secretary or on the Port's website at http://sfport.com/index.aspx?page=25 . This project will also undergo environmental review per CEQA, which is a robust process open to the public. This project will also be submitted to the San Francisco electorate to review the project's proposed building heights. The Port further expects that many media organizations also will continue to cover this project for the benefit of the public.	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	10. The Jury recommends increased publicity and outreach so that an acceptable compromise can be reached on the scope of this development.	Planning Department	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Planning Department would like to reinforce the Port's stated commitment to a continuing, robust public outreach program. This project is not complete and the public can expect further outreach to community groups, neighborhood and merchants' associations, and residents potentially affected by this project. Required public hearings will also occur for this project as will our complete CEQA review. Each of these steps includes public review and comment as well as responses from the appropriate staff and final action by decision makers.	Recommendation Implemented	The Planning Department is currently involved in planning efforts for Port Lands and has included significant community outreach and engagement scope.
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	11. The Jury recommends that the Port Commission work with the Board of Supervisors to place a referendum before the voters that asks for approval to issue IFD Bonds. Such a referendum should specifically state the total amount of bonded indebtedness that the Port seeks to incur through IFD Bonds, the specific sources of funds for IFD Bond repayment, and the length of time required to discharge any IFD Bond debt.	Port of San Francisco	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	Under the Board of Supervisors' policy enabling the Port to create an IFD tax increment district, expenditures are restricted to infrastructure improvements that have been approved in the Port's 10 Year Capital Plan and have CEQA clearance. These processes, independently, include lengthy, thorough public review. Further, since IFDs cannot be formed until after CEQA is complete, this recommendation would essentially require two major public votes for these projects, separated by many years. IFD tax increment generated by these projects that is not required to pay for new public infrastructure to support these neighborhoods is likely to be an important source of funding to address the Port's seawall and projected sea level rise – again without raising taxes. Where taxpayers are being asked to pay for improvements to Port property through financing vehicles such as General Obligation Bonds – to pay for parks, as an example – Port staff agrees that voter approval is the right (and legally required) approach.	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	11. The Jury recommends that the Port Commission work with the Board of Supervisors to place a referendum before the voters that asks for approval to issue IFD Bonds. Such a referendum should specifically state the total amount of bonded indebtedness that the Port seeks to incur through IFD Bonds, the specific sources of funds for IFD Bond repayment, and the length of time required to discharge any IFD Bond debt.	Board of Supervisors	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The Board of Supervisors has placed significant restrictions on how the Port exercises IFD bonds, and it is via processes that involve extensive public review. Voter approval would yield greater awareness, but is neither required by law nor necessary to ensure the taxpayers' interests are protected. Port IFDs are repaid via increment tax generated from Port property and do not increase taxes on voters. Other City agencies successfully issue similar bonds without voter approval, such as Municipal Transportation Agency revenue bonds. Bonds that do encumber taxpayers, such as General Obligation bonds, rightly require voter approval.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1a. The City should prepare and adopt a risk assessment in preparation for developing its comprehensive plan regarding the rising sea level issue	Mayor or Mayor's Designated Agency	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The draft Guidance referenced in the response to Finding 1 provides for comprehensive assessment of the vulnerability of City assets to sea level rise. In addition it provides a framework that can be used in assessing risk associated with development along San Francisco's shoreline and in addressing that risk, thereby providing a road map for preparation of a risk assessment	Recommendation Implemented	In March 10, 2016, City Planning and Department of Public Works presented the Sea Level Rise Action Plan to the Planning Commission. The Action Plan defines an overarching vision and set of objectives for future sea level rise and coastal flooding planning and mitigation. The Action Plan calls for data and vulnerability assessments from all City departments before solutions and actions are defined to address Sea Level Rise in 2030, 2050, and 2100.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1a. The City should prepare and adopt a risk assessment in preparation for developing its comprehensive plan regarding the rising sea level issue	Board of Supervisors	Recommendation Implemented	As reported by Mayoral staff at the Government Audit and Oversight Committee meeting on December 11, 2014, as follows: On September 22, 2014, the Capital Planning Committee adopted the "Guidance for Incorporating Sea Level Rise Into Capital Planning in San Francisco: Assessing Vulnerability, Risk to Support Adaptation:"	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1a. The City should prepare and adopt a risk assessment in preparation for developing its comprehensive plan regarding the rising sea level issue	Department of Public Works	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The draft Guidance referenced in the response to Finding 1 provides for comprehensive assessment of the vulnerability of City assets to sea level rise. In addition it provides a framework that can be used in assessing risk associated with development along San Francisco's shoreline and in addressing that risk, thereby providing a road map for preparation of a risk assessment.	Recommendation Implemented	In March 10, 2016, City Planning and Department of Public Works presented the Sea Level Rise Action Plan to the Planning Commission. The Action Plan defines an overarching vision and set of objectives for future sea level rise and coastal flooding planning and mitigation. The Action Plan calls for data and vulnerability assessments from all City departments before solutions and actions are defined to address Sea Level Rise in 2030, 2050, and 2100.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1a. The City should prepare and adopt a risk assessment in preparation for developing its comprehensive plan regarding the rising sea level issue	Dept. of Environment	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The draft Guidance referenced in the response to Finding 1 provides for comprehensive assessment of the vulnerability of City assets to sea level rise. In addition it provides a framework that can be used in assessing risk associated with development along San Francisco's shoreline and in addressing that risk, thereby providing a road map for preparation of a risk assessment.	Recommendation Implemented	In March of 2016, Mayor Lee released the Sea Level Rise Action Plan (SLRAP), a call to action for City departments and stakeholders to work together to make San Francisco a more resilient city in the face of rising sea levels. The Mayor's plan, led by the Mayor's Sea Level Rise Coordinating Committee, and co-chaired by San Francisco Planning and Public Works, defines an overarching vision and set of objectives for future sea level rise and coastal flooding planning and adaptation in San Francisco. The SLRAP provides direction for City departments to understand and adapt to the impacts of sea level rise, including the areas most at risk. The SLR Action Plan also notes which risk assessments have already been completed for various public infrastructure sectors and which ones are still outstanding.

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text <i>(provided by CGJ)</i>	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1a. The City should prepare and adopt a risk assessment in preparation for developing its comprehensive plan regarding the rising sea level issue	Dept. of Emergency Management	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The draft Guidance referenced in the response to Finding 1 provides for comprehensive assessment of the vulnerability of City assets to sea level rise. In addition it provides a framework that can be used in assessing risk associated with development along San Francisco's shoreline and in addressing that risk, thereby providing a road map for preparation of a risk assessment.	Recommendation Implemented	Please note impacts of sea level rise (including preparing and adopting a risk assessment in preparation for developing a comprehensive plan regarding the rising sea level issue) is organizationally assigned to the San Francisco Planning Department, with support from San Francisco Public Works, the Port of San Francisco, and Public Utilities Commission. While there is a thread to DEM, we are not the lead agency to address this issue. Two resources of note are the San Francisco Sea Level Rise Action Plan published in March 2016 by the Planning Department and Resilient San Francisco: Stronger Today, Stronger Tomorrow published in April 2016 by the Office of Resilience and Recovery which is part of the General Services Administration. Together, they comprise the primary planning resources to address climate change in San Francisco. Although this recommendation does not directly apply to DEM, we would like to make it known the effects of climate change was a consideration integrated into the City's recently revised (2015) Hazard Mitigation Plan.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1a. The City should prepare and adopt a risk assessment in preparation for developing its comprehensive plan regarding the rising sea level issue	Planning Department	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The draft Guidance referenced in the response to Finding 1 provides for comprehensive assessment of the vulnerability of City assets to sea level rise. In addition it provides a framework that can be used in assessing risk associated with development along San Francisco's shoreline and in addressing that risk, thereby providing a road map for preparation of a risk assessment	Recommendation Implemented	In March of 2016, Mayor Lee released the Sea Level Rise Action Plan (SLRAP), a call to action for City departments and stakeholders to work together to make San Francisco a more resilient city in the face of rising sea levels. The Mayor's plan, led by the Mayor's Sea Level Rise Coordinating Committee, and co-chaired by San Francisco Planning and Public Works, defines an overarching vision and set of objectives for future sea level rise and coastal flooding planning and adaptation in San Francisco. The SLRAP provides direction for City departments to understand and adapt to the impacts of sea level rise, including the areas most at risk. The SLR Action Plan also notes which risk assessments have already been completed for various public infrastructure sectors and which ones are still outstanding.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1a. The City should prepare and adopt a risk assessment in preparation for developing its comprehensive plan regarding the rising sea level issue	Port of San Francisco	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The draft Guidance referenced in the response to Finding 1 provides for comprehensive assessment of the vulnerability of City assets to sea level rise. In addition it provides a framework that can be used in assessing risk associated with development along San Francisco's shoreline and in addressing that risk, thereby providing a road map for preparation of a risk assessment.	Recommendation Implemented	In March of 2016, Mayor Lee released the Sea Level Rise Action Plan (SLRAP), a call to action for City departments and stakeholders to work together to make San Francisco a more resilient city in the face of rising sea levels. The Mayor's plan, led by the Mayor's Sea Level Rise Coordinating Committee, and co-chaired by San Francisco Planning and Public Works, defines an overarching vision and set of objectives for future sea level rise and coastal flooding planning and adaptation in San Francisco. The SLRAP provides direction for City departments to understand and adapt to the impacts of sea level rise, including the areas most at risk. The SLRAP also notes which risk assessments have already been completed for various public infrastructure sectors and which ones are still outstanding.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1a. The City should prepare and adopt a risk assessment in preparation for developing its comprehensive plan regarding the rising sea level issue	Public Utilities Commission	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The draft Guidance referenced in the response to Finding 1 provides for comprehensive assessment of the vulnerability of City assets to sea level rise. In addition it provides a framework that can be used in assessing risk associated with development along San Francisco's shoreline and in addressing that risk, thereby providing a road map for preparation of a risk assessment.	Recommendation Implemented	In March 10, 2016, City Planning and Department of Public Works presented the Sea Level Rise Action Plan to the Planning Commission. The Action Plan defines an overarching vision and set of objectives for future sea level rise and coastal flooding planning and mitigation. The Action Plan calls for data and vulnerability assessments from all City departments before solutions and actions are defined to address Sea Level Rise in 2030, 2050, and 2100.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1b. The City should adopt a citywide comprehensive plan for adaptation to rising sea levels, especially along its shores and its floodplains. Said plan should include the provision that construction projects' approval should take into account the anticipated lifespan of each project and the risks faced as outlined in said plan. Special consideration should be given to those anticipated to survive for more than 30 years. Said plan should include a provision that the plan be reviewed and reassessed every 5 years.	Mayor or Mayor's Designated Agency	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The draft Guidance currently under City-wide review provides a framework for development of a comprehensive plan to address adaptation for City assets to the potential effects of sea level rise and states that the Guidance, the science behind SLR projections, and the approach outlined will need to be revisited periodically as new information becomes available. The Guidance requires consideration of asset life cycle in implementation. In addition, CEQA provides the Planning Department with authority to require that projects be designed to minimize and mitigate potential hazards related to sea level rise and takes into account the asset life cycle in its evaluation.	Recommendation Implemented	The Sea Level Rise Action Plan is the first step towards the development of the Citywide Sea Level Rise Adaptation Plan, expected to be completed by summer 2018, which will incorporate the adaptation strategies identified in the Action Plan and set a planning framework to prioritize investments to best improve climate resilience, while protecting economic and environmental value. The Sea Level Rise Adaptation Plan will also identify potential funding sources, governance structures, and implementation timelines.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1b. The City should adopt a citywide comprehensive plan for adaptation to rising sea levels, especially along its shores and its floodplains. Said plan should include the provision that construction projects' approval should take into account the anticipated lifespan of each project and the risks faced as outlined in said plan. Special consideration should be given to those anticipated to survive for more than 30 years. Said plan should include a provision that the plan be reviewed and reassessed every 5 years.	Board of Supervisors	Recommendation Implemented	as reported by Mayoral staff at the Government Audit and Oversight Committee meeting on December 11, 2014, as follows: On September 22, 2014, the Capital Planning Committee adopted the "Guidance for Incorporating Sea Level Rise Into Capital Planning in San Francisco: Assessing Vulnerability, Risk to Support Adaptation;"	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1b. The City should adopt a citywide comprehensive plan for adaptation to rising sea levels, especially along its shores and its floodplains. Said plan should include the provision that construction projects' approval should take into account the anticipated lifespan of each project and the risks faced as outlined in said plan. Special consideration should be given to those anticipated to survive for more than 30 years. Said plan should include a provision that the plan be reviewed and reassessed every 5 years.	Department of Public Works	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The draft Guidance currently under City-wide review provides a framework for development of a comprehensive plan to address adaptation for City assets to the potential effects of sea level rise and states that the Guidance, the science behind SLR projections, and the approach outlined will need to be revisited periodically as new information becomes available. The Guidance requires consideration of asset life cycle in implementation. In addition, CEQA provides the Planning Department with authority to require that projects be designed to minimize and mitigate potential hazards related to sea level rise and takes into account the asset life cycle in its evaluation.	Recommendation Implemented	The Sea Level Rise Action Plan is the first step towards the development of the Citywide Sea Level Rise Adaptation Plan, expected to be completed by summer 2018, which will incorporate the adaptation strategies identified in the Action Plan and set a planning framework to prioritize investments to best improve climate resilience, while protecting economic and environmental value. The Sea Level Rise Adaptation Plan will also identify potential funding sources, governance structures, and implementation timelines.

