Continuity Report

Van Ness Avenue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>Civil Grand Jury [June 15, 2021]</td>
<td>R1 (for F1)</td>
<td>Specifying with the required responses to the 2020-21 Civil Grand Jury recommendation, the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor should direct responding agencies to include measures for implementation as companion of further work in their responses to the 2020-21 Civil Grand Jury findings and recommendations annually.</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue :</td>
<td>has been implemented</td>
<td>The Mayor's Office coordinates with executive departments to respond to Civil Grand Jury findings and recommendations annually. The Mayor's Office works with executive departments to ensure the City's response is consistent and complies with California Penal Code Section 933.05(b) statutory requirements, which includes providing annual responses to the Grand Jury on completion of any and all work. This policy should be included for all contracts after January 1, 2022.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>Civil Grand Jury [June 15, 2021]</td>
<td>R2 (for F2)</td>
<td>Specifying with the required responses to the 2020-21 Civil Grand Jury recommendation, the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor should direct responding agencies to include measures for implementation as companion of further work in their responses to the 2020-21 Civil Grand Jury findings and recommendations annually.</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue :</td>
<td>has been implemented</td>
<td>The Mayor's Office coordinates with executive departments to respond to Civil Grand Jury findings and recommendations annually. The Mayor's Office works with executive departments to ensure the City's response is consistent and complies with California Penal Code Section 933.05(b) statutory requirements, which includes providing annual responses to the Grand Jury on completion of any and all work. This policy should be included for all contracts after January 1, 2022.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>Civil Grand Jury [June 15, 2021]</td>
<td>R3 (for F3)</td>
<td>Specifying with the required responses to the 2020-21 Civil Grand Jury recommendation, the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor should direct responding agencies to include measures for implementation as companion of further work in their responses to the 2020-21 Civil Grand Jury findings and recommendations annually.</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue :</td>
<td>has been implemented</td>
<td>The Mayor's Office coordinates with executive departments to respond to Civil Grand Jury findings and recommendations annually. The Mayor's Office works with executive departments to ensure the City's response is consistent and complies with California Penal Code Section 933.05(b) statutory requirements, which includes providing annual responses to the Grand Jury on completion of any and all work. This policy should be included for all contracts after January 1, 2022.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue, What Lies Beneath [June 27, 2021]</td>
<td>R4 (for F1, F2, F4)</td>
<td>The Board of Supervisors should direct all City agencies to adopt a policy that requires that utilities underground work in the City's main corridors include, as part of the design process, the use of exploratory potholing, or other equivalent industry best-practice to identify unknown underground obstructions adhering to CI/ASCE 38-02 ('Standard Guideline for the Collection and Depiction of underground obstructions adhering to CI/ASCE 38-02') statutory requirements, which includes providing annual responses to the Grand Jury on completion of any and all work.</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue :</td>
<td>has been implemented</td>
<td>The policy for all projects is implemented. Each department must make a determination on a project-by-project basis based on the risk assessment. Currently, all major City projects that involve underground work in main corridors do incorporate potholing, or other equivalent appropriate industry practices, to identify unknown underground obstructions. The City is also working closely with private utilities (e.g., PG&amp;E, Comcast, ATT) during design phase of major projects to account for their utilities, whether active, de-activated, or abandoned.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue, What Lies Beneath [June 27, 2021]</td>
<td>R4 (for F1, F2, F4)</td>
<td>The Board of Supervisors should direct all City agencies to adopt a policy that requires that utilities underground work in the City's main corridors include, as part of the design process, the use of exploratory potholing, or other equivalent industry best-practice to identify unknown underground obstructions adhering to CI/ASCE 38-02 ('Standard Guideline for the Collection and Depiction of underground obstructions adhering to CI/ASCE 38-02') statutory requirements, which includes providing annual responses to the Grand Jury on completion of any and all work.</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue :</td>
<td>has been implemented</td>