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1b. The City should adopt a citywide comprehensive plan for adaptation to rising sea levels, especially along its shores and its floodplains. Said plan should include the provision that construction projects' approval should take into account the anticipated lifespan of each project and the risks faced as outlined in said plan. Special consideration should be given to those anticipated to survive for more than 30 years. Said plan should include a provision that the plan be reviewed and reassessed every 5 years.	Dept. of Environment	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The draft Guidance currently under City-wide review provides a framework for development of a comprehensive plan to address adaptation for City assets to the potential effects of sea level rise and states that the Guidance, the science behind SLR projections, and the approach outlined will need to be revisited periodically as new information becomes available. The Guidance requires consideration of asset life cycle in implementation. In addition, CEQA provides the Planning Department with authority to require that projects be designed to minimize and mitigate potential hazards related to seal level rise and takes into account the asset life cycle in it evaluation.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	As stated above under Response 1a., in March of 2016, Mayor Lee released the Sea Level Rise Action Plan (SLRAP), a call to action for City departments and stakeholders to work together to make San Francisco a more resilient city in the face of rising sea levels. The Mayor's plan, led by the Mayor's Sea Level Rise Coordinating Committee, and co-chaired by San Francisco Planning and Public Works, defines an overarching vision and set of objectives for future sea level rise and coastal flooding planning and adaptation in San Francisco. The SLRAP provides direction for City departments to understand and adapt to the impacts of sea level rise and produce a Citywide Adaptation Plan.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1b. The City should adopt a citywide comprehensive plan for adaptation to rising sea levels, especially along its shores and its floodplains. Said plan should include the provision that construction projects' approval should take into account the anticipated lifespan of each project and the risks faced as outlined in said plan. Special consideration should be given to those anticipated to survive for more than 30 years. Said plan should include a provision that the plan be reviewed and reassessed every 5 years.	Dept. of Emergency Management	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The draft Guidance currently under City-wide review provides a framework for development of a comprehensive plan to address adaptation for City assets to the potential effects of sea level rise and states that the Guidance, the science behind SLR projections, and the approach outlined will need to be revisited periodically as new information becomes available. The Guidance requires consideration of asset life cycle in implementation. In addition, CEQA provides the Planning Department with authority to require that projects be designed to minimize and mitigate potential hazards related to seal level rise and takes into account the asset life cycle in it evaluation.	Recommendation Implemented	This recommendation does not apply to DEM; however, the San Francisco Planning Department, SF Public Works, Port and Public Utilities Commission should be asked. While there is a threat to DEM, we are not the lead agency to address this issue. Two resources of note are the San Francisco Sea Level Rise Action Plan published in March 2016 by the Planning Department and Resilient San Francisco: Stronger Today, Stronger Tomorrow published in April 2016 by the Office of Resilience and Recovery which is part of the General Services Administration. Together, they comprise the primary planning resources to address climate change in San Francisco.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1b. The City should adopt a citywide comprehensive plan for adaptation to rising sea levels, especially along its shores and its floodplains. Said plan should include the provision that construction projects' approval should take into account the anticipated lifespan of each project and the risks faced as outlined in said plan. Special consideration should be given to those anticipated to survive for more than 30 years. Said plan should include a provision that the plan be reviewed and reassessed every 5 years.	Planning Department	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The draft Guidance currently under City-wide review provides a framework for development of a comprehensive plan to address adaptation for City assets to the potential effects of sea level rise and states that the Guidance, the science behind SLR projections, and the approach outlined will need to be revisited periodically as new information becomes available. The Guidance requires consideration of asset life cycle in implementation. In addition, CEQA provides the Planning Department with authority to require that projects be designed to minimize and mitigate potential hazards related to seal level rise and takes into account the asset life cycle in it evaluation.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	As stated above under Response 1a., in March of 2016, Mayor Lee released the Sea Level Rise Action Plan (SLRAP), a call to action for City departments and stakeholders to work together to make San Francisco a more resilient city in the face of rising sea levels. The Mayor's plan, led by the Mayor's Sea Level Rise Coordinating Committee, and co-chaired by San Francisco Planning and Public Works, defines an overarching vision and set of objectives for future sea level rise and coastal flooding planning and adaptation in San Francisco. The SLRAP provides direction for City departments to understand and adapt to the impacts of sea level rise and produce a Citywide Adaptation Plan.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1b. The City should adopt a citywide comprehensive plan for adaptation to rising sea levels, especially along its shores and its floodplains. Said plan should include the provision that construction projects' approval should take into account the anticipated lifespan of each project and the risks faced as outlined in said plan. Special consideration should be given to those anticipated to survive for more than 30 years. Said plan should include a provision that the plan be reviewed and reassessed every 5 years.	Port of San Francisco	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The draft Guidance currently under City-wide review provides a framework for development of a comprehensive plan to address adaptation for City assets to the potential effects of sea level rise and states that the Guidance, the science behind SLR projections, and the approach outlined will need to be revisited periodically as new information becomes available. The Guidance requires consideration of asset life cycle in implementation. In addition, CEQA provides the Planning Department with authority to require that projects be designed to minimize and mitigate potential hazards related to seal level rise and takes into account the asset life cycle in it evaluation.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	As stated above under Response 1a., in March of 2016, Mayor Lee released the Sea Level Rise Action Plan (SLRAP), a call to action for City departments and stakeholders to work together to make San Francisco a more resilient city in the face of rising sea levels. The Mayor's plan, led by the Mayor's Sea Level Rise Coordinating Committee, and co-chaired by San Francisco Planning and Public Works, defines an overarching vision and set of objectives for future sea level rise and coastal flooding planning and adaptation in San Francisco. The SLRAP provides direction for City departments to understand and adapt to the impacts of sea level rise and produce a Citywide Adaptation Plan.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1b. The City should adopt a citywide comprehensive plan for adaptation to rising sea levels, especially along its shores and its floodplains. Said plan should include the provision that construction projects' approval should take into account the anticipated lifespan of each project and the risks faced as outlined in said plan. Special consideration should be given to those anticipated to survive for more than 30 years. Said plan should include a provision that the plan be reviewed and reassessed every 5 years.	Public Utilities Commission	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The draft Guidance currently under City-wide review provides a framework for development of a comprehensive plan to address adaptation for City assets to the potential effects of sea level rise and states that the Guidance, the science behind SLR projections, and the approach outlined will need to be revisited periodically as new information becomes available. The Guidance requires consideration of asset life cycle in implementation. In addition, CEQA provides the Planning Department with authority to require that projects be designed to minimize and mitigate potential hazards related to seal level rise and takes into account the asset life cycle in it evaluation.	Recommendation Implemented	The Sea Level Rise Action Plan is the first step towards the development of the Citywide Sea Level Rise Adaptation Plan, expected to be completed by summer 2018, which will incorporate the adaptation strategies identified in the Action Plan and set a planning framework to prioritize investments to best improve climate resilience, while protecting economic and environmental value. The Sea Level Rise Adaptation Plan will also identify potential funding sources, governance structures, and implementation timelines.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1c. The City should build infrastructure systems that are resilient and adaptable to rising sea levels. That the City, through its planning and building departments, require that any construction project vulnerable to future shoreline or floodplain flooding be designed to be resilient to sea level rise at the 2050 projection, e.g., 16 inches if the construction is not expected to last longer than 2050. For construction intended to last longer than 2050, that the City require that the project be designed to address sea level rise projections for the longer term.	Mayor or Mayor's Designated Agency	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The City agrees with the statement that it should build infrastructure systems that are resilient and adaptable to rising sea levels . It disagrees, however, with some of the specifics in the recommendation that follow. Requiring any construction project be designed to be resilient to the existing 16 inch rise 2050 projection does not take into account other factors that should influence scenario selection, including exposure to storm surge or wave action, asset lifespan and location, and consequence of failure or a project. The Draft Guidance prepared by the Mayor's Sea Level Rise Committee described under Finding 1 will address this issue. Looking beyond 2050, while it is the case that assets with life cycles extending into the late 21st century must consider longer term SLR projections, it may be unwise-and expensive- to require immediate measures to adapt to wide ranging, highly uncertain SLR projections further out in time. Considerations of adaptive management approaches, the adaptive capacity of assets and revisiting of SLR science as the decades unfold are clear component of the draft Guidance that will provide the basis of City policy going forward. Moreover, the Planning Department already evaluates whether proposed projects would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death due to flooding as a result of future sea level rise as part of the environmental review process required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA provides the City with an effective means to ensure that development in areas vulnerable to sea level rise is designed to address related flood hazards.	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1c. The City should build infrastructure systems that are resilient and adaptable to rising sea levels. That the City, through its planning and building departments, require that any construction project vulnerable to future shoreline or floodplain flooding be designed to be resilient to sea level rise at the 2050 projection, e.g., 16 inches if the construction is not expected to last longer than 2050. For construction intended to last longer than 2050, that the City require that the project be designed to address sea level rise projections for the longer term.	Board of Supervisors	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	While the Board of Supervisors agrees that the City should build infrastructure that are resilient and adaptable to rising sea levels, requiring that construction projects should be designed to be resilient to the existing 2050 projection does not take into account other factors that should influence projects, including exposure to storm surge or wave action, asset lifespan and location, and consequence of failure for a project; further, the draft comprehensive plan referenced in Finding No. 1 will address this issue	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1c. The City should build infrastructure systems that are resilient and adaptable to rising sea levels. That the City, through its planning and building departments, require that any construction project vulnerable to future shoreline or floodplain flooding be designed to be resilient to sea level rise at the 2050 projection, e.g., 16 inches if the construction is not expected to last longer than 2050. For construction intended to last longer than 2050, that the City require that the project be designed to address sea level rise projections for the longer term.	Department of Public Works	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	<p>The City agrees with the statement that it should build infrastructure systems that are resilient and adaptable to rising sea levels . It disagrees, however, with some of the specifics in the recommendation that follow. Requiring any construction project be designed to be resilient to the existing 16 inch rise 2050 projection does not take into account other factors that should influence scenario selection, including exposure to storm surge or wave action, asset lifespan and location, and consequence of failure or a project. The Draft Guidance prepared by the Mayor's Sea Level Rise Committee described under Finding 1 will address this issue.</p> <p>Looking beyond 2050, while it is the case that assets with life cycles extending into the late 21st century must consider longer term SLR projections, it may be unwise-and expensive- to require immediate measures to adapt to wide ranging, highly uncertain SLR projections further out in time. Considerations of adaptive management approaches, the adaptive capacity of assets and revisiting of SLR science as the decades unfold are clear component of the draft Guidance that will provide the basis of City policy going forward.</p> <p>Moreover, the Planning Department already evaluates whether proposed projects would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death due to flooding as a result of future sea level rise as part of the environmental review process required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA provides the City with an effective means to ensure that development in areas vulnerable to sea level rise is designed to address related flood hazards.</p>	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1c. The City should build infrastructure systems that are resilient and adaptable to rising sea levels. That the City, through its planning and building departments, require that any construction project vulnerable to future shoreline or floodplain flooding be designed to be resilient to sea level rise at the 2050 projection, e.g., 16 inches if the construction is not expected to last longer than 2050. For construction intended to last longer than 2050, that the City require that the project be designed to address sea level rise projections for the longer term.	Dept. of Environment	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	<p>The City agrees with the statement that it should build infrastructure systems that are resilient and adaptable to rising sea levels . It disagrees, however, with some of the specifics in the recommendation that follow. Requiring any construction project be designed to be resilient to the existing 16 inch rise 2050 projection does not take into account other factors that should influence scenario selection, including exposure to storm surge or wave action, asset lifespan and location, and consequence of failure or a project. The Draft Guidance prepared by the Mayor's Sea Level Rise Committee described under Finding 1 will address this issue.</p> <p>Looking beyond 2050, while it is the case that assets with life cycles extending into the late 21st century must consider longer term SLR projections, it may be unwise-and expensive- to require immediate measures to adapt to wide ranging, highly uncertain SLR projections further out in time. Considerations of adaptive management approaches, the adaptive capacity of assets and revisiting of SLR science as the decades unfold are clear component of the draft Guidance that will provide the basis of City policy going forward.</p> <p>Moreover, the Planning Department already evaluates whether proposed projects would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death due to flooding as a result of future sea level rise as part of the environmental review process required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA provides the City with an effective means to ensure that development in areas vulnerable to sea level rise is designed to address related flood hazards.</p>	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1c. The City should build infrastructure systems that are resilient and adaptable to rising sea levels. That the City, through its planning and building departments, require that any construction project vulnerable to future shoreline or floodplain flooding be designed to be resilient to sea level rise at the 2050 projection, e.g., 16 inches if the construction is not expected to last longer than 2050. For construction intended to last longer than 2050, that the City require that the project be designed to address sea level rise projections for the longer term.	Dept. of Emergency Management	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	<p>The City agrees with the statement that it should build infrastructure systems that are resilient and adaptable to rising sea levels . It disagrees, however, with some of the specifics in the recommendation that follow. Requiring any construction project be designed to be resilient to the existing 16 inch rise 2050 projection does not take into account other factors that should influence scenario selection, including exposure to storm surge or wave action, asset lifespan and location, and consequence of failure or a project. The Draft Guidance prepared by the Mayor's Sea Level Rise Committee described under Finding 1 will address this issue.</p> <p>Looking beyond 2050, while it is the case that assets with life cycles extending into the late 21st century must consider longer term SLR projections, it may be unwise-and expensive- to require immediate measures to adapt to wide ranging, highly uncertain SLR projections further out in time. Considerations of adaptive management approaches, the adaptive capacity of assets and revisiting of SLR science as the decades unfold are clear component of the draft Guidance that will provide the basis of City policy going forward.</p> <p>Moreover, the Planning Department already evaluates whether proposed projects would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death due to flooding as a result of future sea level rise as part of the environmental review process required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA provides the City with an effective means to ensure that development in areas vulnerable to sea level rise is designed to address related flood hazards.</p>	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1c. The City should build infrastructure systems that are resilient and adaptable to rising sea levels. That the City, through its planning and building departments, require that any construction project vulnerable to future shoreline or floodplain flooding be designed to be resilient to sea level rise at the 2050 projection, e.g., 16 inches if the construction is not expected to last longer than 2050. For construction intended to last longer than 2050, that the City require that the project be designed to address sea level rise projections for the longer term.	Planning Department	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	<p>The City agrees with the statement that it should build infrastructure systems that are resilient and adaptable to rising sea levels . It disagrees, however, with some of the specifics in the recommendation that follow. Requiring any construction project be designed to be resilient to the existing 16 inch rise 2050 projection does not take into account other factors that should influence scenario selection, including exposure to storm surge or wave action, asset lifespan and location, and consequence of failure or a project. The Draft Guidance prepared by the Mayor's Sea Level Rise Committee described under Finding 1 will address this issue.</p> <p>Looking beyond 2050, while it is the case that assets with life cycles extending into the late 21st century must consider longer term SLR projections, it may be unwise-and expensive- to require immediate measures to adapt to wide ranging, highly uncertain SLR projections further out in time. Considerations of adaptive management approaches, the adaptive capacity of assets and revisiting of SLR science as the decades unfold are clear component of the draft Guidance that will provide the basis of City policy going forward.</p> <p>Moreover, the Planning Department already evaluates whether proposed projects would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death due to flooding as a result of future sea level rise as part of the environmental review process required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA provides the City with an effective means to ensure that development in areas vulnerable to sea level rise is designed to address related flood hazards.</p>	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1c. The City should build infrastructure systems that are resilient and adaptable to rising sea levels. That the City, through its planning and building departments, require that any construction project vulnerable to future shoreline or floodplain flooding be designed to be resilient to sea level rise at the 2050 projection, e.g., 16 inches if the construction is not expected to last longer than 2050. For construction intended to last longer than 2050, that the City require that the project be designed to address sea level rise projections for the longer term.	Port of San Francisco	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	<p>The City agrees with the statement that it should build infrastructure systems that are resilient and adaptable to rising sea levels . It disagrees, however, with some of the specifics in the recommendation that follow. Requiring any construction project be designed to be resilient to the existing 16 inch rise 2050 projection does not take into account other factors that should influence scenario selection, including exposure to storm surge or wave action, asset lifespan and location, and consequence of failure or a project. The Draft Guidance prepared by the Mayor's Sea Level Rise Committee described under Finding 1 will address this issue.</p> <p>Looking beyond 2050, while it is the case that assets with life cycles extending into the late 21st century must consider longer term SLR projections, it may be unwise-and expensive- to require immediate measures to adapt to wide ranging, highly uncertain SLR projections further out in time. Considerations of adaptive management approaches, the adaptive capacity of assets and revisiting of SLR science as the decades unfold are clear component of the draft Guidance that will provide the basis of City policy going forward.</p> <p>Moreover, the Planning Department already evaluates whether proposed projects would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death due to flooding as a result of future sea level rise as part of the environmental review process required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA provides the City with an effective means to ensure that development in areas vulnerable to sea level rise is designed to address related flood hazards.</p>	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1c. The City should build infrastructure systems that are resilient and adaptable to rising sea levels. That the City, through its planning and building departments, require that any construction project vulnerable to future shoreline or floodplain flooding be designed to be resilient to sea level rise at the 2050 projection, e.g., 16 inches if the construction is not expected to last longer than 2050. For construction intended to last longer than 2050, that the City require that the project be designed to address sea level rise projections for the longer term.	Public Utilities Commission	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	<p>The City agrees with the statement that it should build infrastructure systems that are resilient and adaptable to rising sea levels . It disagrees, however, with some of the specifics in the recommendation that follow. Requiring any construction project be designed to be resilient to the existing 16 inch rise 2050 projection does not take into account other factors that should influence scenario selection, including exposure to storm surge or wave action, asset lifespan and location, and consequence of failure or a project. The Draft Guidance prepared by the Mayor's Sea Level Rise Committee described under Finding 1 will address this issue.</p> <p>Looking beyond 2050, while it is the case that assets with life cycles extending into the late 21st century must consider longer term SLR projections, it may be unwise-and expensive- to require immediate measures to adapt to wide ranging, highly uncertain SLR projections further out in time. Considerations of adaptive management approaches, the adaptive capacity of assets and revisiting of SLR science as the decades unfold are clear component of the draft Guidance that will provide the basis of City policy going forward.</p> <p>Moreover, the Planning Department already evaluates whether proposed projects would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death due to flooding as a result of future sea level rise as part of the environmental review process required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA provides the City with an effective means to ensure that development in areas vulnerable to sea level rise is designed to address related flood hazards.</p>	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1d. That City departments that would necessarily be involved in adaptation to rising sea levels, such as Department of Public Works, Public Utilities Commission, Municipal Transportation Agency, the Port, coordinate their projects with each other and with utility companies, such as PG&E, Comcast, and AT&T, to minimize inconvenience to the public, and to businesses, and to further avoid repetition of efforts and inefficient use of funds, labor, and time.	Mayor or Mayor's Designated Agency	Recommendation Implemented	Currently, City departments coordinate projects with each other and with various utility companies according to procedures established many years ago. In fact, under the lead of DPW various city departments and utility companies have recently invested in implementing an online mapping system that allow all members to view each other projects and facilitate coordination of all projects within the Right-of-Way.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1d. That City departments that would necessarily be involved in adaptation to rising sea levels, such as Department of Public Works, Public Utilities Commission, Municipal Transportation Agency, the Port, coordinate their projects with each other and with utility companies, such as PG&E, Comcast, and AT&T, to minimize inconvenience to the public, and to businesses, and to further avoid repetition of efforts and inefficient use of funds, labor, and time.	Board of Supervisors	Recommendation Implemented	While this recommendation does not directly fall under the jurisdiction of the Board of Supervisors, City departments currently coordinate projects with each other and various utility companies according to procedures established many years ago.	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text <i>(provided by CGJ)</i>	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1d. That City departments that would necessarily be involved in adaptation to rising sea levels, such as Department of Public Works, Public Utilities Commission, Municipal Transportation Agency, the Port, coordinate their projects with each other and with utility companies, such as PG&E, Comcast, and AT&T, to minimize inconvenience to the public, and to businesses, and to further avoid repetition of efforts and inefficient use of funds, labor, and time.	Department of Public Works	Recommendation Implemented	Currently, City departments coordinate projects with each other and with various utility companies according to procedures established many years ago. In fact, under the lead of DPW various city departments and utility companies have recently invested in implementing an online mapping system that allow all members to view each other projects and facilitate coordination of all projects within the Right-of-Way.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1d. That City departments that would necessarily be involved in adaptation to rising sea levels, such as Department of Public Works, Public Utilities Commission, Municipal Transportation Agency, the Port, coordinate their projects with each other and with utility companies, such as PG&E, Comcast, and AT&T, to minimize inconvenience to the public, and to businesses, and to further avoid repetition of efforts and inefficient use of funds, labor, and time.	Dept. of Environment	Recommendation Implemented	Currently, City departments coordinate projects with each other and with various utility companies according to procedures established many years ago. In fact, under the lead of DPW various city departments and utility companies have recently invested in implementing an online mapping system that allow all members to view each other projects and facilitate coordination of all projects within the Right-of-Way.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1d. That City departments that would necessarily be involved in adaptation to rising sea levels, such as Department of Public Works, Public Utilities Commission, Municipal Transportation Agency, the Port, coordinate their projects with each other and with utility companies, such as PG&E, Comcast, and AT&T, to minimize inconvenience to the public, and to businesses, and to further avoid repetition of efforts and inefficient use of funds, labor, and time.	Dept. of Emergency Management	Recommendation Implemented	Currently, City departments coordinate projects with each other and with various utility companies according to procedures established many years ago. In fact, under the lead of DPW various city departments and utility companies have recently invested in implementing an online mapping system that allow all members to view each other projects and facilitate coordination of all projects within the Right-of-Way.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1d. That City departments that would necessarily be involved in adaptation to rising sea levels, such as Department of Public Works, Public Utilities Commission, Municipal Transportation Agency, the Port, coordinate their projects with each other and with utility companies, such as PG&E, Comcast, and AT&T, to minimize inconvenience to the public, and to businesses, and to further avoid repetition of efforts and inefficient use of funds, labor, and time.	Planning Department	Recommendation Implemented	Currently, City departments coordinate projects with each other and with various utility companies according to procedures established many years ago. In fact, under the lead of DPW various city departments and utility companies have recently invested in implementing an online mapping system that allow all members to view each other projects and facilitate coordination of all projects within the Right-of-Way.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1d. That City departments that would necessarily be involved in adaptation to rising sea levels, such as Department of Public Works, Public Utilities Commission, Municipal Transportation Agency, the Port, coordinate their projects with each other and with utility companies, such as PG&E, Comcast, and AT&T, to minimize inconvenience to the public, and to businesses, and to further avoid repetition of efforts and inefficient use of funds, labor, and time.	Port of San Francisco	Recommendation Implemented	Currently, City departments coordinate projects with each other and with various utility companies according to procedures established many years ago. In fact, under the lead of DPW various city departments and utility companies have recently invested in implementing an online mapping system that allow all members to view each other projects and facilitate coordination of all projects within the Right-of-Way.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1d. That City departments that would necessarily be involved in adaptation to rising sea levels, such as Department of Public Works, Public Utilities Commission, Municipal Transportation Agency, the Port, coordinate their projects with each other and with utility companies, such as PG&E, Comcast, and AT&T, to minimize inconvenience to the public, and to businesses, and to further avoid repetition of efforts and inefficient use of funds, labor, and time.	Public Utilities Commission	Recommendation Implemented	Currently, City departments coordinate projects with each other and with various utility companies according to procedures established many years ago. In fact, under the lead of DPW various city departments and utility companies have recently invested in implementing an online mapping system that allow all members to view each other projects and facilitate coordination of all projects within the Right-of-Way.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	2a. The Planning Code should be amended to include maps showing the areas in the City that are most at risk from the impacts of sea level rise. The Planning Code should be amended to prohibit development in said at-risk areas unless there is compliance with the provisions of the City's Building Code and the Port's Building Code (if applicable to the project) outlined in Recommendations 3a and 3b. The Planning Code should include a provision that the amended sections of the Code regarding the impact of rising sea levels be reviewed and reassessed every 5 years.	Board of Supervisors	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) and Port have published maps depicting areas along San Francisco's bay and ocean shorelines that are potentially vulnerable to future flooding due to sea level rise through 2100. Furthermore, CEQA provides the Planning Department with sufficient authority to require projects to be designed to minimize and mitigate potential hazards related to impacts from sea level rise and thus amendments to the Planning Code are not warranted.	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	2a. The Planning Code should be amended to include maps showing the areas in the City that are most at risk from the impacts of sea level rise. The Planning Code should be amended to prohibit development in said at-risk areas unless there is compliance with the provisions of the City's Building Code and the Port's Building Code (if applicable to the project) outlined in Recommendations 3a and 3b. The Planning Code should include a provision that the amended sections of the Code regarding the impact of rising sea levels be reviewed and reassessed every 5 years.	Planning Department	Requires Further Analysis	The SFPUC and Port have published maps depicting areas along San Francisco's bay and ocean shorelines that are potentially vulnerable to future flooding due to projected sea level rise through 2100. The Planning Department considers these maps in evaluating potential flood hazards for projects located in areas vulnerable to seal level rise under CEQA> In addition, the Federal Emergency Management Service is currently preparing a pilot study analyzing future coastal flood risks that account for sea-level rise as par of the California Coastal Analysis and Mapping Project Open Pacific Coast Study. The Planning Department will consider this study in evaluating sea level rise hazards for projects located in affected areas under CEQA. CEQA provides the Planning Departments with sufficient authority to require projects to be designated to minimize and mitigate potential hazards related to sea level rise, and because maps of areas that are vulnerable to impacts from sea level rise have already been developed, amendments to the Planning Code to include such maps or to enforce flood resilient building standards for development in the affected areas may not be warranted. However, the City is currently evaluating whether to develop new policies addressing sea level rise. Such policies may include amendment to the Planning Code. As such, the recommended planning code amendments require further analysis.	Requires Further Analysis	The SFPUC and Port have published detailed maps depicting areas along San Francisco's bay and ocean shorelines that are potentially vulnerable to future flooding due to projected sea level rise through 2100. The Planning Department considers these maps in evaluating potential flood hazards for projects located in areas vulnerable to sea level rise under CEQA. In addition, the Federal Emergency Management Service is currently preparing a pilot study analyzing future coastal flood risks that account for sea-level rise as par of the California Coastal Analysis and Mapping Project Open Pacific Coast Study. The Planning Department will consider this study in evaluating sea level rise hazards for projects located in affected areas. Thus, maps of areas that are vulnerable to impacts from sea level rise have already been developed; amendments to the Planning Code to include such maps or to enforce flood resilient building standards for development in the affected areas may not be warranted. However, the City is currently evaluating whether to develop new policies addressing sea level rise under implementation of the SLRAP. Such policies may include amendment to the Planning Code. As such, the recommended planning code amendments require further analysis.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	2b. The Planning Code should be amended to discourage permanent development in at risk areas where public safety cannot be protected.	Board of Supervisors	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	CEQA provides the Planning Department with the authority to require projects to be designed to minimize and mitigate potential hazards related to sea level rise.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	2b. The Planning Code should be amended to discourage permanent development in at risk areas where public safety cannot be protected.	Planning Department	Requires Further Analysis	CEQA provides the Planning Department with sufficient authority to require projects to be designed to minimize and mitigate potential hazards related to sea level rise. However, as stated above, the City is currently evaluating whether to develop new policies addressing seal level rise. Such policies may include amendment to the Planning Code. As such, the recommended planning code amendments require further analysis.	Requires Further Analysis	As stated above, the City is currently evaluating whether to develop new policies to address sea level rise. Such policies may include amendment to the Planning Code. As such, the recommended planning code amendments require further analysis.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	3. The City's Building Code and the Port's Building Code should be amended to include: (1) provisions addressing the impacts associated with sea level rise, especially when combined with storm surges and king tides; (2) construction methods that would ensure a project's resistance to and protection from the impacts of rising sea levels, especially when combined with sudden storm surges and king tides; (3) amendments written to protect the most vulnerable systems, including but not necessarily limited to, electrical, telecommunications, and fire protection systems; (4) provisions relating to rising sea levels be reviewed and reassessed every five years.	Board of Supervisors	Requires Further Analysis	City departments are actively working with one another and with regional and state agencies to evaluate and develop consistent guidance and policies to address sea level rise.	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 May 7, 2015, the Board held a hearing with the Mayor's Office (who spearheaded for Sea Level Rise Coordinating and Technical Committees) 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.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	3. The City's Building Code and the Port's Building Code should be amended to include: (1) provisions addressing the impacts associated with sea level rise, especially when combined with storm surges and king tides; (2) construction methods that would ensure a project's resistance to and protection from the impacts of rising sea levels, especially when combined with sudden storm surges and king tides; (3) amendments written to protect the most vulnerable systems, including but not necessarily limited to, electrical, telecommunications, and fire protection systems; (4) provisions relating to rising sea levels be reviewed and reassessed every five years.	Dept. Building Inspection	Requires Further Analysis	Although CEQA provides the City with sufficient authority to require projects to be designed to minimize and mitigate potential hazards related to sea level rise, City departments are working with one another and with regional and state agencies to evaluate and developed consistent guidance and policies to address sea level rise. This includes researching adaptation and resiliency measures implemented by other municipalities, including building and planning code changes; and considering incorporating similar changes to the City's codes. The sea level rise projections will continue to evolve as new science and prediction methods become available. Therefore, any future implementation of new building code provision will require specific, prescriptive changes that account for flexibility. Further analysis and coordination between scientific community and affected agencies must be performed to develop consistent, effective, and practical policies, including possibly building or planning code changes, to address sea level rise.	Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	City's Grand Jury Response, per Mayor's transmission to Board of Supervisors, May 5, 2015: Building standards for development in flood prone areas are already provided in the City's Floodplain Management Ordinance. The Floodplain Management Ordinance applies to new development and substantial improvements to existing development that is located within the City's 100-year Flood Hazard Zone. FEMA is currently in the process of developing new flood hazard maps for the City's western shoreline that account for projected sea level rise under a West Coast Sea Level Rise Pilot Study, and it is anticipated that future flood hazard maps will account for flood risks related to sea level rise. Within our current regulatory structure, the California Environmental Quality Act provides the City with sufficient authority to require projects to be designated to minimize and mitigate potential flooding hazards related to sea level rise. The best investment that the City can make at this time is to examine the issue; build upon the newly issued "Guidance for Incorporating on Sea Level Rise into Capital Planning;" and create an action plan for longer term solutions beyond a building-by-building approach that the code changes would govern. While the Interdepartmental Coordinating and Technical Committee on sea level rise described in detail in our response to 12b below may consider building code changes in the future, that work will require further research and public dialog. As such, the recommended building code amendments are not appropriate at this time.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	3. The City's Building Code and the Port's Building Code should be amended to include: (1) provisions addressing the impacts associated with sea level rise, especially when combined with storm surges and king tides; (2) construction methods that would ensure a project's resistance to and protection from the impacts of rising sea levels, especially when combined with sudden storm surges and king tides; (3) amendments written to protect the most vulnerable systems, including but not necessarily limited to, electrical, telecommunications, and fire protection systems; (4) provisions relating to rising sea levels be reviewed and reassessed every five years.	Planning Department	Requires Further Analysis	Although CEQA provides the City with sufficient authority to require projects to be designed to minimize and mitigate potential hazards related to sea level rise, City departments are working with one another and with regional and state agencies to evaluate and developed consistent guidance and policies to address sea level rise. This includes researching adaptation and resiliency measures implemented by other municipalities, including building and planning code changes; and considering incorporating similar changes to the City's codes. The sea level rise projections will continue to evolve as new science and prediction methods become available. Therefore, any future implementation of new building code provision will require specific, prescriptive changes that account for flexibility. Further analysis and coordination between scientific community and affected agencies must be performed to develop consistent, effective, and practical policies, including possibly building or planning code changes, to address sea level rise.	Requires Further Analysis	City departments are working with one another and with regional and state agencies to evaluate and develop consistent guidance and policies to address sea level rise. This includes researching adaptation and resiliency measures implemented by other municipalities, including building and planning code changes, and considering incorporating similar changes to the City's codes. The sea level rise projections will continue to evolve as new science and prediction methods become available. Therefore, any new building code provisions will require specific, prescriptive changes that account for flexibility. Further analysis and coordination between scientific community and affected agencies will be performed to develop consistent, effective, and practical policies, including possibly building or planning code changes, to address sea level rise.

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text <i>(provided by CGJ)</i>	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	3. The City's Building Code and the Port's Building Code should be amended to include: (1) provisions addressing the impacts associated with sea level rise, especially when combined with storm surges and king tides; (2) construction methods that would ensure a project's resistance to and protection from the impacts of rising sea levels, especially when combined with sudden storm surges and king tides; (3) amendments written to protect the most vulnerable systems, including but not necessarily limited to, electrical, telecommunications, and fire protection systems; (4) provisions relating to rising sea levels be reviewed and reassessed every five years.	Port of San Francisco	Requires Further Analysis	Although CEQA provides the City with sufficient authority to require projects to be designed to minimize and mitigate potential hazards related to sea level rise, City departments are working with one another and with regional and state agencies to evaluate and developed consistent guidance and policies to address sea level rise. This includes researching adaptation and resiliency measures implemented by other municipalities, including building and planning code changes; and considering incorporating similar changes to the City's codes. The sea level rise projections will continue to evolve as new science and prediction methods become available. Therefore, any future implementation of new building code provision will require specific, prescriptive changes that account for flexibility. Further analysis and coordination between scientific community and affected agencies must be performed to develop consistent, effective, and practical policies, including possibly building or planning code changes, to address sea level rise.	Requires Further Analysis	City departments are working with one another and with regional and state agencies to evaluate and develop consistent guidance and policies to address sea level rise. This includes researching adaptation and resiliency measures implemented by other municipalities, including building and planning code changes, and considering incorporating similar changes to the City's codes. The sea level rise projections will continue to evolve as new science and prediction methods become available. Therefore, any new building code provisions will require specific, prescriptive changes that account for flexibility. Further analysis and coordination between scientific community and affected agencies will be performed to develop consistent, effective, and practical policies, including possibly building or planning code changes, to address sea level rise.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	4. The City should consult with BCDC at the onset of development plans within BCDC's jurisdiction to ensure equitable and efficient results without necessitating surplus expenditures and time.	Mayor	Recommendation Implemented	The City consults with BCDC throughout the planning and environmental review process and projects located within BCDC's regulatory jurisdiction.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	4. The City should consult with BCDC at the onset of development plans within BCDC's jurisdiction to ensure equitable and efficient results without necessitating surplus expenditures and time.	Planning Department	Recommendation Implemented	The City consults with BCDC throughout the planning and environmental review process and projects located within BCDC's regulatory jurisdiction.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	4. The City should consult with BCDC at the onset of development plans within BCDC's jurisdiction to ensure equitable and efficient results without necessitating surplus expenditures and time.	Port of San Francisco	Recommendation Implemented	The City consults with BCDC throughout the planning and environmental review process and projects located within BCDC's regulatory jurisdiction.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	5. The City should consider implementation of recommendations that are most pertinent to the City, as set forth in the Ocean Beach Master Plan of May 2012.	Mayor or Mayor's Designated Agency	Recommendation Implemented	The City has considered implementation of the most pertinent recommendations set forth in the Ocean Beach Master Plan. SFPUC, MTA, DPW, and the Planning Department are actively working with SPUR, the California Coastal Commission other state and federal agencies and community stakeholders to implement the Ocean Beach Master Plan recommendations concerning coastal erosion hazards at Ocean Beach between Sloat and Skyline Boulevards.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	5. The City should consider implementation of recommendations that are most pertinent to the City, as set forth in the Ocean Beach Master Plan of May 2012.	Board of Supervisors	Recommendation Implemented	SFPUC, MTA, Department of Public Works (DPW) and the Planning Department are actively working with SPUR, the California Coastal Commission, and other state and federal agencies and community stakeholders to implement the Ocean Beach Master Plan recommendations concerning coastal erosion, and this work is ongoing.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	6. The Public Utilities Commission should build larger sewer pumps, sewer pipes, and sewer transport storage boxes surrounding the city in the near future to accommodate king tides, sudden surges, and sea level rise.	Public Utilities Commission	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The SFPUC levels of service incorporate climate change as a requirement for all projects implemented through the \$6.9B Sewer System Improvement Program (SSIP). A comprehensive Climate Change Adaptation Plan is currently being developed as part of the SSIP. Within this planning effort the SFPUC has conducted research of industry best science, has developed Sea Level Rise inundation maps for SF, and is researching what climate science is telling us about future storm intensity. These factors, with conditions unique to the Bayside and Westside, including the impact of King Tides, will inform the planning and design decisions for critical sewer assets.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The department does not have additional updates to its most recent response dated August 22, 2014.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	7. As an interim measure, the City should retrofit outfalls in the wastewater treatment system with backflow prevention devices to prevent salt water intrusion into the collection systems resulting from high tides, sudden surges, and rising sea level. Local pump stations should also be installed to raise the flow to sewer discharge structures with higher elevations.	Public Utilities Commission	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The projects associated with the SFPUC's SSIP include the installation of new backflow prevention devices on Combined Sewage Discharge outfalls on the Bayside that are impacted by high tides, sudden surges and rising sea level. SFPUC is presently piloting an installed device to serve as backflow preventer at one location and continuing design analysis to address all locations. Saltwater backflows do not occur at the Oceanside Plant and are not expected to be an issue in the future. Regarding pump stations, the SFPUC will monitor actual sea level rise and identify adaptation strategies as-needed.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The department does not have additional updates to its most recent response dated August 22, 2014.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	8. The Southeast Wastewater Treatment Plant should be retrofitted to accommodate future king tides, sudden surges, and sea level rise.	Public Utilities Commission	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Over the next 20 years, through proposed projects associated with the SSIP, the SFPUC plans to implement over \$2.5 billion related to improvements to the Southeast Wastewater Treatment Plant. These projects are all informed by predicted sea level rise elevations including King Tides and surges.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The department does not have additional updates to its most recent response dated August 22, 2014.

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	9a. SFO should increase the height of its existing seawalls along its runways to accommodate rising sea levels.	SFO	Will Be Implemented in the Future	A shoreline protection feasibility study is being conducted by Moffatt and Nichol that will provide recommendations to SFO on immediate improvements needed to protect SFO from combined impacts of a 100 years flood and sea level rise. Immediate implementation including environmental review and permitting, design and construction will take place in the next 6-8 years to address a 100 year flood event. SFO is also planning on long term improvements to the entire seawall system to address sea level rise. Long term strategies, with implementation 10-15 years in duration, including upgrading of drainage pump stations to handle larger storm events and building seawalls with robust foundations that will allow future extensions to accommodate additional sea level rise.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Moffat & Nichol feasibility study is complete and has identified deficiencies in the Airport's seawall system and has made recommendations on both near term flood protection measures as well as long term measures to protect against sea level rise. SFO has started the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process and will start the design phase upon approval of CEQA. Near term flood protection will be implemented in the next 4-6 years to address a 100year flood risk. SFO is planning long term flood protection along the entire Airport perimeter to address sea level rise. The long term strategy with an implementation duration of 10 to 15 years include construction higher and more robust seawalls which will have the capacity to be raised over time as well as continued improvements to the Airport's interior drainage and pumping system.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	9b. SFO should continue to improve measures to eliminate standing water on its runways to ensure they remain sufficiently above sea level.	SFO	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	SFO does not have an ongoing problem with standing water in our taxiways or runways. Occasionally, we have had temporary small pockets of standing water on our in-field or turf areas, but it only takes a short time for the pump station to catch up with the rainfall and drain these locations. Over the last ten years, SFO has spent \$26.4 million on pump station and storm drainage improvements, including \$18.8 million spent on our on-going Runway Safety Area program. As part of our on-going capital improvement plan, SFO is planning on investing \$22 million in storm drainage and pump station improvements over the next 5 years. SFO believes the combination of upgrading our storm drain pump stations and fortifying the perimeter seawalls is the best way to protect the runways from sea level rise.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	9c. The northern section of SFO should be analyzed by airport engineers to determine how best to protect its wastewater treatment plant and other infrastructure in that section from sea level rise.	SFO	Recommendation Implemented	SFO engineers are analyzing the best ways to protect the north field area, including the wastewater treatment plant and other infrastructure, as part of the feasibility study mentioned above.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	10a. The Port should begin planning and creating a timeline for construction of flood control barriers in the low spots along the edges of the piers to prevent waterfront flooding associated with sea level rise.	Port of San Francisco	Recommendation Implemented	The Port is currently scoping the level of effort for earthquake retrofit and flood protection improvements to the SF seawall. It is anticipated between 2014 and 2017 an earthquake vulnerability assessment as well as retrofit design concepts will be developed and funding secured. Between 2017 and 2030, individual sections of the retrofit will be designed and constructed.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	10b. To assist with the cost of protective measures to address sea level rise, the Port Commission should establish a reserve fund as part of its leasing policy whereby a surcharge is assessed as part of the rent or as a separate line item in each lease.	Port of San Francisco	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The Port is currently seeking alternate funding sources from federal and state grant programs as well as including considerations of sea level rise in projects identified in the capital planning process. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is evaluating the SF seawall to determine if there is a federal interest in retrofitting the seawall, which could lead to federal matching funds through the federal Water Resources Development Act. By resolution 0125-13, the BOS adopted "Guidelines for the Establishment and use of an Infrastructure Financing District with Project Areas on Land under the Jurisdiction of San Francisco Port Commission" which state: "Any portion of the City's share of tax increment that the City allocated to the waterfront district from the project area but that is not required to fund eligible project-specific public facilities will be re-allocated to the City's General Fund or to improvements to the City's seawall and other measures to protect the City against sea level rise or other foreseeable risks to the City's waterfront." Infrastructure Financing District (IFD) law generally authorizes certain classes of public facilities to be financed through IFDs. The Legislature has broadened the types of authorized public facilities for waterfront districts to include 1) structural repairs and improvements to piers, seawalls, and wharves, and installations of piles 2) shoreline restoration, and 3) improvements which may be publically owned, to protect against sea level rise. The Port is in the process of planning and implementing IFDs on Port property at Seawall Lot 337 in Mission Bay and Pier 70, and will likely pursue legislative authorization to form OFDs in other areas of the waterfront.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11a. The City should start a reserve fund for adaptation for rising sea levels, a portion of which could be obtained from a surcharge on development planned for areas vulnerable to said eventuality.	Mayor	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	A reserve fund for sea level rise adaptation is unnecessary since the Mayor and the BOS allocate capital funds on an annual basis. If policymakers did want to set aside funds, a reserve fund is not the only way of reserving City resources. Depending on the policy objective, a project, baseline, or Charter requirement could be more appropriate. However, any creation of a new reserve would need to be balanced against the loss of allocation flexibility for both the Mayor and the BOS. Based on the language of the recommendation, it is assumed that the Jury is asking for a surcharge on all development, public or private. It should be noted the Sea Level Rise Committee is in the process of creating guidelines for public development. A surcharge on private development has not been analyzed.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11a. The City should start a reserve fund for adaptation for rising sea levels, a portion of which could be obtained from a surcharge on development planned for areas vulnerable to said eventuality.	Board of Supervisors	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	A reserve fund for sea level rise adaptation is unnecessary since the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors allocate capital funds on an annual basis, and the City's 10-year Capital Plan can incorporate efforts to address sea level rise through its annual budgeting process.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11a. The City should start a reserve fund for adaptation for rising sea levels, a portion of which could be obtained from a surcharge on development planned for areas vulnerable to said eventuality.	City Administrator	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	A reserve fund for sea level rise adaptation is unnecessary since the Mayor and the BOS allocate capital funds on an annual basis. If policymakers did want to set aside funds, a reserve fund is not the only way of reserving City resources. Depending on the policy objective, a project, baseline, or Charter requirement could be more appropriate. However, any creation of a new reserve would need to be balanced against the loss of allocation flexibility for both the Mayor and the BOS. Based on the language of the recommendation, it is assumed that the Jury is asking for a surcharge on all development, public or private. It should be noted the Sea Level Rise Committee is in the process of creating guidelines for public development. A surcharge on private development has not been analyzed.	**	

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

Status of the Recommendations
by the Civil Grand Jury
2013-14

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11a. The City should start a reserve fund for adaptation for rising sea levels, a portion of which could be obtained from a surcharge on development planned for areas vulnerable to said eventuality.	Controller	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	A reserve fund for sea level rise adaptation is unnecessary since the Mayor and the BOS allocate capital funds on an annual basis. If policymakers did want to set aside funds, a reserve fund is not the only way of reserving City resources. Depending on the policy objective, a project, baseline, or Charter requirement could be more appropriate. However, any creation of a new reserve would need to be balanced against the loss of allocation flexibility for both the Mayor and the BOS. Based on the language of the recommendation, it is assumed that the Jury is asking for a surcharge on all development, public or private. It should be noted the Sea Level Rose Committee is in the process of creating guidelines for public development. A surcharge on private development has not been analyzed.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11b. The City should assess costs of both implementation of adaptation strategies and potential losses from failing to do so.	Mayor	Recommendation Implemented	<p>As part of the 2014 San Francisco Hazard Mitigation Plan, the City identified both natural and human-made hazards facing the City. The document formulated a plan to reduce losses from those hazards and established a process for implementing the plan. However, the 2014 HMP is not a comprehensive sea level rise plan, nor was it intended to be. It should be noted that the 2014 HMP includes the cost of several mitigation strategies either directly or closely related to sea level rise. The following are all high-priority mitigation actions that the City intends to implement during the five-year lifespan of the 2014 HMP, assuming funding availability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement Phase I of the SFPUC's Sewer System Improvement Program (SSIP), including storm water management, flood control, and green infrastructure projects. Funding source: bond financing: \$75,000,000 approved over the next five years. • Continue the Great Highway Long-Term Stabilization program to respond to continuing beach erosion impacts along the Great Highway at Ocean Beach south of Sloat Boulevard. Estimated project timeframe: 4-5 years. Potential funding source: SFMTA and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Estimated cost: \$3,000,000 - \$5,000,000. • Upgrade segments of the San Francisco International Airport (SFO) shoreline protection system. Address gaps in the system that could allow the entry of floodwater; and address openings for storm water drainage that do not have closure devices, which could allow the entry of floodwaters. Upgrade seawalls to address sea level rise. Estimated project timeframe: 5 years. Potential funding source: Capit.'l Planning/Federal Government. Estimated cost: \$60,000,000. • Upgrade storm drainage outfall pump stations IA, IB, and IC to protect the SFO airfield from 100- year floods and sea level rise. Estimated project timeframe: 1-2 years. Potential funding source: TBD. Estimated cost: \$3,500,000. <p>The 2014 HMP does include a brief hazard profile for sea level rise as part of the HMP's climate change section, but does not contain an analysis of the city's vulnerability to sea level rise. This is because the 2014 HMP was completed before the Sea Level Rise Committee chose sea level rise maps for the City and agreed on the level of sea level rise they believe will impact the City. Future versions of the HMP will incorporate the more recent work of the Sea Level Rise Committee by updating the sea level rise hazard profile and by including a vulnerability analysis for sea level rise.</p>	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11b. The City should assess costs of both implementation of adaptation strategies and potential losses from failing to do so.	Board of Supervisors	Recommendation Implemented	The City identified both natural and man hazards facing the City as part of the 2014 San Francisco Hazard Mitigation Plan; future versions of the Hazard Mitigation Plan will incorporate the more recent work of the Sea Level Rise Committee by updating the sea level rise hazard profile and by including a vulnerability analysis for sea level rise.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11b. The City should assess costs of both implementation of adaptation strategies and potential losses from failing to do so.	City Administrator	Recommendation Implemented	<p>As part of the 2014 San Francisco Hazard Mitigation Plan, the City identified both natural and human-made hazards facing the City. The document formulated a plan to reduce losses from those hazards and established a process for implementing the plan. However, the 2014 HMP is not a comprehensive sea level rise plan, nor was it intended to be. It should be noted that the 2014 HMP includes the cost of several mitigation strategies either directly or closely related to sea level rise. The following are all high-priority mitigation actions that the City intends to implement during the five-year lifespan of the 2014 HMP, assuming funding availability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement Phase I of the SFPUC's Sewer System Improvement Program (SSIP), including storm water management, flood control, and green infrastructure projects. Funding source: bond financing: \$75,000,000 approved over the next five years. • Continue the Great Highway Long-Term Stabilization program to respond to continuing beach erosion impacts along the Great Highway at Ocean Beach south of Sloat Boulevard. Estimated project timeframe: 4-5 years. Potential funding source: SFMTA and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Estimated cost: \$3,000,000 - \$5,000,000. • Upgrade segments of the San Francisco International Airport (SFO) shoreline protection system. Address gaps in the system that could allow the entry of floodwater; and address openings for storm water drainage that do not have closure devices, which could allow the entry of floodwaters. Upgrade seawalls to address sea level rise. Estimated project timeframe: 5 years. Potential funding source: Capit.'l Planning/Federal Government. Estimated cost: \$60,000,000. • Upgrade storm drainage outfall pump stations IA, IB, and IC to protect the SFO airfield from 100- year floods and sea level rise. Estimated project timeframe: 1-2 years. Potential funding source: TBD. Estimated cost: \$3,500,000. <p>The 2014 HMP does include a brief hazard profile for sea level rise as part of the HMP's climate change section, but does not contain an analysis of the city's vulnerability to sea level rise. This is because the 2014 HMP was completed before the Sea Level Rise Committee chose sea level rise maps for the City and agreed on the level of sea level rise they believe will impact the City. Future versions of the HMP will incorporate the more recent work of the Sea Level Rise Committee by updating the sea level rise hazard profile and by including a vulnerability analysis for sea level rise.</p>	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11b. The City should assess costs of both implementation of adaptation strategies and potential losses from failing to do so.	Controller	Recommendation Implemented	<p>As part of the 2014 San Francisco Hazard Mitigation Plan, the City identified both natural and human-made hazards facing the City. The document formulated a plan to reduce losses from those hazards and established a process for implementing the plan. However, the 2014 HMP is not a comprehensive sea level rise plan, nor was it intended to be. It should be noted that the 2014 HMP includes the cost of several mitigation strategies either directly or closely related to sea level rise. The following are all high-priority mitigation actions that the City intends to implement during the five-year lifespan of the 2014 HMP, assuming funding availability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement Phase I of the SFPUC's Sewer System Improvement Program (SSIP), including storm water management, flood control, and green infrastructure projects. Funding source: bond financing: \$75,000,000 approved over the next five years. • Continue the Great Highway Long-Term Stabilization program to respond to continuing beach erosion impacts along the Great Highway at Ocean Beach south of Sloat Boulevard. Estimated project timeframe: 4-5 years. Potential funding source: SFMTA and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Estimated cost: \$3,000,000 - \$5,000,000. • Upgrade segments of the San Francisco International Airport (SFO) shoreline protection system. Address gaps in the system that could allow the entry of floodwater; and address openings for storm water drainage that do not have closure devices, which could allow the entry of floodwaters. Upgrade seawalls to address sea level rise. Estimated project timeframe: 5 years. Potential funding source: Capit.'l Planning/Federal Government. Estimated cost: \$60,000,000. • Upgrade storm drainage outfall pump stations IA, IB, and IC to protect the SFO airfield from 100- year floods and sea level rise. Estimated project timeframe: 1-2 years. Potential funding source: TBD. Estimated cost: \$3,500,000. <p>The 2014 HMP does include a brief hazard profile for sea level rise as part of the HMP's climate change section, but does not contain an analysis of the city's vulnerability to sea level rise. This is because the 2014 HMP was completed before the Sea Level Rise Committee chose sea level rise maps for the City and agreed on the level of sea level rise they believe will impact the City. Future versions of the HMP will incorporate the more recent work of the Sea Level Rise Committee by updating the sea level rise hazard profile and by including a vulnerability analysis for sea level rise.</p>	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11c. The City should explore applying for grants offered by Congress' Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program. Receipt of grants is based upon risk assessments that indicate that potential savings exceed the cost of implementation. The City should explore available matching funds from the Army Corps of Engineers and other federal sources.	Mayor	Recommendation Implemented	<p>The City has taken the necessary steps to qualify for an receive federal funding. Having FEMA approved HMP makes SF eligible for federal hazard and flood mitigation grant funding before and after a Presidentially-declared disaster. Additionally, the Port has explored various opportunities with the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). In December, 2012, the Port asked the USACE to conduct a study under the River of Harbor Act to determine feasibility of federally-assisted improvements to the SF seawall as a storm and flood protection structure. In May 2014, the Corps kicked off a Federal Interest Determination for a project under the Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) Section 103 Shoreline Protection. This funding source is for smaller projects that result in implementation, not study. The federal spending limit is \$3 million and the cost share is 65% Federal and 35% local.</p> <p>In 2010, the Port asked USACE for seawall assistance through the Water Resources and Development Act (WRDA) for maintenance and repair, liquefaction hazard mitigation, and flood protection. While the request has yet to find any success, the Port continues to actively pursue this funding option.</p>	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11c. The City should explore applying for grants offered by Congress' Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program. Receipt of grants is based upon risk assessments that indicate that potential savings exceed the cost of implementation. The City should explore available matching funds from the Army Corps of Engineers and other federal sources.	Board of Supervisors	Recommendation Implemented	<p>While this recommendation does not fall directly under the jurisdiction of the Board of Supervisors, the City and its various agencies have taken the necessary steps to qualify for and receive federal funding. Although some efforts have yet to find success, City departments will continue to actively pursue these and other funding options</p>	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11c. The City should explore applying for grants offered by Congress' Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program. Receipt of grants is based upon risk assessments that indicate that potential savings exceed the cost of implementation. The City should explore available matching funds from the Army Corps of Engineers and other federal sources.	City Administrator	Recommendation Implemented	<p>The City has taken the necessary steps to qualify for an receive federal funding. Having FEMA approved HMP makes SF eligible for federal hazard and flood mitigation grant funding before and after a Presidentially-declared disaster. Additionally, the Port has explored various opportunities with the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). In December, 2012, the Port asked the USACE to conduct a study under the River of Harbor Act to determine feasibility of federally-assisted improvements to the SF seawall as a storm and flood protection structure. In May 2014, the Corps kicked off a Federal Interest Determination for a project under the Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) Section 103 Shoreline Protection. This funding source is for smaller projects that result in implementation, not study. The federal spending limit is \$3 million and the cost share is 65% Federal and 35% local.</p> <p>In 2010, the Port asked USACE for seawall assistance through the Water Resources and Development Act (WRDA) for maintenance and repair, liquefaction hazard mitigation, and flood protection. While the request has yet to find any success, the Port continues to actively pursue this funding option.</p>	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11c. The City should explore applying for grants offered by Congress' Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program. Receipt of grants is based upon risk assessments that indicate that potential savings exceed the cost of implementation. The City should explore available matching funds from the Army Corps of Engineers and other federal sources.	Controller	Recommendation Implemented	<p>The City has taken the necessary steps to qualify for an receive federal funding. Having FEMA approved HMP makes SF eligible for federal hazard and flood mitigation grant funding before and after a Presidentially-declared disaster. Additionally, the Port has explored various opportunities with the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). In December, 2012, the Port asked the USACE to conduct a study under the River of Harbor Act to determine feasibility of federally-assisted improvements to the SF seawall as a storm and flood protection structure. In May 2014, the Corps kicked off a Federal Interest Determination for a project under the Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) Section 103 Shoreline Protection. This funding source is for smaller projects that result in implementation, not study. The federal spending limit is \$3 million and the cost share is 65% Federal and 35% local.</p> <p>In 2010, the Port asked USACE for seawall assistance through the Water Resources and Development Act (WRDA) for maintenance and repair, liquefaction hazard mitigation, and flood protection. While the request has yet to find any success, the Port continues to actively pursue this funding option.</p>	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11d. The City should request an insurance premium estimate from FEMA and then compare that estimate with the funding it could acquire from FEMA for mitigation and adaptation against future flooding.	Mayor	Will Be Implemented in the Future	<p>Staff is currently pursuing all available opportunities to work with FEMA on sea level rise mitigation measures. A FEMA sea level rise workshop specifically for the City and County of San Francisco will be conducted this September.</p>	Recommendation Implemented	<p>Through the Sea Level Rise Coordinating Committee and the Sea Level Rise Action Plan, the City is working with FEMA on sea level rise mitigation measures, as FEMA updates mapping of flood risk in connection with the National Flood Insurance Program. A FEMA sea level rise workshop specifically for the City and County of San Francisco will be conducted this September.</p>

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

Status of the Recommendations
by the Civil Grand Jury
2013-14

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11d. The City should request an insurance premium estimate from FEMA and then compare that estimate with the funding it could acquire from FEMA for mitigation and adaptation against future flooding.	Board of Supervisors	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	FEMA's National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) does not offer flood coverage to municipalities; only to private property owners in jurisdictions that participate in the program	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11d. The City should request an insurance premium estimate from FEMA and then compare that estimate with the funding it could acquire from FEMA for mitigation and adaptation against future flooding.	City Administrator	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Staff is currently pursuing all available opportunities to work with FEMA on sea level rise mitigation measures. A FEMA sea level rise workshop specifically for the City and County of San Francisco will be conducted this September.	Recommendation Implemented	The City consulted with FEMA and determined that the City is ineligible to purchase Flood insurance through the NFIP. Foreseeable damage from Sea Level Rise is not an insurable risk in the open marketplace. The Mayor's Sea Level Rise Coordinating Committee recently released a Sea Level Action Plan in March of 2016 which calls for actions in 2017 to inform work with FEMA on mitigation and adaptation, including: 1. Continue to Advance the Science 2. Complete Citywide Vulnerability and Risk Assessments 3. Conduct Comprehensive Economic Risk Analysis 4. Plan for Adaptation with a Regional Resilience Design Challenge 5. Build Sea Level Rise Awareness and Adaptation Capacity 6. Review Policy and Financing Tools
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11d. The City should request an insurance premium estimate from FEMA and then compare that estimate with the funding it could acquire from FEMA for mitigation and adaptation against future flooding.	Controller	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Staff is currently pursuing all available opportunities to work with FEMA on sea level rise mitigation measures. A FEMA sea level rise workshop specifically for the City and County of San Francisco will be conducted this September.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The City and County of San Francisco is currently compiling a response to FEMA's proposed Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) for San Francisco (and San Francisco International Airport). This could have significant implications for insurance requirements in designated Special Flood Hazard Areas in the City. Staff is currently participating in the FIRM review process and FEMA expects to issue a Letter of Final Determination in December 2016 with the FIRM to be effective in June 2017.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	12a. The City, through its Mayor and Board of Supervisors, should coordinate its efforts with other cities and organizations in the bay area by establishing a regional working group to address the impact of rising sea levels.	Mayor	Recommendation Implemented	The City's Sea Level Rise Committee reached out to a number of other jurisdictions, including those in the bay Area, to assess SLR strategies being pursued in other locations. Committee members are presenting the City's draft Guidance in a number of regional forums and are exploring regional cooperation and collaboration opportunities. SFO in particular has focused on developing regional collaboration and SFO has reached out to stakeholders and neighboring communities to begin a dialog on adaption strategies. SFO jointly applied with San Mateo County for a climate ready grant from the State Coastal Conservancy and successfully won the grant to extend its current feasibility study to include San Bruno and Colma Creeks which empty into the bay immediately north of SFO. A working group including stakeholders from SFO, San Mateo County, BCDC, California State Coastal Conservancy, South San Francisco, San Bruno, Caltrans and SamTrans will begin meeting in August 2014 to address impacts of sea levels on the peninsula.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	12a. The City, through its Mayor and Board of Supervisors, should coordinate its efforts with other cities and organizations in the bay area by establishing a regional working group to address the impact of rising sea levels.	Board of Supervisors	Recommendation Implemented	The City's Sea Level Rise Committee reached out to a number of other jurisdictions to assess sea level rise strategies being pursued in other locations; and a working group including the Airport, San Mateo County, Bay Conservation and Development Commission, California Coastal Conservancy, and other stakeholders began meeting in August 2014 to address impacts of sea levels on the peninsula and will continue to do so.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	12a. The City, through its Mayor and Board of Supervisors, should coordinate its efforts with other cities and organizations in the bay area by establishing a regional working group to address the impact of rising sea levels.	Planning Department	Recommendation Implemented	The City's Sea Level Rise Committee reached out to a number of other jurisdictions, including those in the bay Area, to assess SLR strategies being pursued in other locations. Committee members are presenting the City's draft Guidance in a number of regional forums and are exploring regional cooperation and collaboration opportunities. SFO in particular has focused on developing regional collaboration and SFO has reached out to stakeholders and neighboring communities to begin a dialog on adaption strategies. SFO jointly applied with San Mateo County for a climate ready grant from the State Coastal Conservancy and successfully won the grant to extend its current feasibility study to include San Bruno and Colma Creeks which empty into the bay immediately north of SFO. A working group including stakeholders from SFO, San Mateo County, BCDC, California State Coastal Conservancy, South San Francisco, San Bruno, Caltrans and SamTrans will begin meeting in August 2014 to address impacts of sea levels on the peninsula.	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	12b. The City should create a local working group of community citizens and stakeholders to feed into the regional group.	Mayor	Requires Further Analysis	We agree that community and stakeholder involvement in the process of adapting to sea level rise is essential. City agencies to date have spent the bulk of their time focused on technical issues such as what we know about sea level rise science, the state of the art in planning infrastructure resilience, and other technical subjects. As we get up to speed, we will turn our attention to greater involvement from communities, the private sector, and stakeholders as adaptation planning moving forward. The exact nature of the outreach and involvement has not yet been determined.	Recommendation Implemented	The City assembled the Sea Level Rise Coordinating Committee in March 2015, an interagency task force of 12 City departments co-chaired by San Francisco Planning and San Francisco Public Works to develop a comprehensive understanding of the threat of sea level rise and to create a decisive plan of action. The Sea Level Rise Action Plan is the Committee's first task. The Sea Level Rise Committee will work across the Bay Area to form strategic partnerships with local and regional stakeholders as collaborators to participate in the adaptation planning and implementation process.

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	12b. The City should create a local working group of community citizens and stakeholders to feed into the regional group.	Board of Supervisors	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The proposed work program for developing a comprehensive citywide sea level rise adaptation plan would provide for robust outreach to and collaboration with local and regional community members and stakeholders.	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 May 7, 2015, the Board held a hearing with the Mayor's Office and other 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.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	12b. The City should create a local working group of community citizens and stakeholders to feed into the regional group.	Planning Department	Requires Further Analysis	We agree that community and stakeholder involvement in the process of adapting to sea level rise is essential. City agencies to date have spent the bulk of their time focused on technical issues such as what we know about sea level rise science, the state of the art in planning infrastructure resilience, and other technical subjects. As we get up to speed, we will turn our attention to greater involvement from communities, the private sector, and stakeholders as adaptation planning moving forward. The exact nature of the outreach and involvement has not yet been determined.	Requires Further Analysis	We agree that community and stakeholder involvement in the process of adapting to sea level rise is essential. This action is specifically recommended by the SLRAP. City agencies to date have spent the bulk of their time focused on technical issues such as what we know about sea level rise science, the state of the art in planning infrastructure resilience, and other technical subjects. As we get up to speed, we will turn our attention to greater involvement from communities, the private sector, and stakeholders as adaptation planning moving forward. The exact nature of the outreach and involvement has not yet been determined. The Port has created a Waterfront Plan Working Group to guide a public planning process to update the Port's Waterfront Land Use Plan. That Working Group holds public meetings and has received extensive information and presentations on sea level rise and resilience, including the City's Sea Level Rise Action Plan. Comments and recommendations from the Waterfront Plan Update process will contribute to regional collaborations to address sea level rise.
2013-14	Survey of San Francisco Commission Websites	1a. The Mayor's Office on Disability should coordinate with commissions to ensure that statements for accommodation are easily located on commission websites.	Mayor's Office on Disability	Recommendation Implemented	Upon receipt of the list of boards and commissions from the City Attorney's Office, MOD staff conducted a review of the 39 commission websites. MOD found that the majority of the commission agenda's (32 out of 39) contained an accessibility notice, but at the initial review only 12 of the commission's websites had specific statements for disability accommodations. Subsequent to the review, MOD staff identified and contacted all commission secretaries and provided technical assistance via electronic mail and telephone call. To date, 35 out of the 39 commissions now feature an accessibility notice prominently on both their website and agenda material. Of the remaining four commissions, all agenda materials now feature the accessibility notices. Two are in the process of updating their website through their webmaster. And two failed to respond despite multiple attempts to reach them.	**	
2013-14	Survey of San Francisco Commission Websites	1b. When commission websites are developed to include language support, that support should be provided in the same languages used in the voter's guide.	Mayor's Office on Disability	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	As discussed previously, language support matters fall within the jurisdiction of the Office of Civic Engagement & Immigrant Affairs. They will be submitting a separate report addressing their efforts to implement language access.	**	
2013-14	Survey of San Francisco Commission Websites	1b. When commission websites are developed to include language support, that support should be provided in the same languages used in the voter's guide.	OCEIA (MOD referred item R1b to Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs as they are responsible for language support.)	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The LAO specifies which languages are required for language support by authorizing OCEIA to annually determine whether at least 10,000 Limited English Speaking residents speak a shared language other than English. This sets a threshold that three languages meet at this time: Chinese (both Cantonese and Mandarin), Spanish and Filipino (Tagalog). Departments covered under the LAO must provide services in these required languages. This information is validated each year using the best available data from the United States Census Bureau and/or other reliable sources. Departments may use a determination of five percent of Limited English Speaking Persons who use the Department's services Citywide to provide support in languages other than the three currently required. There are a number of issues with website based information and translating this information accurately in language: 1) The LAO does not require ALL information to be translated (only vital information is required) and does not reference website information at all; 2) not all members of the public have access to the internet or are able to read/understand/access or navigate information in written form; and 3) current and common usage of online translation tools are inaccurate, particularly for character-based languages such as Chinese. OCEIA has been working with City departments to develop better online tools and approaches even those this is not required by the LAO or ADA and issued a number of guidance's on language access.	**	
2013-14	Survey of San Francisco Commission Websites	2. The Mayor should ensure that each commission posts its annual report on the commission website and provides a URL link to the SFPL, promptly.	Mayor	Will Be Implemented in the Future	By the end of the current fiscal year, a letter will be issued to all boards and commissions encouraging them to post their annual report on their website as well as send an e-copy of the report to the Library and the Board of Supervisors.	Recommendation Implemented	A letter was issued to all boards and commissions encouraging them to post their annual report on their website as well as send an e-copy of the report to the Library and the Board of Supervisors.
2013-14	Survey of San Francisco Commission Websites	3. All commissions should keep and post to their website a record of commissioner attendance. Maintenance of an ongoing record should be required.	Mayor	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	While boards and commissions should keep and post to their website a record of attendance, this recommendation must be implemented by the individual entities themselves and not the Mayor's Office.	**	
2013-14	Survey of San Francisco Commission Websites	4. The City Attorney should ensure that there is an annual list of active commissions that is accurate, complete and listed alphabetically.	City Attorney	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The City Attorney's Office will prepare a list of decision-making boards and commissions created by ordinance or City Charter. The Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and City agencies sometimes create advisory bodies that have no policy-making authority and whose members are not required to file financial disclosures. The City Attorney's Office does not track those bodies and may not maintain a list of them.	Recommendation Implemented	The City Attorney's Office prepared a list of decision-making boards and commissions created by ordinance or City Charter. A list of them is maintained on the City Attorney's Office website. It was last updated on January 4, 2016.

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	1. The Jury recommends a contract with the Fair Political Practices Commission for at least a two-year pilot basis to enforce both state and related San Francisco law violations.	Ethics Commission	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The Ethics Commission sees no need for this and it is possible that the Charter would prohibit such a contract. Currently, the FPPC is not allowed to do this under state law (a pilot program exists between the FPPC and the County of San Bernardino, but this is the only jurisdiction allowed under existing statute.)	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	1. The Jury recommends a contract with the Fair Political Practices Commission for at least a two-year pilot basis to enforce both state and related San Francisco law violations.	Board of Supervisors	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	While the Board of Supervisors does not have the authority to implement this recommendation, the Board broadly agrees that such an arrangement would likely improve enforcement, and encourages the Ethics Commission and other elected officials to pursue it.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	1. The Jury recommends a contract with the Fair Political Practices Commission for at least a two-year pilot basis to enforce both state and related San Francisco law violations.	City Attorney	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The City Attorney's Office does not have the authority to implement Recommendation 1. If requested, the City Attorney's Office will assist the Ethics Commission with implementing this recommendation, though this recommendation may first require an amendment to state law, see Cal. Govt. Code section 83123.5.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	1. The Jury recommends a contract with the Fair Political Practices Commission for at least a two-year pilot basis to enforce both state and related San Francisco law violations.	District Attorney	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The recommendation will not be implemented by the District Attorney. The District Attorney has no role in contracting on behalf of the City. Additionally, the enforcement authority of the Ethics Commission is governed by the San Francisco Charter (see Section 3.699-12).	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	2. The Board of Supervisors should request an independent audit by the City Attorney to determine whether prohibited contributions were forfeited to the City as required by law.	Board of Supervisors	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	While the Board supports this recommendation, implementing it will require an individual Supervisor to propose an audit, which should be conducted by the Controller's City Auditor Division with assistance from the City Attorney. While any Supervisor can undertake such an effort, collectively the Board cannot preemptively guarantee one of its members will choose to do so.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	2. The Board of Supervisors should request an independent audit by the City Attorney to determine whether prohibited contributions were forfeited to the City as required by law.	City Attorney	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	Recommendation 2 is a policy matter for the Board of Supervisors. If requested, the City Attorney's Office will assist the Board of Supervisors with implementing this recommendation (assuming sufficient budget authorization is provided to the City Attorney's Office to cover the costs of that review.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	3. The Jury recommends that the Ethics Commission and the Board of Supervisors act to enhance the Citizen's Right of Action to enforce all of the City's ethics laws, with an award of attorney fees and a share of any penalties going to the City for a successful filer, as was provided by Proposition J.	Ethics Commission	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Ethics Commission will investigate to determine whether an enhancement to a Citizens Right of Action would accomplish the further assurance to the public that the laws would enforce.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Beginning in early FY2017, the Ethics Commission anticipates undertaking a broad review of a range of policies and programs administered and enforced by the Commission to help strengthen the overall effectiveness of its Charter mandate. A review of items contained in Prop. J is anticipated to be part of that effort.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	3. The Jury recommends that the Ethics Commission and the Board of Supervisors act to enhance the Citizen's Right of Action to enforce all of the City's ethics laws, with an award of attorney fees and a share of any penalties going to the City for a successful filer, as was provided by Proposition J.	City Attorney	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	Recommendation 3 is a policy matter for the Ethics Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the Mayor. If requested, the City Attorney's Office will assist the Ethics Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the Mayor with implementing this recommendation.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	3. The Jury recommends that the Ethics Commission and the Board of Supervisors act to enhance the Citizen's Right of Action to enforce all of the City's ethics laws, with an award of attorney fees and a share of any penalties going to the City for a successful filer, as was provided by Proposition J.	Board of Supervisors	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The Board of Supervisors is not convinced that the existing private right of action needs to be broadened.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	4. That contract approval forms be converted to a format which allows searches by the name of the official, by the name of the contractor, the value of contracts and the date the contract was signed. Behested payments information should be filed electronically in a format that allows for searches and data aggregation. Form 700s should be formatted to allow data to be searched on income sources, outside employment, gift sources and travel.	Ethics Commission	Recommendation Implemented/Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	<p>Converting each type of form into such a format requires expensive development of software platforms. This particular recommendation would be extremely expensive. Over time, the Commission plans to develop such platforms for most if not all filings it administers. Lack of funding for development means that the addition of the various forms will be done as recourses are made available. It should be noted, for example, that 2014 is the first time ever that all Form 700 financial disclosure filed with the Ethics Commission had to be submitted electronically. This was an important, but technically difficult step. Since there is no specified state electronic schema for these forms, creating a searchable database would be risky as it might not conform to state standards when they are eventually promulgated. But it is a desirable goal and will be accomplished eventually. Absent the proper software, data would have to be entered manually. This is unrealistic as the cost would be higher in terms of staff time and attendant issues would arise such as transfer error.</p> <p>The Commission has already made great progress in moving its many filings into electronic databases, and there should be no doubt that this will continue. SF is ahead of the majority of jurisdictions in this areas. For example, The New York Times recently noted that the Federal Elections Commission takes weeks and in some cases more than a month to process campaign finance filings of federal candidates, whereas in SF this information is processed in matter of minutes. (Note: this recommendation includes Behested Payment Forms, which are not filed with the Ethics Commission.)</p>	Recommendation Implemented / Will Be Implemented in the Future	As described in its February 22, 2016 <i>Blueprint for Accountability</i> budget document, the Ethics Commission has made a new "E-Filing Conversion Project" a top operational priority for FY2017 and 2018. This project recognizes the need to fully modernize how the public accesses all public disclosure filings with the Commission. It identifies a five-year time horizon for the development and phased-in implementation of a more comprehensive and fully searchable online framework for public filings with the Commission, with an estimated five year project cost of roughly \$1.5 million. In January 2016, Commission staff submitted an initial project proposal for project development funding to the City's Committee on Information Technology (COIT). On April 1, 2016, Commission staff presented a project proposal to COIT's Performance Sub-Committee. On May 6, 2016, the full COIT recommended the Commission's proposal with startup funding \$200,000 in FY 16-17 and \$150,000 in FY 17-18 for the initial two years for project development. Ultimately, funding approval will be required by the Board of Supervisors as part of the FY2017 and 2018 budgets. Separately, as a recommendation already implemented, Ethics Commission staff have been partnering with DataSF staff to ensure Form 700 data currently filed online with the Ethics Commission is available through the city's open data site. We anticipate that to occur by June 2016, providing accessibility for that data to be searched and analyzed in a variety of common data formats.

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	4. That contract approval forms be converted to a format which allows searches by the name of the official, by the name of the contractor, the value of contracts and the date the contract was signed. Behested payments information should be filed electronically in a format that allows for searches and data aggregation. Form 700s should be formatted to allow data to be searched on income sources, outside employment, gift sources and travel.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Recommendation Implemented/Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	<p>Converting each type of form into such a format requires expensive development of software platforms. This particular recommendation would be extremely expensive. Over time, the Commission plans to develop such platforms for most if not all filings it administers. Lack of funding for development means that the addition of the various forms will be done as recourses are made available. It should be noted, for example, that 2014 is the first time ever that all Form 700 financial disclosure filed with the Ethics Commission had to be submitted electronically. This was an important, but technically difficult step. Since there is no specified state electronic schema for these forms, creating a searchable database would be risky as it might not conform to state standards when they are eventually promulgated. But it is a desirable goal and will be accomplished eventually. Absent the proper software, data would have to be entered manually. This is unrealistic as the cost would be higher in terms of staff time and attendant issues would arise such as transfer error.</p> <p>The Commission has already made great progress in moving its many filings into electronic databases, and there should be no doubt that this will continue. SF is ahead of the majority of jurisdictions in this areas. For example, The New York Times recently noted that the Federal Elections Commission takes weeks and in some cases more than a month to process campaign finance filings of federal candidates, whereas in SF this information is processed in matter of minutes. (Note: this recommendation includes Behested Payment Forms, which are not filed with the Ethics Commission.)</p>	Recommendation Implemented / Will Be Implemented in the Future	As described in its February 22, 2016 <i>Blueprint for Accountability</i> budget document, the Ethics Commission has made a new "E-Filing Conversion Project" a top operational priority for FY2017 and 2018. This project recognizes the need to fully modernize how the public accesses all public disclosure filings with the Commission. It identifies a five-year time horizon for the development and phased-in implementation of a more comprehensive and fully searchable online framework for public filings with the Commission, with an estimated five year project cost of roughly \$1.5 million. In January 2016, Commission staff submitted an initial project proposal for project development funding to the City's Committee on Information Technology (COIT). On April 1, 2016, Commission staff presented a project proposal to COIT's Performance Sub-Committee. On May 6, 2016, the full COIT recommended the Commission's proposal with startup funding \$200,000 in FY 16-17 and \$150,000 in FY 17-18 for the initial two years for project development. Ultimately, funding approval will be required by the Board of Supervisors as part of the FY2017 and 2018 budgets. Separately, as a recommendation already implemented, Ethics Commission staff have been partnering with DataSF staff to ensure Form 700 data currently filed online with the Ethics Commission is available through the city's open data site. We anticipate that to occur by June 2016, providing accessibility for that data to be searched and analyzed in a variety of common data formats.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	4. That contract approval forms be converted to a format which allows searches by the name of the official, by the name of the contractor, the value of contracts and the date the contract was signed. Behested payments information should be filed electronically in a format that allows for searches and data aggregation. Form 700s should be formatted to allow data to be searched on income sources, outside employment, gift sources and travel.	Chief Data Officer	Recommendation Implemented/Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	<p>The Ethics Commission notes that they plan on implementing this recommendation over time as recourses become available. Converting each type of form into a searchable format requires the development of software platforms. Absent the proper software, data would have to be entered manually. Manual entry is an unattractive option for the Ethics Commission due o the cost of staff time and the potential for transfer error. It should be noted that 2014 is the first time that all Form 700 financial disclosures filed with the Ethics Commission had to be submitted electronically. Since there is no specified state electronic schema for these forms, creating a searchable database would be risky as it might not conform to state standards when they are eventually promulgated. SF is aged of the majority of jurisdiction in this area and processes filings in a matter of minutes. The Federal Election Commission takes weeks and in some cases more than a month to process campaign finance filings of federal candidates.</p>	Recommendation Implemented / Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Ethics Commission is responsible for this recommendation. DataSF is available to assist the Ethics Commission when appropriate to publish data to the open data portal, including helping to publish electronically filed form 700s.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	5. The Ethics Commission work to develop a common format database for data posted to DataSF, initially aiming to combine campaign, lobbying and Form 700 data.	Ethics Commission	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Commission notes that the campaign and lobbyist data are already available in a common database format on DataSF. Form 700 is not on DataSF because a state data schema has yet to be defined by the Fair Political Practices Commission and the Commission will revisit this issue by February 2015.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Please refer also to the response to Recommendation 4 above regarding the Commission's new E-Filing Conversion Project and the availability of Form 700 information currently filed in electronic format on DataSF. In addition, the Commission will be working in early FY2017 to resume steps needed to extend electronic filing requirement to all Form 700 filers in the City. This will include resuming discussions with applicable Bargaining Units first started in 2015 regarding electronic filing issues they raised related to filings by designated filers.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	5. The Ethics Commission work to develop a common format database for data posted to DataSF, initially aiming to combine campaign, lobbying and Form 700 data.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Commission notes that the campaign and lobbyist data are already available in a common database format on DataSF. Form 700 is not on DataSF because a state data schema has yet to be defined by the Fair Political Practices Commission and the Commission will revisit this issue by February 2015.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Please refer also to the response to Recommendation 4 above regarding the Commission's new E-Filing Conversion Project and the availability of Form 700 information currently filed in electronic format on DataSF. In addition, the Commission will be working in early FY2017 to resume steps needed to extend electronic filing requirement to all Form 700 filers in the City. This will include resuming discussions with applicable Bargaining Units first started in 2015 regarding electronic filing issues they raised related to filings by designated filers.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	5. The Ethics Commission work to develop a common format database for data posted to DataSF, initially aiming to combine campaign, lobbying and Form 700 data.	Chief Data Officer	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Ethics Commission and its Executive Director note in their response that campaign and lobbyist data are already available in a common database format on DataSF. For 700 data is not on DataSF because the state data schema has yet to be defined by the Fair Political Practices Commission.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Ethics Commission is responsible for this recommendation. DataSF is in the midst of helping the Ethics Commission automate the publication of Form 700, when filed electronically, to the open data portal.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	6a. The Ethics Commission should proactively look at ways to track back 501(c) (3) &(4) money to real donors before the start of campaigns where this kind of money will be important; its true source should be identified.	Ethics Commission	Recommendation Implemented	Effective July 1, 2014, a new state law requires "Multipurpose Organizations" including nonprofits and federal and out-of-state PACs spending on state and local elections to report as political committees and disclose those donors who are the sources of funds used for political purposes. However, absent qualifying as a campaign committee under state law, nonprofit organizations appear to be generally entitled to keep their donors confidential (ref. 26 USC 6103/6104/7431; NAACP vs Alabama, 357 US 449 [1958])	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	6b. The Ethics Commission should propose ordinance amendments to require disclaimers in mailings, ads, door hangers and other voter outreach materials funded by committees whose individual donors are not identified to the satisfaction of a reasonable person which state "this is paid for by (insert organization name) funded by anonymous donors in this campaign cycle."	Ethics Commission	Requires Further Analysis	The Ethics Commission requires further analysis of this recommendation and will include a discussion of the merits as part of its upcoming consideration of a package of proposals for changes in the Campaign Finance Reform Ordinance (CFRO) anticipated later this year.	Recommendation Implemented	As part of the CFRO amendments proposed by the Ethics Commission that were implemented in July 2015, all committees must now include the following statement on their communications: "Financial statements are available at sfethics.org." In addition, for primarily formed ballot measure committees and primarily formed candidate committees, an additional disclaimer requirement took effect that requires them to disclose the committee's top two donors of \$20,000 or more. This approach provides more specificity about top funding sources in political campaigns than referencing "anonymous donors" and points the public to where they may find the actual source of a committee's contributions.

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	7. The Ethics Commission should make guides and educational materials available in the major languages as is done in other City Departments.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Commission will make guides in education materials as is done in other departments.	Recommendation Implemented / Will Be Implemented in the Future	Seventeen key documents regarding the Ethics Commission's services and programs have been translated into traditional Chinese, Spanish, and Tagalog. Documents that remain current will be posted on the Commission's new website, which is planned for rollout in early summer 2016. Language regarding the availability of translation and interpretation services has been translated, and also will be added to the Commission's new website at that time. A list of the 21 languages that the City provides telephonic interpretation for has been posted in the public area of the office. Software has been installed on a public computer at the Ethics Commission's that enables video remote interpreting in spoken languages and American Sign Language. Staff have been working with OCEIA to record a telephonic message about office hours and services, which is planned to roll out by early summer 2016. Protocols have been developed that Ethics Staff will follow if language services are requested. Staff submitted a written update to the Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs (OCEIA) regarding the Commission's plans to ensure future compliance with the San Francisco Language Access Ordinance requirements before the October 1, 2015 deadline. In addition, the Ethics Commission will be reporting to OCEIA in October 2016 regarding requests for language translation and/or interpretation services.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	8. The lobbyist ordinance should be reviewed and amended to provide clearer public disclosure of contacts with City officials regarding the interests of clients, and who should be required to register and make disclosures.	Ethics Commission	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The new definitions and provisions have been drafted into regulations by the Ethics Commission staff and will be reviewed by the Commission at its regular July 2014 nettings. These new provisions and regulations should be in effect by the end of the calendar year.	Recommendation Implemented	In July 2014, the Board of Supervisors amended the Lobbyist Ordinance to provide clearer public disclosure of contacts with public officials by reducing the monetary threshold and number of contacts to trigger lobbyist registration and reporting. The Commission adopted regulations to accompany the amendments in July 2014 to further clarify the changes and increase disclosure.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	8. The lobbyist ordinance should be reviewed and amended to provide clearer public disclosure of contacts with City officials regarding the interests of clients, and who should be required to register and make disclosures.	Board of Supervisors	Recommendation Implemented	The Board of Supervisors this year approved Ordinance No. 98-14, which significantly strengthened lobbyist disclosure requirements.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	9. The requirement for disclosure of all expenditures aimed at influencing City Hall decisions should be reinstated in the law with full public disclosure.	Ethics Commission	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Commission will ensure that any such measure is enforced. Within the next 12 months the Ethics Commission will consider re-examining whether or not there is a need to make further changes to the lobbying ordinance to enhance public disclosure of expenditures aimed at influencing City Hall decisions.	Recommendation Implemented	In 2015, the Commission developed a proposal to amend the Lobbyist Ordinance to impose reporting requirements on expenditure lobbyists that seek to engage members of the public to lobby City officials. At its June 29, 2015 meeting, the Commission voted unanimously to place this proposal – ultimately designated Proposition C – on the November 3, 2015 ballot. Proposition C was passed by the voters and became effective on February 1, 2016. After a further series of Interested Persons meetings in late 2015 and early 2016, implementing regulations were approved by the Commission on February 29, 2016.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	9. The requirement for disclosure of all expenditures aimed at influencing City Hall decisions should be reinstated in the law with full public disclosure.	Board of Supervisors	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The lobbyist ordinance was recently strengthened by the Board of Supervisors, and the expenditure lobbyist definition was not reinstated, in part because of the history of this provision, as outlined by the Ethics Commission response	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	10. Work of "strategic advisors" that provide guidance on winning approvals from City officials and/or the public should be reviewed by the Ethics Commission for possible inclusion in the lobbyist registration and/or campaign consultant law.	Ethics Commission	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	Regulating activity that is not lobbying and that is not campaign consulting would appear to be outside of the Ethics Commission's jurisdiction since it would not involve government contacts or campaign activity.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	11. The Ethics Commission in conjunction with the City Attorney should develop a policy to ensure preservation of e-mails and text messages consistent with preservation of other public records. The policy, along with policies on preservation of public records, should be made available for public comment. Once it is completed and published it should be made available on City Attorney and Ethics Commission web pages that lists each Department, its policy, and how to obtain documents.	City Attorney	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	Recommendation 11 is a policy matter for the Ethics Commission and other appropriate City agencies, such as the Board of Supervisoros and the Mayor. If requested, the City Attorney's Office will assist the Ethis commission and other appropriate City agencies with the implementation of this recommendation, likely through legislation that would establish a City-wide protocol regarding preservation of public records.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	11. The Ethics Commission in conjunction with the City Attorney should develop a policy to ensure preservation of e-mails and text messages consistent with preservation of other public records. The policy, along with policies on preservation of public records, should be made available for public comment. Once it is completed and published it should be made available on City Attorney and Ethics Commission web pages that lists each Department, its policy, and how to obtain documents.	Ethics Commission	Requires Further Analysis	Needs further analysis subject to an upcoming Supreme Court ruling. The City's document retention policy does not appear hazy. The Administrative Code requires each department to have its own policy and schedule regarding retention. The concept regarding the regulation of text messages is understandable, but compares to the regulation of telephone calls. The process for overseeing these activities seems untenable and would likely require increasingly resources, although it should be the subject of continued discussion. The questions and issues in the area of private texts and private e-mails are currently under debate in the California court system; the most current ruling states that these items are not in the public domain. However, the issue is now to be heard by the California Supreme Court; the subsequent ruling should dictate the City's course of action.	Requires Further Analysis	Further analysis remains pending as the CA Supreme Court has not yet ruled in the case referenced in the Ethics Commission's prior response. While the case has been fully briefed, no oral argument date has yet been set, so a realistic timetable for further action cannot be identified at this juncture. Once there has been a ruling by the Court, the Ethics Commission will work with the Office of the City Attorney on any next steps that are indicated by the Court's action.

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	11. The Ethics Commission in conjunction with the City Attorney should develop a policy to ensure preservation of e-mails and text messages consistent with preservation of other public records. The policy, along with policies on preservation of public records, should be made available for public comment. Once it is completed and published it should be made available on City Attorney and Ethics Commission web pages that lists each Department, its policy, and how to obtain documents.	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	Will Be Implemented in the Future	A policy should be developed to ensure preservation of email and text messages consistent with applicable laws and modern business practices. Email and text messages sent to or from City officers or employees related to public business that have any meaningful content should be retained for at least 2 years (or longer if applicable). The Task Force, through its Education, Outreach, and Training Committee, intends to develop such a policy in conjunction with the City Attorney's Office and the Ethics Commission, with outreach to City agencies, boards, commissions, and departments, and subject to public comment.	--	Agency elected not to respond.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	11. The Ethics Commission in conjunction with the City Attorney should develop a policy to ensure preservation of e-mails and text messages consistent with preservation of other public records. The policy, along with policies on preservation of public records, should be made available for public comment. Once it is completed and published it should be made available on City Attorney and Ethics Commission web pages that lists each Department, its policy, and how to obtain documents.	Board of Supervisors	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	by nature, such policy changes would be beyond the jurisdiction of the Board of Supervisors. The Board looks forward to upcoming work on this issue by the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, the Ethics Commission and the City Attorney.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	12. The Jury recommends that the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force review departmental web sites for compliance and notify non-compliant departments to immediately post their sources of outside funding, or face a show-cause before the Ethics Commission on why the information has not been posted.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Commission Director will direct staff to notify all departments to remind officials and employees to follow this requirement and ensure that such postings are easy to locate on departmental website.	Requires Further Analysis	At present, Ethics Commission staff are employing a practice of reaching out to departments to remind them of the departmental web posting notice whenever an outside funding notice is received by the Commission offices. Establishing a periodic, broader, and more pro-active review of departmental websites to help ensure compliance would be desirable practice. That undertaking would be dependent on sufficient staffing resources at the Commission to sustain that practice. As noted in the Commission's FY2017 and 2018 budget document, " <i>Blueprint for Accountability</i> ," the Commission has requested additional staff resources, including funding for two additional enforcement staff and two new policy positions. In addition, a series of internal program reviews are underway to identify gaps in policies and procedures, and identify effective practices to address those gaps. The outcome of these efforts, decisions from the FY2017 budget process, and any further policy direction from the Ethics Commission about key priorities it believes warrants attention, will all be factors that determine the agency's capacity to implement this practice in the coming year.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	12. The Jury recommends that the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force review departmental web sites for compliance and notify non-compliant departments to immediately post their sources of outside funding, or face a show-cause before the Ethics Commission on why the information has not been posted.	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	Recommendation Implemented	The Task Force, through its Compliance and Amendments Committee and Education, Outreach, and Training Committee, continues to review the web sites of City agencies, boards, commissions, and departments based on complaints received. For example, the Task Force and its committees have discussed issues with the Arts Commission, Health Department, and Planning Department websites recently. However, limited resources have delayed a complete review of each website and the development of a content model as previously reported. The Task Force is preparing to send a memorandum to department heads reminding them of the requirement to post sources of outside funding on department websites.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	13. All violations of departmental Statements of Incompatible Activities should be disclosed to the Ethics Commission and posted on the Commission's web site.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The Commission's position is that this cannot be implemented when it violates employee privacy rights. Additionally, only a narrow range of five types of employee misconduct is disclosable, and even then ONLY when such matters are "confirmed". The "Good Government Guide" indicates that the process for determining if such matters are confirmed is "unclear". Further, the Guide states that "The privacy issues pertaining to these types of personnel records can be complex, and other consideration in addition to privacy, such as the need to maintain effective investigations, may be relevant". The categories not exempt from disclosures are: 1.) personal dishonesty, 2.) misappropriation of public funds, resources or benefits, 3.) unlawful discrimination against another on the basis of status, 4.) abuse of authority, and 5.) violence. The disclosable categories are not necessarily addressed in each departmental SIA. Therefore, in order to carry out this recommendation, the Ethics Commission would have to take each reported case of employee misconduct, analyze whether it meets the disclosable threshold under local law, and then compare it with the requirements of the individual departmental SIA. There are at least 53 different departments SIAs in existence; administering this proposal would be both difficult and incredibly time consuming and possibly incite a legal challenge.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	13. All violations of departmental Statements of Incompatible Activities should be disclosed to the Ethics Commission and posted on the Commission's web site.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The Commission's position is that this cannot be implemented when it violates employee privacy rights. Additionally, only a narrow range of five types of employee misconduct is disclosable, and even then ONLY when such matters are "confirmed". The "Good Government Guide" indicates that the process for determining if such matters are confirmed is "unclear". Further, the Guide states that "The privacy issues pertaining to these types of personnel records can be complex, and other consideration in addition to privacy, such as the need to maintain effective investigations, may be relevant". The categories not exempt from disclosures are: 1.) personal dishonesty, 2.) misappropriation of public funds, resources or benefits, 3.) unlawful discrimination against another on the basis of status, 4.) abuse of authority, and 5.) violence. The disclosable categories are not necessarily addressed in each departmental SIA. Therefore, in order to carry out this recommendation, the Ethics Commission would have to take each reported case of employee misconduct, analyze whether it meets the disclosable threshold under local law, and then compare it with the requirements of the individual departmental SIA. There are at least 53 different departments SIAs in existence; administering this proposal would be both difficult and incredibly time consuming and possibly incite a legal challenge.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	14a. The Ethics Commission should continue to routinely notify all non-filers of their obligation within 30 days of the state filing deadline.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Recommendation Implemented	The Commission already does this.	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text <i>(provided by CGJ)</i>	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	14a. The Ethics Commission should continue to routinely notify all non-filers of their obligation within 30 days of the state filing deadline.	Ethics Commission	Recommendation Implemented	The Commission already does this.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	14b. The Ethics Commission should recommend dismissal for any officer or employee who fails to file by the 90 day deadline for referral to the Fair Political Practices Commission.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will Be Implemented in the Future	If someone has failed to file within 90 days, the Ethics Commission will recommend to the appointing authority suspension of that person until they have filed.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Beginning in early FY2017, the Ethics Commission anticipates undertaking a broad internal review of range of its policies and programs to assess and help strengthen the overall effectiveness of its programmatic mandates, including procedures related to the Form 700 filing process. To ensure program or policy gaps are identified, and effective practices are implemented to address those gaps, the Commission has requested funding for two new policy positions and two additional enforcement staff as part of a focused effort to begin to rightsize the organization with its FY2017 and 2018 budget request. The outcome of these efforts will be factors that shape the agency's capacity to effectively implement this policy and practice in the coming year.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	14b. The Ethics Commission should recommend dismissal for any officer or employee who fails to file by the 90 day deadline for referral to the Fair Political Practices Commission.	Ethics Commission	Will Be Implemented in the Future	If someone has failed to file within 90 days, the Ethics Commission will recommend to the appointing authority suspension of that person until they have filed.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Beginning in early FY2017, the Ethics Commission anticipates undertaking a broad internal review of range of its policies and programs to assess and help strengthen the overall effectiveness of its programmatic mandates, including procedures related to the Form 700 filing process. To ensure program or policy gaps are identified, and effective practices are implemented to address those gaps, the Commission has requested funding for two new policy positions and two additional enforcement staff as part of a focused effort to begin to rightsize the organization with its FY2017 and 2018 budget request. The outcome of these efforts will be factors that shape the agency's capacity to effectively implement this policy and practice in the coming year.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	14c. The Ethics Commission should recommend dismissal for any officer or employee who files a Statement of Economic Interest that is inaccurate and relevant to the position they hold.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will Be Implemented in the Future	If someone has failed to file within 90 days, the Ethics Commission will recommend to the appointing authority suspension of that person until they have filed.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Beginning in early FY2017, the Ethics Commission anticipates undertaking a broad internal review of range of its policies and programs to assess and help strengthen the overall effectiveness of its programmatic mandates, including procedures related to the Form 700 filing process. To ensure program or policy gaps are identified, and effective practices are implemented to address those gaps, the Commission has requested funding for two new policy positions and two additional enforcement staff as part of a focused effort to begin to rightsize the organization with its FY2017 and 2018 budget request. The outcome of these efforts will be factors that shape the agency's capacity to effectively implement this policy and practice in the coming year.

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	14c. The Ethics Commission should recommend dismissal for any officer or employee who files a Statement of Economic Interest that is inaccurate and relevant to the position they hold.	Ethics Commission	Will Be Implemented in the Future	If someone has failed to file within 90 days, the Ethics Commission will recommend to the appointing authority suspension of that person until they have filed.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Beginning in early FY2017, the Ethics Commission anticipates undertaking a broad internal review of range of its policies and programs to assess and help strengthen the overall effectiveness of its programmatic mandates, including procedures related to the Form 700 filing process. To ensure program or policy gaps are identified, and effective practices are implemented to address those gaps, the Commission has requested funding for two new policy positions and two additional enforcement staff as part of a focused effort to begin to rightsize the organization with its FY2017 and 2018 budget request. The outcome of these efforts will be factors that shape the agency's capacity to effectively implement this policy and practice in the coming year.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	14d. Now that all Form 700 filers file electronically, the Ethics Commission should propose that they be filed with them as well as with the Department filing officer.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Ethics Commission has already discussed doing this and it is an eventual goal. 2014 is the first year that Forms 700 filed with the Commission have been filed exclusively electronically. The Director notes that while this process was successful and resulted in only five non-filers as of this writing, it was also difficult to convert the many filers to a new process. The Commission needs a few years to settle into the new process but would like to introduce a change wherein all Form 700 filers in the City file directly with the Ethics Commission electronically. We envision doing this in the foreseeable future; a set timeframe is not possible because it will largely be determined by available funding.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Currently, elected officials, department heads, and board and Commission members are required to file Form 700s electronically with the Ethics Commission. In 2015, the Ethics Commission initiated the process of requiring all designated Form 700 filers to file with the Ethics Commission. The Commission agreed to postpone that process, however, when Bargaining Unit representatives raised concerns about the impact of electronic filing with regard to designated filers whose job classifications they represent. Discussions did not continue later in 2015, as both the Ethics Commission and Bargaining Units were in a period of executive leadership transition. With the Ethics Commission's hiring now resolved, Ethics Commission Staff will be working to resume discussions with applicable Bargaining Units in early FY2017 regarding concerns they raised previously regarding extending electronic filing requirement to all Form 700 filers in the City.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	14d. Now that all Form 700 filers file electronically, the Ethics Commission should propose that they be filed with them as well as with the Department filing officer.	Ethics Commission	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Ethics Commission has already discussed doing this and it is an eventual goal. 2014 is the first year that Forms 700 filed with the Commission have been filed exclusively electronically. The Director notes that while this process was successful and resulted in only five non-filers as of this writing, it was also difficult to convert the many filers to a new process. The Commission needs a few years to settle into the new process but would like to introduce a change wherein all Form 700 filers in the City file directly with the Ethics Commission electronically. We envision doing this in the foreseeable future; a set timeframe is not possible because it will largely be determined by available funding.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Currently, elected officials, department heads, and board and Commission members are required to file Form 700s electronically with the Ethics Commission. In 2015, the Ethics Commission initiated the process of requiring all designated Form 700 filers to file with the Ethics Commission. The Commission agreed to postpone that process, however, when Bargaining Unit representatives raised concerns about the impact of electronic filing with regard to designated filers whose job classifications they represent. Discussions did not continue later in 2015, as both the Ethics Commission and Bargaining Units were in a period of executive leadership transition. With the Ethics Commission's hiring now resolved, Ethics Commission Staff will be working to resume discussions with applicable Bargaining Units in early FY2017 regarding concerns they raised previously regarding extending electronic filing requirement to all Form 700 filers in the City.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	15. The Ethics Commission should audit and act on violations disclosed through Form 700 filings of local prohibitions such as compensated advocacy and incompatible activities, and enforce these violations with strong action.	Ethics Commission	Recommendation Implemented	The Ethics Commission already does this. The Director notes that while we do not have the staffing resources to audit all Form 700 filings, we do review a portion of them based on investigative criteria, complaints filed and other information that is brought to our attention.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	15. The Ethics Commission should audit and act on violations disclosed through Form 700 filings of local prohibitions such as compensated advocacy and incompatible activities, and enforce these violations with strong action.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Recommendation Implemented	The Ethics Commission already does this. The Director notes that while we do not have the staffing resources to audit all Form 700 filings, we do review a portion of them based on investigative criteria, complaints filed and other information that is brought to our attention.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	16. The Ethics Commission should require full disclosure of contributions or payments for official travel of City officials, including the actual amount contributed and the names of the original donors. The official should also disclose what official business was conducted, including meetings, who participated in the meetings, topics, speeches given, ceremonies attended and other information.	Ethics Commission	Requires Further Analysis	The Ethics Commission will conduct more analysis on this item in its upcoming plans for proposed changes to the Governmental Ethics Ordinance (GEO) anticipated next year. The BOS will need to concur.	Requires Further Analysis	While current law requires a description of the purpose of the trip and the itinerary, descriptions of the meetings, who participated in the meetings, and the meeting topics are not addressed. Speeches given and ceremonies attended are similarly not identified, although there have been instances where those have been reported with the purpose of travel. The Ethics Commission is currently examining a proposal related to gifts of travel by lobbyists to City officials and will consider those issues further at its May 23, 2016, Commission meeting. In addition, beginning in early FY2017, the Ethics Commission anticipates undertaking a broad internal review of range of its policies and programs to assess and help strengthen the overall effectiveness of its programmatic mandates, including procedures related to the disclosure of gifts of travel to City officials more generally. The outcome of the Commission's funding request for two new policy positions will be a key factor that shapes the agency's capacity to effectively evaluate this and similar policies and practices in the coming year.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	16. The Ethics Commission should require full disclosure of contributions or payments for official travel of City officials, including the actual amount contributed and the names of the original donors. The official should also disclose what official business was conducted, including meetings, who participated in the meetings, topics, speeches given, ceremonies attended and other information.	Board of Supervisors	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	By nature, such policy changes would be beyond the jurisdiction of the Board of Supervisors. The Board looks forward to the additional analysis and recommendation of the Ethics Commission.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	17a. The Ethics Commission staff should collect the official calendars prepared under the Sunshine Ordinance monthly, convert them to electronic form and post them online.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The Ethics Commission does not have the staffing resources to do this; other priorities are wanting already. The Ethics Commission recommends that departments should collect the official calendars prepared under the Sunshine Ordinance monthly, convert them to electronic form and post them online.	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	17a. The Ethics Commission staff should collect the official calendars prepared under the Sunshine Ordinance monthly, convert them to electronic form and post them online.	Ethics Commission	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The Ethics Commission does not have the staffing resources to do this; other priorities are wanting already. The Ethics Commission recommends that departments should collect the official calendars prepared under the Sunshine Ordinance monthly, convert them to electronic form and post them online.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	17a. The Ethics Commission staff should collect the official calendars prepared under the Sunshine Ordinance monthly, convert them to electronic form and post them online.	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	Having official calendars available at one central place or website-e.g., via the Ethics Commissions collection of official calendars, or on a central open data API-would facilitate the publics ability to locate those official calendars. This recommendation would shift responsibility from Department Heads to the Ethics Commission. However, there is no reason why various departments should not be responsible for making calendars on their own websites as well. Additionally, barring possible technology and resource barriers that are presently unknown to the SOTF, the SOTF can provide static links on its own website to the public calendars of all city departments and agencies. The SOTF, through its Compliance and Amendments Committee and/or its Education Outreach and Training Committee, intends in the next 6 months to review departments' and agencies' compliance and urge department heads to maintain their calendars permanently and post them on their websites no later than "three business days subsequent to the calendar entry date." The Task Force will also incorporate the Sunshine Ordinance's public calendar requirements into its education and outreach materials.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	17a. The Ethics Commission staff should collect the official calendars prepared under the Sunshine Ordinance monthly, convert them to electronic form and post them online.	City Attorney	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	Recommendation 17a is a policy matter for the Ethics Commission. If requested, the City Attorney's Office will assist the Ethics Commission with the implementation of this recommendation.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	17b. The City Attorney and the Ethics Commission ensure that those officials subject to the calendar requirement, and their administrative staff, be trained on the law's requirements.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Director will work with the City Attorney's office to include this item in future annual Sunshine Trainings (although it does not apply to the vast majority of those who receive the training.)	Recommendation Implemented / Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	In April 2015, the City Attorney's Office provided notice to officials required to comply with this provision and subsequent training materials also include information about this requirement. There is not currently a requirement that administrative staff be trained on its requirements. The Ethics Commission Director does not presently envision proposing one. Ensuring the attention and compliance by administrative staff to the requirement of the calendar law seems most appropriately the direct responsibility of the officials subject to its requirements, to whom the administrative staff report. As the administrative staff's appointing authority, those officials should provide, and be accountable for providing, clear information and establishing clear expectations for compliance in practice.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	17b. The City Attorney and the Ethics Commission ensure that those officials subject to the calendar requirement, and their administrative staff, be trained on the law's requirements.	Ethics Commission	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Director will work with the City Attorney's office to include this item in future annual Sunshine Trainings (although it does not apply to the vast majority of those who receive the training.)	Recommendation Implemented / Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	In April 2015, the City Attorney's Office provided notice to officials required to comply with this provision and subsequent training materials also include information about this requirement. There is not currently a requirement that administrative staff be trained on its requirements. The Ethics Commission Director does not presently envision proposing one. Ensuring the attention and compliance by administrative staff to the requirement of the calendar law seems most appropriately the direct responsibility of the officials subject to its requirements, to whom the administrative staff report. As the administrative staff's appointing authority, those officials should provide, and be accountable for providing, clear information and establishing clear expectations for compliance in practice.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	17b. The City Attorney and the Ethics Commission ensure that those officials subject to the calendar requirement, and their administrative staff, be trained on the law's requirements.	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	Recommendation Implemented	The Task Force has not reviewed compliance with the department head calendar requirement as previously reported due to limited resources. The Task Force is preparing to send a memorandum to department heads reminding them of the department head calendar requirement. The Task Force is also considering recommending an ordinance to the Board of Supervisors to extend the department head calendar requirement to members of the Board of Supervisors. Finally, the Task Force, through its Education, Outreach, and Training Committee, still intends to conduct a larger review of all existing Sunshine Ordinance training materials and programs, as previously reported, as resources permit.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	17b. The City Attorney and the Ethics Commission ensure that those officials subject to the calendar requirement, and their administrative staff, be trained on the law's requirements.	City Attorney	Will Be Implemented in the Future	In cooperation with the Ethics Commission, the City Attorney's Office will implement this recommendation by including a discussion of the Sunshine Ordinance's calendar requirements in its bi-annual ethics and sunshine training.	Recommendation Implemented	While the City Attorney's Office (the "Office") initially proposed including discussion of the Sunshine Ordinance's calendar requirement in its bi-annual sunshine and ethics training, after further consideration, the Office decided to implement this recommendation in a more targeted manner. The vast majority of the officials required to attend the bi-annual sunshine and ethics training, i.e., members of City boards and commissions, are not subject to the Sunshine Ordinance's calendar requirement. Instead of the bi-annual training, on August 7, 2015, the Office distributed a detailed memorandum regarding the calendar requirement to the department heads and elected officials who must comply with this law. (A copy of this memorandum is attached.) In addition, the Office will incorporate a discussion of current version of the calendar requirement in the next version of the Office's Good Government Guide.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	18. The Board of Supervisors should adopt a rule subjecting themselves to the public calendar requirement of the Sunshine Ordinance.	Board of Supervisors	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	As evidenced by the Civil Grand Jury report, Supervisors already willingly disclose their calendars	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	19. The Commission should grant or deny post-public employment restriction waiver applications by resolutions that indicate specifically how the decision meets the conditions of the ordinance.	Ethics Commission	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Commission approves of this idea and will issue written resolution for future decisions when waivers are granted.	Recommendation Implemented	The Commission agrees that its analysis of and determinations regarding any post-employment restriction waivers should be fully transparent to provide accountability for exemption it provides to the City's revolving door restrictions. To that end, the Commission's process requires detailed written requests from those seeking waivers, including information about their prior City duties; how, in their view, the waiver would not create the potential for undue influence or unfair advantage; and an accounting of how not granting a waiver would cause extreme hardship for the City officer or employee. Written staff recommendations that are public documents accompany any waiver request, all of which are included in the meeting materials for the Commission meeting at which the waiver is considered. The Commission's discussions occur in open session, and each Commissioner must vote in public session whether or not to grant a waiver request. In so voting, the Commission must make a specific finding that granting such a waiver would not create the potential for undue influence or unfair advantage, or that imposing the restriction would cause extreme hardship for the individual requesting the waiver. The individual requestor is then provided with a written letter from the Commission that conveys those findings. In sum, these steps provide a clear accounting of the basis on which the Commission makes any waiver determinations with regard to post-employment matters. As the Commission assesses a range of policy and procedural matters in FY2017, its review will also include a look at current practices in this area to determine what if any further steps would be helpful to strengthen its transparency in this area.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	20a. The Mayor's Office should establish a blue-ribbon committee of experts and stakeholders in open government, sunshine and transparency, including former Sunshine Task Force members. The Committee of Experts should review and update the Sunshine Ordinance as necessary and should report to both entities and the Board of Supervisors recommendations that would result in coordination and respect for the functions of each entity.	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The Task Force again notes its power and duty to "propose to the Board of Supervisors amendments to the Sunshine Ordinance," including the proposed ordinance discussed above regarding Recommendation 17b. The Task Force's Compliance and Amendments Committee is responsible for, among other things, recommending to the Task Force amendments to the Sunshine Ordinance. The Task Force, in turn, may recommend amendments to the Board of Supervisors. However, since the voters amended the Sunshine Ordinance in 1999 and did not provide for further amendments through the legislative process, most substantive amendments would have to go back to the voters for approval.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	20a. The Mayor's Office should establish a blue-ribbon committee of experts and stakeholders in open government, sunshine and transparency, including former Sunshine Task Force members. The Committee of Experts should review and update the Sunshine Ordinance as necessary and should report to both entities and the Board of Supervisors recommendations that would result in coordination and respect for the functions of each entity.	Mayor	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The establishment of a new committee is not necessary to revise San Francisco campaign and ethics laws. The Ethics Commission can submit legislation directly to the Board of Supervisors. Additionally, proposed revisions to the Sunshine Ordinance can be offered by experts and stakeholders outside of the committee process. Most recently, Supervisor David Chiu proposed changes to the lobbying ordinance that were eventually approved by the Board of Supervisors.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	20a. The Mayor's Office should establish a blue-ribbon committee of experts and stakeholders in open government, sunshine and transparency, including former Sunshine Task Force members. The Committee of Experts should review and update the Sunshine Ordinance as necessary and should report to both entities and the Board of Supervisors recommendations that would result in coordination and respect for the functions of each entity.	Board of Supervisors	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	This recommendation is not directed to the Board of Supervisors. Any individual Supervisors could propose the creation of a task force legislatively.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	20a. The Mayor's Office should establish a blue-ribbon committee of experts and stakeholders in open government, sunshine and transparency, including former Sunshine Task Force members. The Committee of Experts should review and update the Sunshine Ordinance as necessary and should report to both entities and the Board of Supervisors recommendations that would result in coordination and respect for the functions of each entity.	Ethics Commission	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The Ethics Commissions defers to the Mayor's office.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	20b. For now, arrangements should be made jointly by the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to have complaints heard by an independent hearing officer who would develop a consistent legally sufficient record of the case for the decision of each body. This would allow the meetings of the Task Force and the Commission to focus on broader policy issues.	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The Task Force has made substantial progress in reducing its backlog of cases and has, in fact, changed its complaint procedures to allow different and faster ways to address complaints. Further, the Ethics Commission reviewed its procedures for handling referrals from the Task Force and made new policy choices that will also allow more options for enforcement while continuing to give an appropriate level of deference to Task Force decisions. As such, the Task Force will not pursue the independent hearing officer idea further. □	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	20b. For now, arrangements should be made jointly by the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to have complaints heard by an independent hearing officer who would develop a consistent legally sufficient record of the case for the decision of each body. This would allow the meetings of the Task Force and the Commission to focus on broader policy issues.	Mayor	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	There is no procedure in the voter adopted Sunshine Ordinance to allow for adjudication of complaints by an independent hearing officer. The Ethics Commission is the officially appointed body that investigates referrals and complaints from the Sunshine Reform Task Force.	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	20b. For now, arrangements should be made jointly by the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to have complaints heard by an independent hearing officer who would develop a consistent legally sufficient record of the case for the decision of each body. This would allow the meetings of the Task Force and the Commission to focus on broader policy issues.	Board of Supervisors	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	This recommendation relates to the operation of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force and the Ethics Commission, and is not directed at the Board of Supervisors;	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	20b. For now, arrangements should be made jointly by the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to have complaints heard by an independent hearing officer who would develop a consistent legally sufficient record of the case for the decision of each body. This would allow the meetings of the Task Force and the Commission to focus on broader policy issues.	Ethics Commission	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The Ethics Commission does not agree with this recommendation and believes it is in the public's best interest to have the Commission continue to investigate and hear Sunshine Referrals and complaints. Further, there is no mechanism in the Sunshine Ordinance to do this.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	21. The Board of Supervisors should provide the Commissioners an Executive Secretary separate from the existing Commission's employee base who will, among other duties, prepare the Commission's agendas, maintain minutes, lists of complaints, serve as a liaison for public input and interested persons meetings and assist a Commission member to be the parliamentarian.	Board of Supervisors	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The Board of Supervisors agrees that an additional staff member could improve the effectiveness of the Ethics Commission. The Board will consider this recommendation as part of the Ethics Commission's next budget. Unfortunately, the constraints imposed by the Civil Grand Jury response process do not allow the Board to officially say that this recommendation will be considered at a later date.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	21. The Board of Supervisors should provide the Commissioners an Executive Secretary separate from the existing Commission's employee base who will, among other duties, prepare the Commission's agendas, maintain minutes, lists of complaints, serve as a liaison for public input and interested persons meetings and assist a Commission member to be the parliamentarian.	Ethics Commission	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The Ethics Commission's staffing priorities are for more investigators and auditors. The Commission notes that, while in an ideal world a Commission Secretary is desirable, for a commission this small it is not an urgent need.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	21. The Board of Supervisors should provide the Commissioners an Executive Secretary separate from the existing Commission's employee base who will, among other duties, prepare the Commission's agendas, maintain minutes, lists of complaints, serve as a liaison for public input and interested persons meetings and assist a Commission member to be the parliamentarian.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The Ethics Commission's staffing priorities are for more investigators and auditors. The Commission notes that, while in an ideal world a Commission Secretary is desirable, for a commission this small it is not an urgent need.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	22. The Commissioners should use their committee structure to focus on Ethics Commission issues. In the weeks between monthly meetings, each commissioner could take the lead on issues of concern to the Ethics Commission, such as developing policies on emerging campaign finance issues, transparency matters, complaint processing and training. This structure would allow for more interaction with the public and the regulated community.	Ethics Commission	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Commission will consider using committees on an as-needed basis. The committee system was designed for larger bodies. A commission of only five members using a committee system would likely entail a larger number of meetings unwieldy for such a small body and would result in redundant sessions. Commissioners are volunteers donating a great deal of their time and wisdom to the city and have managed to conduct business appropriately. As needed, special meetings have been conducted to move more sizable or difficult issues before the Commission. Even Roberts Rules of Order states that the formality necessary in a large assembly would hinder the business of a small board.	Recommendation Implemented	The Commission has used a Committee structure on an as-needed basis, for example during its 2015 recruitment and selection of a new Executive Director. In addition, individual Commissioners have taken the lead on issues in between regular Commission meetings. For example, preparing draft policies for consideration by the full body (such as Prop. C language in mid 2015); participating directly in public forums related to the Commission's Prop. C ballot measure proposal in the Fall of 2015; and conducting research and preparing analyses related to pressing issues (such as its review of recommendations from the 2014-15 Civil Grand Jury on strengthening the Whistleblower Protection Ordinance.)
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	23. That the Ethics Commission apply to the City Attorney for permission to engage outside counsel for advice and recommendations	Ethics Commission	Requires Further Analysis	This Ethics Commission is willing to discuss the merits of this with the City Attorney, but has concerns about continuity and costs. Under the Charter, it is ultimately not the Commission's decision to make.	Requires Further Analysis	Beginning in early FY2017, the Ethics Commission anticipates undertaking a broad review of range of policies and programs at the Commission to help strengthen its overall effectiveness in achieving its Charter mandates. Should those discussions touch on or address any structural issues such as Recommendation 23, the Commission would be willing to discuss the merits of those proposals with the City Attorney's Office and others, as any such change would require considered review and amendment of the city Charter.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	23. That the Ethics Commission apply to the City Attorney for permission to engage outside counsel for advice and recommendations	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Requires Further Analysis	This Ethics Commission is willing to discuss the merits of this with the City Attorney, but has concerns about continuity and costs. Under the Charter, it is ultimately not the Commission's decision to make.	Requires Further Analysis	Beginning in early FY2017, the Ethics Commission anticipates undertaking a broad review of range of policies and programs at the Commission to help strengthen its overall effectiveness in achieving its Charter mandates. Should those discussions touch on or address any structural issues such as Recommendation 23, the Commission would be willing to discuss the merits of those proposals with the City Attorney's Office and others, as any such change would require considered review and amendment of the city Charter.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	23. That the Ethics Commission apply to the City Attorney for permission to engage outside counsel for advice and recommendations	City Attorney	?	Partially disagree. As explained above, the Ethics Commission has rarely requested or relied on outside counsel to step into the shoes of the City Attorney's Office for particular matters. As this history reflects, there is no need for the Ethics Commission to apply to the City Attorney for permission to engage outside counsel, except in extremely rare circumstances. Notably, the Ethics Commission cannot freely engage its own outside counsel. Charter section 15.102 mandates that the City Attorney serve as "the legal advisor of the Commission." The Charter also sets out a specific procedure by which any elected official, department head, board or commission may request outside counsel. The Ethics Commission may employ this process, but only if it has reason to believe that the City Attorney has "a prohibited financial conflict of interest under California law or a prohibited ethical conflict of interest under the California Rules of Professional Conduct." See S.F. Charter 66.102(1). Since the voters adopted section 6.102 in 2001, the Ethics Commission has not invoked this procedure.	Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	As explained in the Office's previous response, Charter Section 15.102 expressly prescribes that the City Attorney shall serve as "the legal advisor of the Commission." And to the extent that the City Attorney's Office has a conflict of interest, Charter Section 6.102 establishes a process by which City clients may request outside counsel; notably, the Ethics Commission has never invoked this process. In the two years since the Office provided its initial response to this recommendation, the Ethics Commission - consistent with its past approach - has not requested or expressed any interest in seeking outside counsel. Based on the Charter and practical experience, the Office respectfully disagrees with this recommendation and will continue to advise the Ethics Commission.

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	24. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should request an annual written report from the Ethics Commission that meets the standards set out in the Charter for annual reviews of the effectiveness of the City's laws. This report should be posted on the Ethics Commission web site.	Board of Supervisors	Recommendation Implemented	In its response to the Civil Grand Jury Report, the Ethics Commission indicated that it will provide such a report	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	24. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should request an annual written report from the Ethics Commission that meets the standards set out in the Charter for annual reviews of the effectiveness of the City's laws. This report should be posted on the Ethics Commission web site.	Mayor	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	This recommendation appears unnecessary. The City Charter mandates an annual review of law effectiveness, not a written review. The Ethics Commission and the Executive Director communicate to the Mayor and the Board through memos, oral testimony and in-person meetings and the Annual Report.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	24. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should request an annual written report from the Ethics Commission that meets the standards set out in the Charter for annual reviews of the effectiveness of the City's laws. This report should be posted on the Ethics Commission web site.	Ethics Commission	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Commission will provide a report.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Commission strongly agrees that it should provide regular and comprehensive reports to the Mayor and Board about the effectiveness of City laws it is charged with administering and enforcing. The Commission's desire to provide improved transparency about its operations and programs are illustrated by its February 22, 2016 FY2017 and 2018 budget request document, "Blueprint for Accountability," and its most recent March 2016 "Report on Limited Public Financing in the 2015 City Elections." Beginning in early FY2017, the Ethics Commission anticipates undertaking a broad internal review of range of its policies and programs to assess and help strengthen the overall impact and effectiveness the laws within its jurisdiction. These reviews will be designed to identify gaps in policies and identify the most effective ways to address those gaps and strengthen the effectiveness of the City's political reform laws. Policy recommendations resulting from these efforts will be forwarded to the Board and Mayor. It should be noted that this undertaking will be largely dependent on sufficient staffing resources. As noted in the Commission's "Blueprint for Accountability," the Commission has requested additional staff resources, including funding for two additional enforcement staff and two new policy positions. The outcome of these efforts, decisions from the FY2017 budget process, and any further policy direction from the Ethics Commission about key priorities it believes warrants attention, will all be factors that determine the agency's capacity to implement a regular practice of reporting fully and meaningfully about the impact of city laws.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	25. The Ethics Commission should begin to focus Staff resources on monitoring and auditing other items within the Ethics Commission jurisdiction unrelated to campaigns such as the following ordinances: Conflict of Interest, Governmental Ethics, The Lobbyist Ordinance, Campaign Consultant Ordinance and the Sunshine Ordinance.	Ethics Commission	Recommendation Implemented	Provided with sufficient resources, more work in the area will be accomplished. The Commission staff does much more of this work than the finding indicates , but lacks the staff and resources to do this work on a comprehensive basis. As it is, the staff can only audit a few non-publically financed campaigns each year due to resource limitations. The Commission notes that additional auditors are needed just for campaign finance; extending the audit reach is a desirable notion, but like many of these recommendations, this one comes with costs but no suggestions on how to meet them. Note: recent changes in the lobbyist ordinance will require audits of lobbyist in the future.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	25. The Ethics Commission should begin to focus Staff resources on monitoring and auditing other items within the Ethics Commission jurisdiction unrelated to campaigns such as the following ordinances: Conflict of Interest, Governmental Ethics, The Lobbyist Ordinance, Campaign Consultant Ordinance and the Sunshine Ordinance.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Recommendation Implemented	Provided with sufficient resources, more work in the area will be accomplished. The Commission staff does much more of this work than the finding indicates , but lacks the staff and resources to do this work on a comprehensive basis. As it is, the staff can only audit a few non-publically financed campaigns each year due to resource limitations. The Commission notes that additional auditors are needed just for campaign finance; extending the audit reach is a desirable notion, but like many of these recommendations, this one comes with costs but no suggestions on how to meet them. Note: recent changes in the lobbyist ordinance will require audits of lobbyist in the future.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	25. The Ethics Commission should begin to focus Staff resources on monitoring and auditing other items within the Ethics Commission jurisdiction unrelated to campaigns such as the following ordinances: Conflict of Interest, Governmental Ethics, The Lobbyist Ordinance, Campaign Consultant Ordinance and the Sunshine Ordinance.	Board of Supervisors	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	This recommendation is within the jurisdiction of the Ethics Commission; however, the Board of Supervisors should consider providing additional resources in the next budget process	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	26. The Ethics Commission should determine information reported elsewhere that is relevant for supplemental understanding of information currently reported locally, and provide links to it on the Ethics Commission web site, if it cannot be imported and posted.	Ethics Commission	Recommendation Implemented	The Commission already provides links to the Secretary of State's CAL-Access database and material on the Fair Political Practices Commission website. The Ethics Commission Staff will continue to link to other relevant websites where appropriate. The Commission adds that this should be noted ha the Commissions website is already considered among the best and most comprehensive sites in the country.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	26. The Ethics Commission should determine information reported elsewhere that is relevant for supplemental understanding of information currently reported locally, and provide links to it on the Ethics Commission web site, if it cannot be imported and posted.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Recommendation Implemented	The Commission already provides links to the Secretary of State's CAL-Access database and material on the Fair Political Practices Commission website. The Ethics Commission Staff will continue to link to other relevant websites where appropriate. The Commission adds that this should be noted ha the Commissions website is already considered among the best and most comprehensive sites in the country.	**	
2013-21	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	26. The Ethics Commission should determine information reported elsewhere that is relevant for supplemental understanding of information currently reported locally, and provide links to it on the Ethics Commission web site, if it cannot be imported and posted.	Chief Data Officer	Recommendation Implemented	The Commission's website is already considered among the best and most comprehensive sites in the county. Links to the Secretary of States CAL-Access database and material on the Fair Political Practices Commission web sites are easy to access. The website will continue to link to other relevant websites where appropriate.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	27. When a bill is proposed or passed to amend campaign finance and ethics laws, it should specify how it "furthers the purposes of this Chapter".	Ethics Commission	Recommendation Implemented	All proposed changes to existing ordinances are accompanied by comprehensive staff memoranda explaining the details and purposes of the proposed changes.	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2014 Response	Original 2014 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2016 Response ⁽¹⁾	2016 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	27. When a bill is proposed or passed to amend campaign finance and ethics laws, it should specify how it "furthers the purposes of this Chapter".	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Recommendation Implemented	All proposed changes to existing ordinances are accompanied by comprehensive staff memoranda explaining the details and purposes of the proposed changes.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	27. When a bill is proposed or passed to amend campaign finance and ethics laws, it should specify how it "furthers the purposes of this Chapter".	Board of Supervisors	Recommendation Implemented	The Board of Supervisors believes that individual Supervisors will ask the City Attorney to include such findings in future legislation.	**	
2013-25	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	27. When a bill is proposed or passed to amend campaign finance and ethics laws, it should specify how it "furthers the purposes of this Chapter".	City Attorney	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	Recommendation 27 is a policy matter for the Ethics Commission and the Board of Supervisors. If requested, the City Attorney's Office will assist the Ethics Commission and the Board of Supervisors with implementation of this recommendation.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	28. That the Commission hold hearings, whether through their committees or in the full Commission, to ask the public to report matters that appear improper, then call the responsible officials before the Commission to account for and defend their actions.	Ethics Commission	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	Allowing anyone to force public officials to appear before the Ethics Commission to defend themselves against charges invites anyone with personal agendas to create punitive actions against public officials -at will whether there is a basis or not for such accusations. This proposal does not regard actual law-breaking, but merely the appearance of impropriety and calls Constitutional issues directly into consideration.	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	29. That the Ethics Commission hold a hearing on "Proposition J Revisited" to consider how some of its concepts apply today and whether the "public benefit" definition includes elements that should be incorporated into sections of the C&GCC, and specifically consider offering amendments to C&GCC which re-incorporate its Findings and Declarations into current San Francisco law, and to consider placing these amendments on the ballot.	Ethics Commission	Requires Further Analysis	City laws prevent all City officials and employees from accepting anything of value for they duties they perform. In addition, local ordinance identifies a number of "restricted sources" who may not make donations to candidate and office holders. Note: The language in Prop J was determined to be unconstitutional by the LA Superior Court in 2002. That ruling still stands and there is no reason to believe that it would fare different in SF, indicating that a measure to readopt Prop J, as written would be fruitless. The Commission intends to include this use as part of a larger discussion of the conflict of interest and campaign finance rules.	Requires Further Analysis	The Commission agrees that periodic reviews of its laws are necessary to ensure they remain strong, workable, and effective in meeting the policy goals for which they are established. Beginning in early FY2017, the Ethics Commission anticipates undertaking a broad review of a range of policies and programs administered and enforced by the Commission to help strengthen the overall effectiveness of its Charter mandate. A review of items contained in Prop. J is anticipated to be part of that effort.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	29. That the Ethics Commission hold a hearing on "Proposition J Revisited" to consider how some of its concepts apply today and whether the "public benefit" definition includes elements that should be incorporated into sections of the C&GCC, and specifically consider offering amendments to C&GCC which re-incorporate its Findings and Declarations into current San Francisco law, and to consider placing these amendments on the ballot.	Board of Supervisors	Will Not Be Implemented : Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	This recommendation is directed at the Ethics Commission, though individual Supervisors could also call a hearing on the matter. The Board recognizes the legislative history outlined by the Ethics Commission.	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	1. The Jury recommends the Board of Supervisors convene a hearing this calendar year to review the final report from the Mayor's Housing Task Force and ensure that policy recommendations improve the relationship between Market Rate and Affordable Housing to reflect the economic diversity of the City, and include annual monitoring of regional housing achievement numbers as defined by the Regional Housing Needs Allocation and the Housing Element.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	1. The Jury recommends the Board of Supervisors convene a hearing this calendar year to review the final report from the Mayor's Housing Task Force and ensure that policy recommendations improve the relationship between Market Rate and Affordable Housing to reflect the economic diversity of the City, and include annual monitoring of regional housing achievement numbers as defined by the Regional Housing Needs Allocation and the Housing Element.	Mayors Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) Not required to respond on this item.	**	
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	2. The Jury recommends that MOHCD articulate strategies to improve achievement of regional housing targets for Middle Income households and establish incremental targets by year. The Jury also recommends that MOHCD report annually to the Board of Supervisors on progress in achieving these targets and include best practice research from other municipalities about Middle Income policy solutions.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	**	
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	3. The Jury recommends that as Housing Trust Fund (HTF) funds are allocated to Housing Authority properties, MOHCD and the Mayor document a funding analysis for the allocation and the impact these disbursements may have on MOHCD Affordable Housing goals and programs to the Board of Supervisors and the public in the year of encumbrance. Reports should include annual updates on repayment.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	**	
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	4a. To keep the public and the Board of Supervisors informed on a timely basis, the Jury recommends that the MOHCD website be made much more user friendly with improved navigation and better public access to content.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	**	
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	4b. The Jury recommends that MOHCD immediately designate a website manager responsible for technical design and ease-of-use, plus content management including timely posting of documents and metrics reports that are in the public interest.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	**	
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	5a. The Jury recommends MOHCD publish an Annual Report on their website by March of each year. This report should be oriented to a general audience and include information highlights and measures that communicate achievement towards City Affordable Housing program goals.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	**	
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	5b. The Jury recommends MOHCD publish a quarterly Affordable Housing Pipeline Report within a month of each quarter's closing. This may be done within the Planning Department's Quarterly Pipeline Report, but should also include quarterly Affordable Housing program progress highlights.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	**	
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	5b. The Jury recommends MOHCD publish a quarterly Affordable Housing Pipeline Report within a month of each quarter's closing. This may be done within the Planning Department's Quarterly Pipeline Report, but should also include quarterly Affordable Housing program progress highlights.	Planning Department	**	
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	6a. MOHCD needs to track and publish metrics with greater frequency using measures based on pipeline and HUD CAPER reporting that help the public to assess the progress of their new development and Housing Support Program efforts.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	Recommendation Implemented	MOHCD publishes housing pipeline data on our website as well as on OpenData SF. This data is updated quarterly.
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	6b. MOHCD should work with the Planning Department to formulate a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) specifying timing and responsibility for the preparation and publication of Affordable Housing pipeline data in the Quarterly Pipeline Report. A new report commonly referred to as The Dashboard should be completed. An effort to publish these reports on SF Open Data should be prioritized.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	6b. MOHCD should work with the Planning Department to formulate a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) specifying timing and responsibility for the preparation and publication of Affordable Housing pipeline data in the Quarterly Pipeline Report. A new report commonly referred to as The Dashboard should be completed. An effort to publish these reports on SF Open Data should be prioritized.	Planning Department	**	
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	6c. MOHCD should establish a metric for accounting public contributions per development project. This financing leverage measure should be reported in the MOHCD Annual Report by project type.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	**	
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	7. The Jury recommends MOHCD use their website to post up-to-date housing development project information and provide access to key milestone documents as is done on the Boston Redevelopment Authority website.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	Recommendation Implemented	This functionality is now available on the MOHCD website.
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	8a. The Jury recommends MOHCD provide developer partners with more comprehensive materials in the Marketing template, including model BMR program marketing plans, advertising samples, marketing templates in multiple languages, directories of approved consultant and public agency partners, and training materials including web delivered training videos, to set clearly understood minimum standards for outreach.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	**	
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	8b. The Jury recommends MOHCD implement regular evaluations of marketing effectiveness and marketing materials by surveying applicants to indicate source of notification by housing opportunity.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	Recommendation Implemented	The DAHLIA system is now accepting applications for all below-market rate (BMR) and 100% affordable rental opportunities. Applicants are asked the source of notification of housing opportunity, which we can use to continually evaluate marketing effectiveness.
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	9a. MOHCD should provide applicants clear, concise materials on the application process, and conduct and evaluate applicant feedback satisfaction surveys after each new major development project comes on-line.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	Recommendation Implemented	The DAHLIA system is now accepting applications for all below-market rate (BMR) and 100% affordable rental opportunities. As part of the continuous improvement of the DAHLIA system, we are regularly surveying users about their experience.
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	9b. MOHCD should prioritize the completion of their Single Family Program Data and Administration System. MOHCD should measure and report on the cost effectiveness of process improvements and efficiencies from implementation of this system in their Annual Report.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	Recommendation Implemented	The DAHLIA system is now accepting applications for all below-market rate (BMR) and 100% affordable rental opportunities. Without the process improvements and efficiencies afforded by the system, we would not have been able to handle the volume of applications or the complexity of additional housing preferences which have been added by the Board of Supervisors since the Civil Grand Jury report was issued. It is difficult to measure the cost impact of not being able to implement the additional housing preferences.
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	10a. The Jury recommends MOHCD work to improve the ethnic diversity of residents in their BMR programs and monitor progress in mitigating any institutional barriers to fair housing choice. Data on representational statistics should be collected and evaluated at regular intervals, preferably every 2 years. Any statistical disparities should be reported to the Board of Supervisors.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	**	
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	10b. The Jury recommends MOHCD work with developer partners to standardize criteria used for BMR rental application denials. Strategies to reduce minimum down payment requirement denials for BMR ownership units should be given consideration..	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)	Recommendation Implemented	We have standardized criteria used for BMR rental denials and implemented that criteria across all projects. In addition, we are currently evaluating downpayment requirements and may consider making changes in the BMR Procedures Manual. The Manual is currently being revised to also include changes required by the updated Inclusionary Housing Ordinance which became law August 2017 and the Density Bonus Law which became law July 2017.

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	11. The Jury recommends that the Planning Department and the Department of Building Inspection make internal process changes to improve the accuracy of data tagged as a new Affordable Housing project under the Inclusionary Housing Program.	Planning Department	**	
2013-14	The Mayor's Office of Housing: Under Pressure and Challenged to Preserve Diversity	11. The Jury recommends that the Planning Department and the Department of Building Inspection make internal process changes to improve the accuracy of data tagged as a new Affordable Housing project under the Inclusionary Housing Program.	Dept. Building Inspection	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Recommendation Implemented/will be implemented in early September, 2018 Per the 2016 Action Plan, DBI staff, working closely with Department of Technology Staff, did complete clearly defined business rules and workflow processes through a rigorous requirements' process. The requirements were completed by the end of 2016 and given to the vendor, Accela, for ongoing implementation. The new Go Live Launch date for the new Permit and Project Tracking System is September 5, 2018.
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	R1a: The City's policy for limited-time temporary disability payments should be followed for the Sheriff's Department, thereby eventually moving any work injury claim to permanent disability status and financial closure of those claims, opening positions for new hires.	Sheriff's Department	**	
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	R1b: The Board of Supervisors should request an audit conducted by the Budget and Legislative Analyst of payments made on behalf of the Sheriff's Department for workers compensation claims and related overtime costs.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	R1c: The Sheriff's Department should review its safety programs with the Workforce Development Division, analyze the cause of worker injuries, and update safety education programs for both staff and inmates.	Sheriff's Department	**	
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	R1c: The Sheriff's Department should review its safety programs with the Workforce Development Division, analyze the cause of worker injuries, and update safety education programs for both staff and inmates.	Department of Human Resources	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Injury data is produced quarterly for the top 10 departments, which includes the Sheriff's Department, along with costs and expenses reporting. A Safety Analyst, hired at the WC Division in June, 2017, is working to develop the reporting template for the injury trend analyses using the reporter tools from the electronic claims management system in conjunction with the software vendor. Trend reports should be automatically produced from the claims system by 7/1/2018.

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	R1d: Communication between the Sheriff's Department and the appropriate City personnel in the Worker's Compensation Division who adjust workers' compensation claims should occur on a regular basis to review ongoing status of all outstanding claims.	Sheriff's Department	**	
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	R1d: Communication between the Sheriff's Department and the appropriate City personnel in the Worker's Compensation Division who adjust workers' compensation claims should occur on a regular basis to review ongoing status of all outstanding claims.	Department of Human Resources	**	
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	2.a The Sheriff's Department should review and update all policies and procedures for conducting daily activities, and planning and preparing for emergencies every 2 years.	Sheriff's Department	**	
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	2.b Inmates admitted to general wards at San Francisco General Hospital must be guarded. Procedures for both nighttime and daytime staffing should be immediately reviewed and all policy and procedure documents updated.	Sheriff's Department	**	
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	2.b Inmates admitted to general wards at San Francisco General Hospital must be guarded. Procedures for both nighttime and daytime staffing should be immediately reviewed and all policy and procedure documents updated.	Department of Public Health	**	
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	2.c Inmates are transferred between SFPD stations and when necessary, to San Francisco General Hospital. Procedures for any transfers should be clarified and established as a Policy & Procedure document.	Sheriff's Department	**	
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	2.c Inmates are transferred between SFPD stations and when necessary, to San Francisco General Hospital. Procedures for any transfers should be clarified and established as a Policy & Procedure document.	San Francisco Police Department	**	
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	2.c Inmates are transferred between SFPD stations and when necessary, to San Francisco General Hospital. Procedures for any transfers should be clarified and established as a Policy & Procedure document.	Department of Public Health	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	2.d During transfers, inmates may be intoxicated or needing minor medical care. Procedures for handling this situation should be clarified with the Department of Health to establish a policy and procedure document.	Sheriff's Department	**	
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	2.d During transfers, inmates may be intoxicated or needing minor medical care. Procedures for handling this situation should be clarified with the Department of Health to establish a policy and procedure document.	Department of Public Health	**	
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	3.a The Sheriff's Department should review and revise its written Orientation Guide for incoming inmates regarding safety, behavior standards, and daily routines.	Sheriff's Department	**	
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	3.b Appropriate reading level should be ascertained and applied to the guidelines in Recommendation 3a.	Sheriff's Department	**	
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	4.a An Advisory Committee of educators and industry professionals should be organized to advise each Five Keys program on further development of goals and practices to expand student attendance, academic studies, and job preparation.	Sheriff's Department	**	
2013-14	Inquiry into the Operation and Programs of the San Francisco Jails	4.b Further outreach into the community should be accomplished to incorporate more and varied job opportunities for graduates of Five Keys after their release.	Sheriff's Department	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	1. The Port Commission should be restructured to reflect more public interest. The Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors seek necessary changes in state law to allow a charter amendment to be submitted to the public for revision of the current five-member Port Commission appointed by the Mayor to a Port Commission with three mayoral appointees and two by the Board of Supervisors. We recommend that this change be put before the voters in 2015.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	1. The Port Commission should be restructured to reflect more public interest. The Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors seek necessary changes in state law to allow a charter amendment to be submitted to the public for revision of the current five-member Port Commission appointed by the Mayor to a Port Commission with three mayoral appointees and two by the Board of Supervisors. We recommend that this change be put before the voters in 2015.	Mayor (not required to respond; submitted response)	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	2a. Costs and benefits to repair and maintain these piers should be evaluated and weighed against the cost and benefits of not doing so. It may be possible that the sacrifice of some piers will reduce maintenance costs, thereby freeing monies for repair of more significant structures and create more open space.	Port of San Francisco	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	2b. Other sources of revenue should be expanded. Maritime and industrial use in the Southern Waterfront has great potential. The Port is actively pursuing growth in this area and should continue to improve infrastructure and search for new tenants.	Port of San Francisco	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	3. Proposed variances from the Plan should receive increased public scrutiny prior to the issuance of an RFP.	Port of San Francisco	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	3. Proposed variances from the Plan should receive increased public scrutiny prior to the issuance of an RFP.	Planning Department	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	4a. The Port should immediately begin an assessment and update of the Waterfront Land Use Plan, to be renamed the Waterfront Maritime and Land Use Plan to meet current and future requirements for Port development. This should be completed and adopted in a relatively short time span of one to two years.	Port of San Francisco	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	4b. The Port should ensure that changes or variances to the existing Waterfront Land Use Plan or the City's General Plan should have extensive public input before implementation.	Port of San Francisco	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	4b. The Port should ensure that changes or variances to the existing Waterfront Land Use Plan or the City's General Plan should have extensive public input before implementation.	Planning Department	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	4b. The Port should ensure that changes or variances to the existing Waterfront Land Use Plan or the City's General Plan should have extensive public input before implementation.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	5. SFMTA should incorporate current and future transit needs, taking into consideration not only increased capacity requirements from individual projects, but the cumulative effect of multiple projects added to existing passenger loads. SFMTA must address reliability and increased capacity that will be required for all modes of transportation, especially the T-Line and motor coach lines connecting to the Pier 70 site. The VETAG system should be maintained to operate at maximum efficiency.	Port of San Francisco	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	5. SFMTA should incorporate current and future transit needs, taking into consideration not only increased capacity requirements from individual projects, but the cumulative effect of multiple projects added to existing passenger loads. SFMTA must address reliability and increased capacity that will be required for all modes of transportation, especially the T-Line and motor coach lines connecting to the Pier 70 site. The VETAG system should be maintained to operate at maximum efficiency.	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	6. The City should immediately begin lobbying for modifications to the Passenger Vessel Services Act of 1886 to allow foreignflagged vessels easier access to the City as a pilot program. This lobbying effort should be in conjunction with other U.S. passenger port destinations including those in Alaska, Hawaii, Oregon, and Washington.	Port of San Francisco	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	6. The City should immediately begin lobbying for modifications to the Passenger Vessel Services Act of 1886 to allow foreignflagged vessels easier access to the City as a pilot program. This lobbying effort should be in conjunction with other U.S. passenger port destinations including those in Alaska, Hawaii, Oregon, and Washington.	Mayor	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	6. The City should immediately begin lobbying for modifications to the Passenger Vessel Services Act of 1886 to allow foreignflagged vessels easier access to the City as a pilot program. This lobbying effort should be in conjunction with other U.S. passenger port destinations including those in Alaska, Hawaii, Oregon, and Washington.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	7. The Port should consider alternatives to fund the cost of rehabilitating Piers 30-32. The sale of Seawall Lot 330 could supply a large portion of \$68 M needed to strengthen the substructure for light use. The Jury recommends that the Port actively investigate alternative light uses for Piers 30-32. In addition to general park usage, sports fields for soccer, tennis, basketball, or other sports could be provided. Temporary venues for entertainment companies such as Teatro ZinZanni, Cirque de Soleil, and Cavalia would also not require an extensive substructure. Although not light use, the Port might also consider placement of a major marine research institute to fully utilize the unique characteristics of this site.	Port of San Francisco	Requires Further Analysis	A Port Commission informational presentation on June 14, 2016 included a staff report and analysis of engineering, land use, regulatory and financial requirements for Piers 30-32 (http://sfport.com/sites/default/files/Commission/Documents/Commission%20Meeting%20Staff%20Reports/2016%20Commission%20Meeting%20Items/JUN14/Item%2012A%20Piers%2030-32%20CCfinal.pdf). The facility condition dictates the need for extensive and costly construction to support development, and complicated regulatory and public trust challenges. This would likely limit interest to developers with a vision for this location that matters more than cost, and patience will be required to obtain public support and to navigate the very challenging regulatory process for this unique site. The Waterfront Plan Update process is expected to conclude in second quarter of 2018, which will include public discussion of the information in this staff report, and further comments and ideas about improvement options for Piers 30-32.

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	8a. All major events at the Port, like the America's Cup, must be approved by the Port Commission and the Board of Supervisors.	Port of San Francisco	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	8a. All major events at the Port, like the America's Cup, must be approved by the Port Commission and the Board of Supervisors.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	8a. All major events at the Port, like the America's Cup, must be approved by the Port Commission and the Board of Supervisors.	Mayor	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	8b. Prior to approval, the City should require a validated cost proposal using fair market rental rates, revenue sharing with the Port, marquee billing for the City, full post-event accounting, and posting of all event financials on the Port website within one month after completion of the event. Said report shall include an itemization of: o The amount and source of all revenue generated by the event. o The amount, payor, and payee of each cost incurred for the event. o The name of each event cancelled, if any, as a result of the approval of the event and the amount of revenue lost as a result of the cancellation.	Port of San Francisco	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	8b. Prior to approval, the City should require a validated cost proposal using fair market rental rates, revenue sharing with the Port, marquee billing for the City, full post-event accounting, and posting of all event financials on the Port website within one month after completion of the event. Said report shall include an itemization of: o The amount and source of all revenue generated by the event. o The amount, payor, and payee of each cost incurred for the event. o The name of each event cancelled, if any, as a result of the approval of the event and the amount of revenue lost as a result of the cancellation.	Board of Supervisors	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	8b. Prior to approval, the City should require a validated cost proposal using fair market rental rates, revenue sharing with the Port, marquee billing for the City, full post-event accounting, and posting of all event financials on the Port website within one month after completion of the event. Said report shall include an itemization of: o The amount and source of all revenue generated by the event. o The amount, payor, and payee of each cost incurred for the event. o The name of each event cancelled, if any, as a result of the approval of the event and the amount of revenue lost as a result of the cancellation.	Mayor	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	9a. The Port should ensure ongoing community input be maintained until an acceptable compromise is reached on the final plans.	Port of San Francisco	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	9a. The Port should ensure ongoing community input be maintained until an acceptable compromise is reached on the final plans.	Planning Department	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	9a. The Port should ensure ongoing community input be maintained until an acceptable compromise is reached on the final plans.	Department of Public Works	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	9a. The Port should ensure ongoing community input be maintained until an acceptable compromise is reached on the final plans.	Recreation and Parks Department	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	9b. The Jury neither supports nor opposes the development of Pier 70 but we strongly endorse the extensive public outreach and community input as part of the design and development process of the Pier 70 Master Plan. We recommend that the Port follow this model as a template for all major developments on Port lands.	Port of San Francisco	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	9b. The Jury neither supports nor opposes the development of Pier 70 but we strongly endorse the extensive public outreach and community input as part of the design and development process of the Pier 70 Master Plan. We recommend that the Port follow this model as a template for all major developments on Port lands.	Planning Department	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	9b. The Jury neither supports nor opposes the development of Pier 70 but we strongly endorse the extensive public outreach and community input as part of the design and development process of the Pier 70 Master Plan. We recommend that the Port follow this model as a template for all major developments on Port lands.	Department of Public Works	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	9b. The Jury neither supports nor opposes the development of Pier 70 but we strongly endorse the extensive public outreach and community input as part of the design and development process of the Pier 70 Master Plan. We recommend that the Port follow this model as a template for all major developments on Port lands.	Recreation and Parks Department	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	10. The Jury recommends increased publicity and outreach so that an acceptable compromise can be reached on the scope of this development.	Port of San Francisco	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	10. The Jury recommends increased publicity and outreach so that an acceptable compromise can be reached on the scope of this development.	Planning Department	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	11. The Jury recommends that the Port Commission work with the Board of Supervisors to place a referendum before the voters that asks for approval to issue IFD Bonds. Such a referendum should specifically state the total amount of bonded indebtedness that the Port seeks to incur through IFD Bonds, the specific sources of funds for IFD Bond repayment, and the length of time required to discharge any IFD Bond debt.	Port of San Francisco	**	
2013-14	The Port of San Francisco: Caught Between Public Trust and Private Dollars	11. The Jury recommends that the Port Commission work with the Board of Supervisors to place a referendum before the voters that asks for approval to issue IFD Bonds. Such a referendum should specifically state the total amount of bonded indebtedness that the Port seeks to incur through IFD Bonds, the specific sources of funds for IFD Bond repayment, and the length of time required to discharge any IFD Bond debt.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1a. The City should prepare and adopt a risk assessment in preparation for developing its comprehensive plan regarding the rising sea level issue	Mayor or Mayor's Designated Agency	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1a. The City should prepare and adopt a risk assessment in preparation for developing its comprehensive plan regarding the rising sea level issue	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1a. The City should prepare and adopt a risk assessment in preparation for developing its comprehensive plan regarding the rising sea level issue	Department of Public Works	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1a. The City should prepare and adopt a risk assessment in preparation for developing its comprehensive plan regarding the rising sea level issue	Dept. of Environment	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1a. The City should prepare and adopt a risk assessment in preparation for developing its comprehensive plan regarding the rising sea level issue	Dept. of Emergency Management	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1a. The City should prepare and adopt a risk assessment in preparation for developing its comprehensive plan regarding the rising sea level issue	Planning Department	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1a. The City should prepare and adopt a risk assessment in preparation for developing its comprehensive plan regarding the rising sea level issue	Port of San Francisco	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1a. The City should prepare and adopt a risk assessment in preparation for developing its comprehensive plan regarding the rising sea level issue	Public Utilities Commission	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1b. The City should adopt a citywide comprehensive plan for adaptation to rising sea levels, especially along its shores and its floodplains. Said plan should include the provision that construction projects' approval should take into account the anticipated lifespan of each project and the risks faced as outlined in said plan. Special consideration should be given to those anticipated to survive for more than 30 years. Said plan should include a provision that the plan be reviewed and reassessed every 5 years.	Mayor or Mayor's Designated Agency	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1b. The City should adopt a citywide comprehensive plan for adaptation to rising sea levels, especially along its shores and its floodplains. Said plan should include the provision that construction projects' approval should take into account the anticipated lifespan of each project and the risks faced as outlined in said plan. Special consideration should be given to those anticipated to survive for more than 30 years. Said plan should include a provision that the plan be reviewed and reassessed every 5 years.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1b. The City should adopt a citywide comprehensive plan for adaptation to rising sea levels, especially along its shores and its floodplains. Said plan should include the provision that construction projects' approval should take into account the anticipated lifespan of each project and the risks faced as outlined in said plan. Special consideration should be given to those anticipated to survive for more than 30 years. Said plan should include a provision that the plan be reviewed and reassessed every 5 years.	Department of Public Works	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1b. The City should adopt a citywide comprehensive plan for adaptation to rising sea levels, especially along its shores and its floodplains. Said plan should include the provision that construction projects' approval should take into account the anticipated lifespan of each project and the risks faced as outlined in said plan. Special consideration should be given to those anticipated to survive for more than 30 years. Said plan should include a provision that the plan be reviewed and reassessed every 5 years.	Dept. of Environment	Will be Implemented in the Future	We are an active participating member of the Sea Level Rise Committee. The plan is due in 2019.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1b. The City should adopt a citywide comprehensive plan for adaptation to rising sea levels, especially along its shores and its floodplains. Said plan should include the provision that construction projects' approval should take into account the anticipated lifespan of each project and the risks faced as outlined in said plan. Special consideration should be given to those anticipated to survive for more than 30 years. Said plan should include a provision that the plan be reviewed and reassessed every 5 years.	Dept. of Emergency Management	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1b. The City should adopt a citywide comprehensive plan for adaptation to rising sea levels, especially along its shores and its floodplains. Said plan should include the provision that construction projects' approval should take into account the anticipated lifespan of each project and the risks faced as outlined in said plan. Special consideration should be given to those anticipated to survive for more than 30 years. Said plan should include a provision that the plan be reviewed and reassessed every 5 years.	Planning Department	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Mayor's Sea Level Rise Coordinating Committee, and co-chaired by San Francisco Planning and Port, is implementing the city's Sea Level Rise Action Plan. This year's work has primarily focused on assessing the vulnerability of public and private assets across San Francisco through a multi-department effort. Sea Level Rise Action Plan implementation will continue through 2020.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1b. The City should adopt a citywide comprehensive plan for adaptation to rising sea levels, especially along its shores and its floodplains. Said plan should include the provision that construction projects' approval should take into account the anticipated lifespan of each project and the risks faced as outlined in said plan. Special consideration should be given to those anticipated to survive for more than 30 years. Said plan should include a provision that the plan be reviewed and reassessed every 5 years.	Port of San Francisco	Will Be Implemented in the Future	In March of 2016, Mayor Lee released the Sea Level Rise Action Plan (SLRAP), a call to action for City departments and stakeholders to work together to make San Francisco a more resilient city in the face of rising sea levels. The implementation plan is led by the Mayor's Sea Level Rise Coordinating Committee (SLRCC), and which is now co-chaired by San Francisco Planning and the Port. The SLRCC is comprised of 12 departments including Public Works and the PUC, in addition to Planning and the Port. These departments own property and/or facilities that are at risk to rising sea levels. The SLRCC developed a work program for 2016, 2017, 2018 to create a property inventory, vulnerability and risk assessment. The final task will be an adaptation plan based on the vulnerability and risk assessments. The inventory is complete and the vulnerability assessment will be done by the end of the first quarter of 2018. The risk assessment should begin in the 3rd quarter of the year with the adaptation to follow.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1b. The City should adopt a citywide comprehensive plan for adaptation to rising sea levels, especially along its shores and its floodplains. Said plan should include the provision that construction projects' approval should take into account the anticipated lifespan of each project and the risks faced as outlined in said plan. Special consideration should be given to those anticipated to survive for more than 30 years. Said plan should include a provision that the plan be reviewed and reassessed every 5 years.	Public Utilities Commission	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1c. The City should build infrastructure systems that are resilient and adaptable to rising sea levels. That the City, through its planning and building departments, require that any construction project vulnerable to future shoreline or floodplain flooding be designed to be resilient to sea level rise at the 2050 projection, e.g., 16 inches if the construction is not expected to last longer than 2050. For construction intended to last longer than 2050, that the City require that the project be designed to address sea level rise projections for the longer term.	Mayor or Mayor's Designated Agency	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1c. The City should build infrastructure systems that are resilient and adaptable to rising sea levels. That the City, through its planning and building departments, require that any construction project vulnerable to future shoreline or floodplain flooding be designed to be resilient to sea level rise at the 2050 projection, e.g., 16 inches if the construction is not expected to last longer than 2050. For construction intended to last longer than 2050, that the City require that the project be designed to address sea level rise projections for the longer term.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1c. The City should build infrastructure systems that are resilient and adaptable to rising sea levels. That the City, through its planning and building departments, require that any construction project vulnerable to future shoreline or floodplain flooding be designed to be resilient to sea level rise at the 2050 projection, e.g., 16 inches if the construction is not expected to last longer than 2050. For construction intended to last longer than 2050, that the City require that the project be designed to address sea level rise projections for the longer term.	Department of Public Works	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1c. The City should build infrastructure systems that are resilient and adaptable to rising sea levels. That the City, through its planning and building departments, require that any construction project vulnerable to future shoreline or floodplain flooding be designed to be resilient to sea level rise at the 2050 projection, e.g., 16 inches if the construction is not expected to last longer than 2050. For construction intended to last longer than 2050, that the City require that the project be designed to address sea level rise projections for the longer term.	Dept. of Environment	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1c. The City should build infrastructure systems that are resilient and adaptable to rising sea levels. That the City, through its planning and building departments, require that any construction project vulnerable to future shoreline or floodplain flooding be designed to be resilient to sea level rise at the 2050 projection, e.g., 16 inches if the construction is not expected to last longer than 2050. For construction intended to last longer than 2050, that the City require that the project be designed to address sea level rise projections for the longer term.	Dept. of Emergency Management	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1c. The City should build infrastructure systems that are resilient and adaptable to rising sea levels. That the City, through its planning and building departments, require that any construction project vulnerable to future shoreline or floodplain flooding be designed to be resilient to sea level rise at the 2050 projection, e.g., 16 inches if the construction is not expected to last longer than 2050. For construction intended to last longer than 2050, that the City require that the project be designed to address sea level rise projections for the longer term.	Planning Department	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1c. The City should build infrastructure systems that are resilient and adaptable to rising sea levels. That the City, through its planning and building departments, require that any construction project vulnerable to future shoreline or floodplain flooding be designed to be resilient to sea level rise at the 2050 projection, e.g., 16 inches if the construction is not expected to last longer than 2050. For construction intended to last longer than 2050, that the City require that the project be designed to address sea level rise projections for the longer term.	Port of San Francisco	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1c. The City should build infrastructure systems that are resilient and adaptable to rising sea levels. That the City, through its planning and building departments, require that any construction project vulnerable to future shoreline or floodplain flooding be designed to be resilient to sea level rise at the 2050 projection, e.g., 16 inches if the construction is not expected to last longer than 2050. For construction intended to last longer than 2050, that the City require that the project be designed to address sea level rise projections for the longer term.	Public Utilities Commission	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1d. That City departments that would necessarily be involved in adaptation to rising sea levels, such as Department of Public Works, Public Utilities Commission, Municipal Transportation Agency, the Port, coordinate their projects with each other and with utility companies, such as PG&E, Comcast, and AT&T, to minimize inconvenience to the public, and to businesses, and to further avoid repetition of efforts and inefficient use of funds, labor, and time.	Mayor or Mayor's Designated Agency	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1d. That City departments that would necessarily be involved in adaptation to rising sea levels, such as Department of Public Works, Public Utilities Commission, Municipal Transportation Agency, the Port, coordinate their projects with each other and with utility companies, such as PG&E, Comcast, and AT&T, to minimize inconvenience to the public, and to businesses, and to further avoid repetition of efforts and inefficient use of funds, labor, and time.	Board of Supervisors	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1d. That City departments that would necessarily be involved in adaptation to rising sea levels, such as Department of Public Works, Public Utilities Commission, Municipal Transportation Agency, the Port, coordinate their projects with each other and with utility companies, such as PG&E, Comcast, and AT&T, to minimize inconvenience to the public, and to businesses, and to further avoid repetition of efforts and inefficient use of funds, labor, and time.	Department of Public Works	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1d. That City departments that would necessarily be involved in adaptation to rising sea levels, such as Department of Public Works, Public Utilities Commission, Municipal Transportation Agency, the Port, coordinate their projects with each other and with utility companies, such as PG&E, Comcast, and AT&T, to minimize inconvenience to the public, and to businesses, and to further avoid repetition of efforts and inefficient use of funds, labor, and time.	Dept. of Environment	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1d. That City departments that would necessarily be involved in adaptation to rising sea levels, such as Department of Public Works, Public Utilities Commission, Municipal Transportation Agency, the Port, coordinate their projects with each other and with utility companies, such as PG&E, Comcast, and AT&T, to minimize inconvenience to the public, and to businesses, and to further avoid repetition of efforts and inefficient use of funds, labor, and time.	Dept. of Emergency Management	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1d. That City departments that would necessarily be involved in adaptation to rising sea levels, such as Department of Public Works, Public Utilities Commission, Municipal Transportation Agency, the Port, coordinate their projects with each other and with utility companies, such as PG&E, Comcast, and AT&T, to minimize inconvenience to the public, and to businesses, and to further avoid repetition of efforts and inefficient use of funds, labor, and time.	Planning Department	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1d. That City departments that would necessarily be involved in adaptation to rising sea levels, such as Department of Public Works, Public Utilities Commission, Municipal Transportation Agency, the Port, coordinate their projects with each other and with utility companies, such as PG&E, Comcast, and AT&T, to minimize inconvenience to the public, and to businesses, and to further avoid repetition of efforts and inefficient use of funds, labor, and time.	Port of San Francisco	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	1d. That City departments that would necessarily be involved in adaptation to rising sea levels, such as Department of Public Works, Public Utilities Commission, Municipal Transportation Agency, the Port, coordinate their projects with each other and with utility companies, such as PG&E, Comcast, and AT&T, to minimize inconvenience to the public, and to businesses, and to further avoid repetition of efforts and inefficient use of funds, labor, and time.	Public Utilities Commission	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	2a. The Planning Code should be amended to include maps showing the areas in the City that are most at risk from the impacts of sea level rise. The Planning Code should be amended to prohibit development in said at-risk areas unless there is compliance with the provisions of the City's Building Code and the Port's Building Code (if applicable to the project) outlined in Recommendations 3a and 3b. The Planning Code should include a provision that the amended sections of the Code regarding the impact of rising sea levels be reviewed and reassessed every 5 years.	Board of Supervisors	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	2a. The Planning Code should be amended to include maps showing the areas in the City that are most at risk from the impacts of sea level rise. The Planning Code should be amended to prohibit development in said at-risk areas unless there is compliance with the provisions of the City's Building Code and the Port's Building Code (if applicable to the project) outlined in Recommendations 3a and 3b. The Planning Code should include a provision that the amended sections of the Code regarding the impact of rising sea levels be reviewed and reassessed every 5 years.	Planning Department	Requires Further Analysis	The SFPUC and Port have published detailed maps depicting areas along San Francisco's bay and ocean shorelines that are potentially vulnerable to future flooding due to projected sea level rise through 2100. The Planning Department considers these maps in evaluating potential flood hazards for projects located in areas vulnerable to sea level rise under CEQA. In addition, the Federal Emergency Management Service is currently preparing a pilot study analyzing future coastal flood risks that account for sea-level rise as par of the California Coastal Analysis and Mapping Project Open Pacific Coast Study. The Planning Department will consider this study in evaluating sea level rise hazards for projects located in affected areas. Thus, maps of areas that are vulnerable to impacts from sea level rise have already been developed; amendments to the Planning Code to include such maps or to enforce flood resilient building standards for development in the affected areas may not be warranted. However, the City is currently evaluating whether to develop new policies addressing sea level rise under implementation of the SLRAP. Such policies may include amendment to the Planning Code. As such, the recommended planning code amendments require further analysis.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	2b. The Planning Code should be amended to discourage permanent development in at risk areas where public safety cannot be protected.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	2b. The Planning Code should be amended to discourage permanent development in at risk areas where public safety cannot be protected.	Planning Department	Requires Further Analysis	As stated above, the City is currently evaluating whether to develop new policies to address sea level rise. Such policies may include amendment to the Planning Code. As such, the recommended planning code amendments require further analysis.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	3. The City's Building Code and the Port's Building Code should be amended to include: (1) provisions addressing the impacts associated with sea level rise, especially when combined with storm surges and king tides; (2) construction methods that would ensure a project's resistance to and protection from the impacts of rising sea levels, especially when combined with sudden storm surges and king tides; (3) amendments written to protect the most vulnerable systems, including but not necessarily limited to, electrical, telecommunications, and fire protection systems; (4) provisions relating to rising sea levels be reviewed and reassessed every five years.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	3. The City's Building Code and the Port's Building Code should be amended to include: (1) provisions addressing the impacts associated with sea level rise, especially when combined with storm surges and king tides; (2) construction methods that would ensure a project's resistance to and protection from the impacts of rising sea levels, especially when combined with sudden storm surges and king tides; (3) amendments written to protect the most vulnerable systems, including but not necessarily limited to, electrical, telecommunications, and fire protection systems; (4) provisions relating to rising sea levels be reviewed and reassessed every five years.	Dept. Building Inspection	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	3. The City's Building Code and the Port's Building Code should be amended to include: (1) provisions addressing the impacts associated with sea level rise, especially when combined with storm surges and king tides; (2) construction methods that would ensure a project's resistance to and protection from the impacts of rising sea levels, especially when combined with sudden storm surges and king tides; (3) amendments written to protect the most vulnerable systems, including but not necessarily limited to, electrical, telecommunications, and fire protection systems; (4) provisions relating to rising sea levels be reviewed and reassessed every five years.	Planning Department	Requires Further Analysis	City departments are working with one another and with regional and state agencies to evaluate and develop consistent guidance and policies to address sea level rise. This includes researching adaptation and resiliency measures implemented by other municipalities, including building and planning code changes, and considering incorporating similar changes to the City's codes. The sea level rise projections will continue to evolve as new science and prediction methods become available. Therefore, any new building code provisions will require specific, prescriptive changes that account for flexibility. Further analysis and coordination between scientific community and affected agencies will be performed to develop consistent, effective, and practical policies, including possibly building or planning code changes, to address sea level rise.

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	3. The City's Building Code and the Port's Building Code should be amended to include: (1) provisions addressing the impacts associated with sea level rise, especially when combined with storm surges and king tides; (2) construction methods that would ensure a project's resistance to and protection from the impacts of rising sea levels, especially when combined with sudden storm surges and king tides; (3) amendments written to protect the most vulnerable systems, including but not necessarily limited to, electrical, telecommunications, and fire protection systems; (4) provisions relating to rising sea levels be reviewed and reassessed every five years.	Port of San Francisco	Requires Further Analysis	City departments continue to work with one another and with regional and state agencies to evaluate and develop consistent guidance and policies to address sea level rise. This includes researching adaptation and resiliency measures implemented by other municipalities, including building and planning code changes, and considering incorporating similar changes to the City's codes. The sea level rise projections will continue to evolve as new science and prediction methods become available. Therefore, any new building code provisions will require specific, prescriptive changes that account for flexibility. Further analysis and coordination between scientific community and affected agencies will be performed to develop consistent, effective, and practical policies, including possibly building or planning code changes, to address sea level rise. One action taken to coordinate efforts across city departments included a citywide training of the City's "Guidance for Incorporating Sea Level Rise into Capital Planning." The Guidance requires that projects over \$5 million that are identified in the Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Zone to complete a check-list to address exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity due to sea level rise. Projects meeting the requirement were required to submit a checklist to the City Engineer. Another city wide action includes executing on the Sea Level Rise Action Plan prepared in 2016. The City is currently conducting a comprehensive Vulnerability Assessment to identify assets including city infrastructure, private land uses, and community services that are at risk from sea level rise.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	4. The City should consult with BCDC at the onset of development plans within BCDC's jurisdiction to ensure equitable and efficient results without necessitating surplus expenditures and time.	Mayor	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	4. The City should consult with BCDC at the onset of development plans within BCDC's jurisdiction to ensure equitable and efficient results without necessitating surplus expenditures and time.	Planning Department	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	4. The City should consult with BCDC at the onset of development plans within BCDC's jurisdiction to ensure equitable and efficient results without necessitating surplus expenditures and time.	Port of San Francisco	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	5. The City should consider implementation of recommendations that are most pertinent to the City, as set forth in the Ocean Beach Master Plan of May 2012.	Mayor or Mayor's Designated Agency	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	5. The City should consider implementation of recommendations that are most pertinent to the City, as set forth in the Ocean Beach Master Plan of May 2012.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	6. The Public Utilities Commission should build larger sewer pumps, sewer pipes, and sewer transport storage boxes surrounding the city in the near future to accommodate king tides, sudden surges, and sea level rise.	Public Utilities Commission	Recommendation Implemented	Sea Level Rise Guidance was originally adopted by the Capital Planning Committee on September 22, 2014; revisions and a supplement were adopted on December 14, 2015. The instructions were created to establish and apply a consistent and comprehensive review, planning and implementation process to carry out the "Guidance for Incorporating Sea Level Rise (SLR) into Capital Planning in San Francisco". The SFPUC is adhering to these guidelines as projects are developed and designed.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	7. As an interim measure, the City should retrofit outfalls in the wastewater treatment system with backflow prevention devices to prevent salt water intrusion into the collection systems resulting from high tides, sudden surges, and rising sea level. Local pump stations should also be installed to raise the flow to sewer discharge structures with higher elevations.	Public Utilities Commission	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The SFPUC is completing an analysis of the overall Collection System to determine condition of the Combined Sewage Discharge outfalls and timing of when backflow prevention devices need to be installed. The analysis utilizes San Francisco's Guidance for Incorporating Sea Level Rise.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	8. The Southeast Wastewater Treatment Plant should be retrofitted to accommodate future king tides, sudden surges, and sea level rise.	Public Utilities Commission	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Over the next 20 years, through proposed projects associated with the SSIP, the SFPUC plans to implement over \$2.5 billion related to improvements to the Southeast Wastewater Treatment Plant. These projects are all informed by the San Francisco's Guidance for Incorporating Sea Level Rise which includes King Tides and surges.

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	9a. SFO should increase the height of its existing seawalls along its runways to accommodate rising sea levels.	SFO	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The SFO Shoreline Protection Program - Conceptual Design Development Report completed (Telamon/AECOM, November 2017). The CEQA EIR process will begin January 2018 and will be completed by December 2019. Concurrently, the environmental permitting process will begin June 2018 and will be completed June 2019..
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	9b. SFO should continue to improve measures to eliminate standing water on its runways to ensure they remain sufficiently above sea level.	SFO	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	9c. The northern section of SFO should be analyzed by airport engineers to determine how best to protect its wastewater treatment plant and other infrastructure in that section from sea level rise.	SFO	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	10a. The Port should begin planning and creating a timeline for construction of flood control barriers in the low spots along the edges of the piers to prevent waterfront flooding associated with sea level rise.	Port of San Francisco	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	10b. To assist with the cost of protective measures to address sea level rise, the Port Commission should establish a reserve fund as part of its leasing policy whereby a surcharge is assessed as part of the rent or as a separate line item in each lease.	Port of San Francisco	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11a. The City should start a reserve fund for adaptation for rising sea levels, a portion of which could be obtained from a surcharge on development planned for areas vulnerable to said eventuality.	Mayor	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11a. The City should start a reserve fund for adaptation for rising sea levels, a portion of which could be obtained from a surcharge on development planned for areas vulnerable to said eventuality.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11a. The City should start a reserve fund for adaptation for rising sea levels, a portion of which could be obtained from a surcharge on development planned for areas vulnerable to said eventuality.	City Administrator	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11a. The City should start a reserve fund for adaptation for rising sea levels, a portion of which could be obtained from a surcharge on development planned for areas vulnerable to said eventuality.	Controller	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11b. The City should assess costs of both implementation of adaptation strategies and potential losses from failing to do so.	Mayor	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11b. The City should assess costs of both implementation of adaptation strategies and potential losses from failing to do so.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11b. The City should assess costs of both implementation of adaptation strategies and potential losses from failing to do so.	City Administrator	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11b. The City should assess costs of both implementation of adaptation strategies and potential losses from failing to do so.	Controller	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11c. The City should explore applying for grants offered by Congress' Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program. Receipt of grants is based upon risk assessments that indicate that potential savings exceed the cost of implementation. The City should explore available matching funds from the Army Corps of Engineers and other federal sources.	Mayor	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11c. The City should explore applying for grants offered by Congress' Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program. Receipt of grants is based upon risk assessments that indicate that potential savings exceed the cost of implementation. The City should explore available matching funds from the Army Corps of Engineers and other federal sources.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11c. The City should explore applying for grants offered by Congress' Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program. Receipt of grants is based upon risk assessments that indicate that potential savings exceed the cost of implementation. The City should explore available matching funds from the Army Corps of Engineers and other federal sources.	City Administrator	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11c. The City should explore applying for grants offered by Congress' Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program. Receipt of grants is based upon risk assessments that indicate that potential savings exceed the cost of implementation. The City should explore available matching funds from the Army Corps of Engineers and other federal sources.	Controller	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11d. The City should request an insurance premium estimate from FEMA and then compare that estimate with the funding it could acquire from FEMA for mitigation and adaptation against future flooding.	Mayor	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11d. The City should request an insurance premium estimate from FEMA and then compare that estimate with the funding it could acquire from FEMA for mitigation and adaptation against future flooding.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11d. The City should request an insurance premium estimate from FEMA and then compare that estimate with the funding it could acquire from FEMA for mitigation and adaptation against future flooding.	City Administrator	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	11d. The City should request an insurance premium estimate from FEMA and then compare that estimate with the funding it could acquire from FEMA for mitigation and adaptation against future flooding.	Controller	Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	As noted in the City Administrator's 2016 response, the City is ineligible to purchase flood insurance through the NFIP so this recommendation to get an insurance estimate will not be completed. However, the risk to the City from flooding is being addressed through the Seawall Resiliency Project that was launched in 2015. This project entails immediate life-safety upgrades that may exceed \$500 million and full infrastructure improvements are estimated to cost up to \$5 billion. The City has already invested nearly \$10 million for project planning and San Francisco's proposed 10-year Capital Plan for FY2018-2027 includes a proposed \$350 million GO bond for the Nov 2018 ballot to help protect and strengthen the Seawall. The bond will require 2/3rds voter approval and will not raise tax rates.
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	12a. The City, through its Mayor and Board of Supervisors, should coordinate its efforts with other cities and organizations in the bay area by establishing a regional working group to address the impact of rising sea levels.	Mayor	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	12a. The City, through its Mayor and Board of Supervisors, should coordinate its efforts with other cities and organizations in the bay area by establishing a regional working group to address the impact of rising sea levels.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	12a. The City, through its Mayor and Board of Supervisors, should coordinate its efforts with other cities and organizations in the bay area by establishing a regional working group to address the impact of rising sea levels.	Planning Department	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	12b. The City should create a local working group of community citizens and stakeholders to feed into the regional group.	Mayor	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	12b. The City should create a local working group of community citizens and stakeholders to feed into the regional group.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Rising Sea Levels...At Our Doorstep	12b. The City should create a local working group of community citizens and stakeholders to feed into the regional group.	Planning Department	Will Be Implemented in the Future	We agree that community and stakeholder involvement in the process of adapting to sea level rise is essential. This action is specifically recommended by the SLRAP. City agencies to date have spent the bulk of their time focused on technical issues such as what we know about sea level rise science, the state of the art in planning infrastructure resilience, and other technical subjects. As we get up to speed, we will turn our attention to greater involvement from communities, the private sector, and stakeholders as adaptation planning moving forward. The exact nature of the outreach and involvement has not yet been determined. The Port has created a Waterfront Plan Working Group to guide a public planning process to update the Port's Waterfront Land Use Plan. That Working Group holds public meetings and has received extensive information and presentations on sea level rise and resilience, including the City's Sea Level Rise Action Plan. Comments and recommendations from the Waterfront Plan Update process will contribute to regional collaborations to address sea level rise.
2013-14	Survey of San Francisco Commission Websites	1a. The Mayor's Office on Disability should coordinate with commissions to ensure that statements for accommodation are easily located on commission websites.	Mayor's Office on Disability	**	
2013-14	Survey of San Francisco Commission Websites	1b. When commission websites are developed to include language support, that support should be provided in the same languages used in the voter's guide.	Mayor's Office on Disability	**	
2013-14	Survey of San Francisco Commission Websites	1b. When commission websites are developed to include language support, that support should be provided in the same languages used in the voter's guide.	OCEIA (MOD referred item R1b to Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs as they are responsible for language support.)	**	
2013-14	Survey of San Francisco Commission Websites	2. The Mayor should ensure that each commission posts its annual report on the commission website and provides a URL link to the SFPL, promptly.	Mayor	**	
2013-14	Survey of San Francisco Commission Websites	3. All commissions should keep and post to their website a record of commissioner attendance. Maintenance of an ongoing record should be required.	Mayor	**	
2013-14	Survey of San Francisco Commission Websites	4. The City Attorney should ensure that there is an annual list of active commissions that is accurate, complete and listed alphabetically.	City Attorney	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	1. The Jury recommends a contract with the Fair Political Practices Commission for at least a two-year pilot basis to enforce both state and related San Francisco law violations.	Ethics Commission	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	1. The Jury recommends a contract with the Fair Political Practices Commission for at least a two-year pilot basis to enforce both state and related San Francisco law violations.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	1. The Jury recommends a contract with the Fair Political Practices Commission for at least a two-year pilot basis to enforce both state and related San Francisco law violations.	City Attorney	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	1. The Jury recommends a contract with the Fair Political Practices Commission for at least a two-year pilot basis to enforce both state and related San Francisco law violations.	District Attorney	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	2. The Board of Supervisors should request an independent audit by the City Attorney to determine whether prohibited contributions were forfeited to the City as required by law.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	2. The Board of Supervisors should request an independent audit by the City Attorney to determine whether prohibited contributions were forfeited to the City as required by law.	City Attorney	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	3. The Jury recommends that the Ethics Commission and the Board of Supervisors act to enhance the Citizen's Right of Action to enforce all of the City's ethics laws, with an award of attorney fees and a share of any penalties going to the City for a successful filer, as was provided by Proposition J.	Ethics Commission	--	Agency elected not to respond.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	3. The Jury recommends that the Ethics Commission and the Board of Supervisors act to enhance the Citizen's Right of Action to enforce all of the City's ethics laws, with an award of attorney fees and a share of any penalties going to the City for a successful filer, as was provided by Proposition J.	City Attorney	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	3. The Jury recommends that the Ethics Commission and the Board of Supervisors act to enhance the Citizen's Right of Action to enforce all of the City's ethics laws, with an award of attorney fees and a share of any penalties going to the City for a successful filer, as was provided by Proposition J.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	4. That contract approval forms be converted to a format which allows searches by the name of the official, by the name of the contractor, the value of contracts and the date the contract was signed. Behested payments information should be filed electronically in a format that allows for searches and data aggregation. Form 700s should be formatted to allow data to be searched on income sources, outside employment, gift sources and travel.	Ethics Commission	Recommendation Implemented / Will Be Implemented in the Future	<p>Contract approval filings are available on the City's OpenData portal in a format that allows the public to search data based on various fields, including the name of the official, by the name of the contractor, the value of contracts and the date the contract was signed. See https://data.sfgov.org/City-Management-and-Ethics/Campaign-Finance-SFEC-1-126-Notification-of-Contra/sn2k-q974/data</p> <p>Behested payments reporting by elected officials using a Form 803 is governed by the State Political Reform Act of 1974 as amended and the California Fair Political Practices Commission. The forms are required to be filed with the reporting official's agency, with a copy forwarded to the Ethics Commission within 30 days after the original filing. Given these constraints, the Ethics Commission cannot require electronic filing of Form 803. However, with legislation recommended by the Ethics Commission and transmitted to the Board of Supervisors in November 2017, officials would be required to file behested payments reports with the Ethics Commission in a format to be defined by the Commission. If adopted and funded, this legislation would provide the opportunity for the Commission to develop a reporting format that allows for public searches and data aggregation.</p> <p>The ability to search data disclosed on a Form 700, including income sources, outside employment, gift sources, and travel, is available for statements required to be filed with the Ethics Commission (i.e., for elected officials, members of city boards and commissions, and department heads). In the past year, the Ethics Commission has initiated discussions with the Department of Human Resources to identify requirements and steps necessary to design and implement an expanded electronic filing system for all designated filers. Once that system is developed and implemented, it will be capable of enabling data to be searched for all designated filers, including on income sources, outside employment, gift sources, and travel.</p>

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	4. That contract approval forms be converted to a format which allows searches by the name of the official, by the name of the contractor, the value of contracts and the date the contract was signed. Behested payments information should be filed electronically in a format that allows for searches and data aggregation. Form 700s should be formatted to allow data to be searched on income sources, outside employment, gift sources and travel.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will Be Implemented in the Future / Partially Implemented	<p>Contract approval filings are available on the City's OpenData portal in a format that allows the public to search data based on various fields, including the name of the official, by the name of the contractor, the value of contracts and the date the contract was signed. See https://data.sfgov.org/City-Management-and-Ethics/Campaign-Finance-SFEC-1-126-Notification-of-Contra/sn2k-q974/data</p> <p>Behested payments reporting by elected officials using a Form 803 is governed by the State Political Reform Act of 1974 as amended and the California Fair Political Practices Commission. The forms are required to be filed with the reporting official's agency, with a copy forwarded to the Ethics Commission within 30 days after the original filing. Given these constraints, the Ethics Commission cannot require electronic filing of Form 803. However, with legislation recommended by the Ethics Commission and transmitted to the Board of Supervisors in November 2017, officials would be required to file behested payments reports with the Ethics Commission in a format to be defined by the Commission. If adopted and funded, this legislation would provide the opportunity for the Commission to develop a reporting format that allows for public searches and data aggregation.</p> <p>The ability to search data disclosed on a Form 700, including income sources, outside employment, gift sources, and travel, is available for statements required to be filed with the Ethics Commission (i.e., for elected officials, members of city boards and commissions, and department heads). In the past year, the Ethics Commission has initiated discussions with the Department of Human Resources to identify requirements and steps necessary to design and implement an expanded electronic filing system for all designated filers. Once that system is developed and implemented, it will be capable of enabling data to be searched for all designated filers, including on income sources, outside employment, gift sources, and travel.</p>
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	4. That contract approval forms be converted to a format which allows searches by the name of the official, by the name of the contractor, the value of contracts and the date the contract was signed. Behested payments information should be filed electronically in a format that allows for searches and data aggregation. Form 700s should be formatted to allow data to be searched on income sources, outside employment, gift sources and travel.	Chief Data Officer	Will Be Implemented in the Future / Partially Implemented	<p>The Ethics Commission is responsible for this recommendation. DataSF is available to assist the Ethics Commission when appropriate to publish data to the open data portal. Current status and prior help is detailed below.</p> <p>Contract approval filings are available on the City's OpenData portal in a format that allows the public to search data based on various fields, including the name of the official, by the name of the contractor, the value of contracts and the date the contract was signed. See https://data.sfgov.org/City-Management-and-Ethics/Campaign-Finance-SFEC-1-126-Notification-of-Contra/sn2k-q974/data</p> <p>Behested payments reporting by elected officials using a Form 803 is governed by the State Political Reform Act of 1974 as amended and the California Fair Political Practices Commission. The forms are required to be filed with the reporting official's agency, with a copy forwarded to the Ethics Commission within 30 days after the original filing. Given these constraints, the Ethics Commission cannot require electronic filing of Form 803. However, with legislation recommended by the Ethics Commission and transmitted to the Board of Supervisors in November 2017, officials would be required to file behested payments reports with the Ethics Commission in a format to be defined by the Commission. If adopted and funded, this legislation would provide the opportunity for the Commission to develop a reporting format that allows for public searches and data aggregation.</p> <p>The ability to search data disclosed on a Form 700, including income sources, outside employment, gift sources, and travel, is available for statements required to be filed with the Ethics Commission (i.e., for elected officials, members of city boards and commissions, and department heads). In the past year, the Ethics Commission has initiated discussions with the Department of Human Resources to identify requirements and steps necessary to design and implement an expanded electronic filing system for all designated filers. Once that system is developed and implemented, it will be capable of enabling data to be searched for all designated filers, including on income sources, outside employment, gift sources, and travel.</p>
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	5. The Ethics Commission work to develop a common format database for data posted to DataSF, initially aiming to combine campaign, lobbying and Form 700 data.	Ethics Commission	Recommendation Implemented	Information disclosed on campaign, lobbying, and Form 700 forms filed with the Ethics Commission is now available in a common data format on the City's OpenData system.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	5. The Ethics Commission work to develop a common format database for data posted to DataSF, initially aiming to combine campaign, lobbying and Form 700 data.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Recommendation Implemented	Information disclosed on campaign, lobbying, and Form 700 forms filed with the Ethics Commission is now available in a common data format on the City's OpenData system.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	5. The Ethics Commission work to develop a common format database for data posted to DataSF, initially aiming to combine campaign, lobbying and Form 700 data.	Chief Data Officer	Recommendation Implemented	DataSF provided support to the Ethics Commission to implement this. Information disclosed on campaign, lobbying, and Form 700 forms filed with the Ethics Commission is now available in a common data format on the City's open data system.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	6a. The Ethics Commission should proactively look at ways to track back 501(c) (3) &(4) money to real donors before the start of campaigns where this kind of money will be important; its true source should be identified.	Ethics Commission	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	6b. The Ethics Commission should propose ordinance amendments to require disclaimers in mailings, ads, door hangers and other voter outreach materials funded by committees whose individual donors are not identified to the satisfaction of a reasonable person which state "this is paid for by (insert organization name) funded by anonymous donors in this campaign cycle."	Ethics Commission	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	7. The Ethics Commission should make guides and educational materials available in the major languages as is done in other City Departments.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Recommendation Implemented	<p>The Ethics Commission translated several guides and materials regarding the Commission's programs and services into Chinese, Spanish, and Filipino, to the extent that resources were available in FY 2015-2016. Since then the contents of most of those documents have changed but we have not had the funding to update the translations. The documents that remain current are available on the Commission's website.</p> <p>In addition, the Commission provides in-office language services for those who need assistance, in the following manner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • posts in its public area of the office a list of 21 of the languages for which the City provides telephonic interpretation; • makes available on its public kiosk computer Web-based interpretation services for the languages supported by the LanguageLine service; and • has developed protocols for the Staff to follow if language services are requested. <p>While the Commission sought but did not receive additional funding to expand its language services as part of its FY17 and FY18 budget request, it recognizes the need to further its work in this area (See Item V of the Commission's February 2017 budget submission to the Mayor at https://sfethics.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/2017.02.27-Agenda-Item-8-Attach-1-Budget-Doc-combined.pdf). Expanded document translation services to better engage diverse communities will continue to be an item identified in the Commission's FY19 and FY20 budget requests as areas of unmet need with the ongoing goal of providing expanded services in the future.</p>
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	8. The lobbyist ordinance should be reviewed and amended to provide clearer public disclosure of contacts with City officials regarding the interests of clients, and who should be required to register and make disclosures.	Ethics Commission	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	8. The lobbyist ordinance should be reviewed and amended to provide clearer public disclosure of contacts with City officials regarding the interests of clients, and who should be required to register and make disclosures.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	9. The requirement for disclosure of all expenditures aimed at influencing City Hall decisions should be reinstated in the law with full public disclosure.	Ethics Commission	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	9. The requirement for disclosure of all expenditures aimed at influencing City Hall decisions should be reinstated in the law with full public disclosure.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	10. Work of "strategic advisors" that provide guidance on winning approvals from City officials and/or the public should be reviewed by the Ethics Commission for possible inclusion in the lobbyist registration and/or campaign consultant law.	Ethics Commission	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	11. The Ethics Commission in conjunction with the City Attorney should develop a policy to ensure preservation of e-mails and text messages consistent with preservation of other public records. The policy, along with policies on preservation of public records, should be made available for public comment. Once it is completed and published it should be made available on City Attorney and Ethics Commission web pages that lists each Department, its policy, and how to obtain documents.	City Attorney	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	11. The Ethics Commission in conjunction with the City Attorney should develop a policy to ensure preservation of e-mails and text messages consistent with preservation of other public records. The policy, along with policies on preservation of public records, should be made available for public comment. Once it is completed and published it should be made available on City Attorney and Ethics Commission web pages that lists each Department, its policy, and how to obtain documents.	Ethics Commission	--	Agency elected not to respond.

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	11. The Ethics Commission in conjunction with the City Attorney should develop a policy to ensure preservation of e-mails and text messages consistent with preservation of other public records. The policy, along with policies on preservation of public records, should be made available for public comment. Once it is completed and published it should be made available on City Attorney and Ethics Commission web pages that lists each Department, its policy, and how to obtain documents.	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	--	Agency elected not to respond.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	11. The Ethics Commission in conjunction with the City Attorney should develop a policy to ensure preservation of e-mails and text messages consistent with preservation of other public records. The policy, along with policies on preservation of public records, should be made available for public comment. Once it is completed and published it should be made available on City Attorney and Ethics Commission web pages that lists each Department, its policy, and how to obtain documents.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	12. The Jury recommends that the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force review departmental web sites for compliance and notify non-compliant departments to immediately post their sources of outside funding, or face a show-cause before the Ethics Commission on why the information has not been posted.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Recommendation Implemented	Information disclosed on campaign, lobbying, and Form 700 forms filed with the Ethics Commission is now available in a common data format on the City's OpenData system.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	12. The Jury recommends that the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force review departmental web sites for compliance and notify non-compliant departments to immediately post their sources of outside funding, or face a show-cause before the Ethics Commission on why the information has not been posted.	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	13. All violations of departmental Statements of Incompatible Activities should be disclosed to the Ethics Commission and posted on the Commission's web site.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	13. All violations of departmental Statements of Incompatible Activities should be disclosed to the Ethics Commission and posted on the Commission's web site.	Ethics Commission	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	14a. The Ethics Commission should continue to routinely notify all non-filers of their obligation within 30 days of the state filing deadline.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	14a. The Ethics Commission should continue to routinely notify all non-filers of their obligation within 30 days of the state filing deadline.	Ethics Commission	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	14b. The Ethics Commission should recommend dismissal for any officer or employee who fails to file by the 90 day deadline for referral to the Fair Political Practices Commission.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	<p>Following the creation of its new policy unit in early 2017, the Ethics Commission reviewed several policies related to the filing of officials' Form 700 Economic Interest statements to strengthen accountability in city government by improving the effectiveness of City ethics laws. The Commission has not recommend dismissal for any officer or employee who files a Statement of Economic Interest that is inaccurate and relevant to the position they hold. However, the Commission did recommend steps to strengthen accountability and compliance by city officials with core disclosure requirements as follows:</p> <p>1. A New Disqualification Rule for Board and Commission Members to Better Support Transparent and Impartial Decision Making. The Ethics Commission approved a new law to recommend to the the Board of Supervisors to disqualify members of City boards and commissions from participating in or voting on certain matters if they have not filed their Statement of Economic Interests ("Form 700") as required. As proposed by the Ethics Commission, if a City board or commission member fails to timely file a Form 700, he or she would be disqualified from making decisions on matters that come before that board or commission until the required filing is submitted. The ordinance would require an announcement at the beginning of each meeting regarding any non-filing member's disqualification from making decisions. The Ethics Commission transmitted its recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on October 3, 2017 for its consideration and action. See: https://sfethics.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Non-Voting-Ordinance-Transmittal-Letter-Final.pdf .</p> <p>2. Enhanced Compliance with Ethics and Sunshine Training through New Regulations to Synchronize Training with Annual Form 700 Filing Deadline, At its regular monthly meeting on October 23, 2017, the Ethics Commission adopted a new regulation that will change the operative deadlines for City officials to complete their required Ethics and Sunshine Ordinance training so that they match those officials' Form 700 filing deadlines. The regulations were adopted to support the effectiveness of these training requirements through enhanced compliance with the training requirement, while also making it easier for the public to track applicable deadlines and monitor officials' compliance.</p> <p>California law requires certain public officials and employees to complete training in government ethics rules and to file a Statement of Economic Interest ("Form 700"). City law also requires certain officials to complete training on the Sunshine Ordinance, the City's open government law. Each of these three requirements must be completed under a different set of deadlines. The Commission's new regulation will synchronize the Ethics and Sunshine Ordinance training deadlines with the filing of the Form 700. The regulation will result in officials certifying their completion of Ethics and Sunshine trainings within thirty days of assuming office, and by April 1st of each year.</p>
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	14b. The Ethics Commission should recommend dismissal for any officer or employee who fails to file by the 90 day deadline for referral to the Fair Political Practices Commission.	Ethics Commission	--	Agency elected not to respond.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	14c. The Ethics Commission should recommend dismissal for any officer or employee who files a Statement of Economic Interest that is inaccurate and relevant to the position they hold.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	<p>Following the creation of its new policy unit in early 2017, the Ethics Commission reviewed several policies related to the filing of officials' Form 700 Economic Interest statements to strengthen accountability in city government by improving the effectiveness of City ethics laws. The Commission has not recommend dismissal for any officer or employee who files a Statement of Economic Interest that is inaccurate and relevant to the position they hold. However, the Commission did recommend steps to strengthen accountability and compliance by city officials with core disclosure requirements as follows:</p> <p>1. A New Disqualification Rule for Board and Commission Members to Better Support Transparent and Impartial Decision Making. The Ethics Commission approved a new law to recommend to the the Board of Supervisors to disqualify members of City boards and commissions from participating in or voting on certain matters if they have not filed their Statement of Economic Interests ("Form 700") as required. As proposed by the Ethics Commission, if a City board or commission member fails to timely file a Form 700, he or she would be disqualified from making decisions on matters that come before that board or commission until the required filing is submitted. The ordinance would require an announcement at the beginning of each meeting regarding any non-filing member's disqualification from making decisions. The Ethics Commission transmitted its recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on October 3, 2017 for its consideration and action. See: https://sfethics.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Non-Voting-Ordinance-Transmittal-Letter-Final.pdf .</p> <p>2. Enhanced Compliance with Ethics and Sunshine Training through New Regulations to Synchronize Training with Annual Form 700 Filing Deadline, At its regular monthly meeting on October 23, 2017, the Ethics Commission adopted a new regulation that will change the operative deadlines for City officials to complete their required Ethics and Sunshine Ordinance training so that they match those officials' Form 700 filing deadlines. The regulations were adopted to support the effectiveness of these training requirements through enhanced compliance with the training requirement, while also making it easier for the public to track applicable deadlines and monitor officials' compliance.</p> <p>California law requires certain public officials and employees to complete training in government ethics rules and to file a Statement of Economic Interest ("Form 700"). City law also requires certain officials to complete training on the Sunshine Ordinance, the City's open government law. Each of these three requirements must be completed under a different set of deadlines. The Commission's new regulation will synchronize the Ethics and Sunshine Ordinance training deadlines with the filing of the Form 700. The regulation will result in officials certifying their completion of Ethics and Sunshine trainings within thirty days of assuming office, and by April 1st of each year.</p> <p>The proposed Ethics Commission Regulations 67.33-1 and 15.102-1 will amend and replace related existing Commission regulations. Under City Charter Sec. 15.102, any regulation adopted by the Ethics Commission must be transmitted to the Board of Supervisors within 24 hours of its adoption. A copy of the Commission's October 24, 2017 transmission to the Board is available at https://sfethics.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Sunshine-Ethics-Referral-to-BOS-Final.pdf. Unless two-thirds of all members of the Board of Supervisors vote to veto the regulation within 60 days of its adoption by the Commission, the regulation becomes effective 60 days after that date. The Commission's proposed regulations are available at https://sfethics.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/2017.10.23-Agenda-Item-7-Ethics-and-Sunshine-Ordinance-Training-Regulations-Memo_Final.pdf.</p>

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	14c. The Ethics Commission should recommend dismissal for any officer or employee who files a Statement of Economic Interest that is inaccurate and relevant to the position they hold.	Ethics Commission	--	Agency elected not to respond.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	14d. Now that all Form 700 filers file electronically, the Ethics Commission should propose that they be filed with them as well as with the Department filing officer.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The Commission continues to work toward extending e-filing of Form 700s for all designated employees. In the past year, the Ethics Commission has initiated discussions with the Department of Human Resources to identify requirements and steps necessary to design and implement an expanded electronic filing system for all designated filers. Once that system is developed and implemented, it will be capable of enabling all designated filers to file their statements online directly through the Ethics Commission's electronic filing system portal.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	14d. Now that all Form 700 filers file electronically, the Ethics Commission should propose that they be filed with them as well as with the Department filing officer.	Ethics Commission	--	Agency elected not to respond.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	15. The Ethics Commission should audit and act on violations disclosed through Form 700 filings of local prohibitions such as compensated advocacy and incompatible activities, and enforce these violations with strong action.	Ethics Commission	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	15. The Ethics Commission should audit and act on violations disclosed through Form 700 filings of local prohibitions such as compensated advocacy and incompatible activities, and enforce these violations with strong action.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	16. The Ethics Commission should require full disclosure of contributions or payments for official travel of City officials, including the actual amount contributed and the names of the original donors. The official should also disclose what official business was conducted, including meetings, who participated in the meetings, topics, speeches given, ceremonies attended and other information.	Ethics Commission	--	Agency elected not to respond.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	16. The Ethics Commission should require full disclosure of contributions or payments for official travel of City officials, including the actual amount contributed and the names of the original donors. The official should also disclose what official business was conducted, including meetings, who participated in the meetings, topics, speeches given, ceremonies attended and other information.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	17a. The Ethics Commission staff should collect the official calendars prepared under the Sunshine Ordinance monthly, convert them to electronic form and post them online.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	17a. The Ethics Commission staff should collect the official calendars prepared under the Sunshine Ordinance monthly, convert them to electronic form and post them online.	Ethics Commission	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	17a. The Ethics Commission staff should collect the official calendars prepared under the Sunshine Ordinance monthly, convert them to electronic form and post them online.	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	17a. The Ethics Commission staff should collect the official calendars prepared under the Sunshine Ordinance monthly, convert them to electronic form and post them online.	City Attorney	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	17b. The City Attorney and the Ethics Commission ensure that those officials subject to the calendar requirement, and their administrative staff, be trained on the law's requirements.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	17b. The City Attorney and the Ethics Commission ensure that those officials subject to the calendar requirement, and their administrative staff, be trained on the law's requirements.	Ethics Commission	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	17b. The City Attorney and the Ethics Commission ensure that those officials subject to the calendar requirement, and their administrative staff, be trained on the law's requirements.	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	17b. The City Attorney and the Ethics Commission ensure that those officials subject to the calendar requirement, and their administrative staff, be trained on the law's requirements.	City Attorney	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	18. The Board of Supervisors should adopt a rule subjecting themselves to the public calendar requirement of the Sunshine Ordinance.	Board of Supervisors	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	19. The Commission should grant or deny post-public employment restriction waiver applications by resolutions that indicate specifically how the decision meets the conditions of the ordinance.	Ethics Commission	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	20a. The Mayor's Office should establish a blue-ribbon committee of experts and stakeholders in open government, sunshine and transparency, including former Sunshine Task Force members. The Committee of Experts should review and update the Sunshine Ordinance as necessary and should report to both entities and the Board of Supervisors recommendations that would result in coordination and respect for the functions of each entity.	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	20a. The Mayor's Office should establish a blue-ribbon committee of experts and stakeholders in open government, sunshine and transparency, including former Sunshine Task Force members. The Committee of Experts should review and update the Sunshine Ordinance as necessary and should report to both entities and the Board of Supervisors recommendations that would result in coordination and respect for the functions of each entity.	Mayor	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	20a. The Mayor's Office should establish a blue-ribbon committee of experts and stakeholders in open government, sunshine and transparency, including former Sunshine Task Force members. The Committee of Experts should review and update the Sunshine Ordinance as necessary and should report to both entities and the Board of Supervisors recommendations that would result in coordination and respect for the functions of each entity.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	20a. The Mayor's Office should establish a blue-ribbon committee of experts and stakeholders in open government, sunshine and transparency, including former Sunshine Task Force members. The Committee of Experts should review and update the Sunshine Ordinance as necessary and should report to both entities and the Board of Supervisors recommendations that would result in coordination and respect for the functions of each entity.	Ethics Commission	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	20b. For now, arrangements should be made jointly by the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to have complaints heard by an independent hearing officer who would develop a consistent legally sufficient record of the case for the decision of each body. This would allow the meetings of the Task Force and the Commission to focus on broader policy issues.	Sunshine Ordinance Task Force	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	20b. For now, arrangements should be made jointly by the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to have complaints heard by an independent hearing officer who would develop a consistent legally sufficient record of the case for the decision of each body. This would allow the meetings of the Task Force and the Commission to focus on broader policy issues.	Mayor	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	20b. For now, arrangements should be made jointly by the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to have complaints heard by an independent hearing officer who would develop a consistent legally sufficient record of the case for the decision of each body. This would allow the meetings of the Task Force and the Commission to focus on broader policy issues.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	20b. For now, arrangements should be made jointly by the Ethics Commission and the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force to have complaints heard by an independent hearing officer who would develop a consistent legally sufficient record of the case for the decision of each body. This would allow the meetings of the Task Force and the Commission to focus on broader policy issues.	Ethics Commission	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	21. The Board of Supervisors should provide the Commissioners an Executive Secretary separate from the existing Commission's employee base who will, among other duties, prepare the Commission's agendas, maintain minutes, lists of complaints, serve as a liaison for public input and interested persons meetings and assist a Commission member to be the parliamentarian.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	21. The Board of Supervisors should provide the Commissioners an Executive Secretary separate from the existing Commission's employee base who will, among other duties, prepare the Commission's agendas, maintain minutes, lists of complaints, serve as a liaison for public input and interested persons meetings and assist a Commission member to be the parliamentarian.	Ethics Commission	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	21. The Board of Supervisors should provide the Commissioners an Executive Secretary separate from the existing Commission's employee base who will, among other duties, prepare the Commission's agendas, maintain minutes, lists of complaints, serve as a liaison for public input and interested persons meetings and assist a Commission member to be the parliamentarian.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	22. The Commissioners should use their committee structure to focus on Ethics Commission issues. In the weeks between monthly meetings, each commissioner could take the lead on issues of concern to the Ethics Commission, such as developing policies on emerging campaign finance issues, transparency matters, complaint processing and training. This structure would allow for more interaction with the public and the regulated community.	Ethics Commission	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	23. That the Ethics Commission apply to the City Attorney for permission to engage outside counsel for advice and recommendations	Ethics Commission	--	Agency elected not to respond.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	23. That the Ethics Commission apply to the City Attorney for permission to engage outside counsel for advice and recommendations	Ethics Commission Executive Director	Requires Further Analysis	At the Ethics Commission's Regular Monthly Meeting in June 2017, the Ethics Commission reviewed and considered a proposal to engage outside counsel for advice and recommendations made by Commissioner Quentin Kopp. See https://sfethics.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/June-22-2017-Staff-report-and-June-23-2017-supplemental-memo-from-City-Attorneys-office.pdf . A motion by Commissioner Kopp to request a Charter amendment to allow for independent Counsel failed on a 2-2 vote, with one Commission vacancy. With a fifth member appointed to the Commission in August 2018, the Commission plans to take up the issue again at its January 2018 monthly meeting.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	23. That the Ethics Commission apply to the City Attorney for permission to engage outside counsel for advice and recommendations	City Attorney	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	24. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should request an annual written report from the Ethics Commission that meets the standards set out in the Charter for annual reviews of the effectiveness of the City's laws. This report should be posted on the Ethics Commission web site.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	24. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should request an annual written report from the Ethics Commission that meets the standards set out in the Charter for annual reviews of the effectiveness of the City's laws. This report should be posted on the Ethics Commission web site.	Mayor	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	24. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should request an annual written report from the Ethics Commission that meets the standards set out in the Charter for annual reviews of the effectiveness of the City's laws. This report should be posted on the Ethics Commission web site.	Ethics Commission	--	Agency elected not to respond.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	25. The Ethics Commission should begin to focus Staff resources on monitoring and auditing other items within the Ethics Commission jurisdiction unrelated to campaigns such as the following ordinances: Conflict of Interest, Governmental Ethics, The Lobbyist Ordinance, Campaign Consultant Ordinance and the Sunshine Ordinance.	Ethics Commission	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	25. The Ethics Commission should begin to focus Staff resources on monitoring and auditing other items within the Ethics Commission jurisdiction unrelated to campaigns such as the following ordinances: Conflict of Interest, Governmental Ethics, The Lobbyist Ordinance, Campaign Consultant Ordinance and the Sunshine Ordinance.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	25. The Ethics Commission should begin to focus Staff resources on monitoring and auditing other items within the Ethics Commission jurisdiction unrelated to campaigns such as the following ordinances: Conflict of Interest, Governmental Ethics, The Lobbyist Ordinance, Campaign Consultant Ordinance and the Sunshine Ordinance.	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	26. The Ethics Commission should determine information reported elsewhere that is relevant for supplemental understanding of information currently reported locally, and provide links to it on the Ethics Commission web site, if it cannot be imported and posted.	Ethics Commission	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	26. The Ethics Commission should determine information reported elsewhere that is relevant for supplemental understanding of information currently reported locally, and provide links to it on the Ethics Commission web site, if it cannot be imported and posted.	Ethics Commission Executive Director	**	
2013-21	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	26. The Ethics Commission should determine information reported elsewhere that is relevant for supplemental understanding of information currently reported locally, and provide links to it on the Ethics Commission web site, if it cannot be imported and posted.	Chief Data Officer	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	27. When a bill is proposed or passed to amend campaign finance and ethics laws, it should specify how it "furthers the purposes of this Chapter".	Ethics Commission	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title	Recommendation	Response Required	2017 Response ⁽¹⁾	2017 Response Text
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	27. When a bill is proposed or passed to amend campaign finance and ethics laws, it should specify how it "furthers the purposes of this Chapter".	Ethics Commission Executive Director	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	27. When a bill is proposed or passed to amend campaign finance and ethics laws, it should specify how it "furthers the purposes of this Chapter".	Board of Supervisors	**	
2013-25	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	27. When a bill is proposed or passed to amend campaign finance and ethics laws, it should specify how it "furthers the purposes of this Chapter".	City Attorney	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	28. That the Commission hold hearings, whether through their committees or in the full Commission, to ask the public to report matters that appear improper, then call the responsible officials before the Commission to account for and defend their actions.	Ethics Commission	**	
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	29. That the Ethics Commission hold a hearing on "Proposition J Revisited" to consider how some of its concepts apply today and whether the "public benefit" definition includes elements that should be incorporated into sections of the C&GCC, and specifically consider offering amendments to C&GCC which re-incorporate its Findings and Declarations into current San Francisco law, and to consider placing these amendments on the ballot.	Ethics Commission	--	Agency elected not to respond.
2013-14	Ethics in the City: Promise, Practice or Pretense	29. That the Ethics Commission hold a hearing on "Proposition J Revisited" to consider how some of its concepts apply today and whether the "public benefit" definition includes elements that should be incorporated into sections of the C&GCC, and specifically consider offering amendments to C&GCC which re-incorporate its Findings and Declarations into current San Francisco law, and to consider placing these amendments on the ballot.	Board of Supervisors	**	

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