<td>The policy for all projects is implemented. Each department must make a determination on a project-by-project basis based on the risk assessment. Currently, all major City projects that involve underground work in main corridors do incorporate potholing, or other equivalent appropriate industry practices, to identify unknown underground obstructions. The City is also working closely with private utilities (e.g., PG&amp;E, Comcast, ATT) during design phase of major projects to account for their utilities, whether active, de-activated, or abandoned.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue, What Lies Beneath [June 27, 2021]</td>
<td>R4 (for F1, F2, F4)</td>
<td>The Board of Supervisors should direct all City agencies to adopt a policy that requires that utilities underground work in the City's main corridors include, as part of the design process, the use of exploratory potholing, or other equivalent industry best-practice to identify unknown underground obstructions adhering to CI/ASCE 38-02 ('Standard Guideline for the Collection and Depiction of underground obstructions adhering to CI/ASCE 38-02') statutory requirements, which includes providing annual responses to the Grand Jury on completion of any and all work.</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue :</td>
<td>has been implemented</td>
<td>The policy for all projects is implemented. Each department must make a determination on a project-by-project basis based on the risk assessment. Currently, all major City projects that involve underground work in main corridors do incorporate potholing, or other equivalent appropriate industry practices, to identify unknown underground obstructions. The City is also working closely with private utilities (e.g., PG&amp;E, Comcast, ATT) during design phase of major projects to account for their utilities, whether active, de-activated, or abandoned.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue, What Lies Beneath [June 27, 2021]</td>
<td>R4 (for F1, F2, F4)</td>
<td>The Board of Supervisors should direct all City agencies to adopt a policy that requires that utilities underground work in the City's main corridors include, as part of the design process, the use of exploratory potholing, or other equivalent industry best-practice to identify unknown underground obstructions adhering to CI/ASCE 38-02 ('Standard Guideline for the Collection and Depiction of underground obstructions adhering to CI/ASCE 38-02') statutory requirements, which includes providing annual responses to the Grand Jury on completion of any and all work.</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue :</td>
<td>has been implemented</td>
<td>The policy for all projects is implemented. Each department must make a determination on a project-by-project basis based on the risk assessment. Currently, all major City projects that involve underground work in main corridors do incorporate potholing, or other equivalent appropriate industry practices, to identify unknown underground obstructions. The City is also working closely with private utilities (e.g., PG&amp;E, Comcast, ATT) during design phase of major projects to account for their utilities, whether active, de-activated, or abandoned.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue, What Lies Beneath [June 27, 2021]</td>
<td>R4 (for F1, F2, F4)</td>
<td>The Board of Supervisors should direct all City agencies to adopt a policy that requires that utilities underground work in the City's main corridors include, as part of the design process, the use of exploratory potholing, or other equivalent industry best-practice to identify unknown underground obstructions adhering to CI/ASCE 38-02 ('Standard Guideline for the Collection and Depiction of underground obstructions adhering to CI/ASCE 38-02') statutory requirements, which includes providing annual responses to the Grand Jury on completion of any and all work.</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue :</td>
<td>has been implemented</td>
<td>The policy for all projects is implemented. Each department must make a determination on a project-by-project basis based on the risk assessment. Currently, all major City projects that involve underground work in main corridors do incorporate potholing, or other equivalent appropriate industry practices, to identify unknown underground obstructions. The City is also working closely with private utilities (e.g., PG&amp;E, Comcast, ATT) during design phase of major projects to account for their utilities, whether active, de-activated, or abandoned.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response not required. Recommendation has been fully implemented or abandoned.*
By June 2022, the Board of Supervisors should amend SFMTA Board of Directors’ Resolution No. 85, as amended, to require the SFMTA to analyze options for adopting a dynamic policy setting forth best practices for CM/GC contracts to be awarded no later than at the 30% design stage for major capital projects on small streets, and to deliver its findings to the Board of Supervisors by March 31, 2023.

SFMTA will review recommended best practices for future CM/GC projects and apply them, as applicable and in their discretion. It is up to the individual department to implement the CMGC management policy and apply industry best practices to their projects. For example, SFMTA already implements industry-standard best practices in CMGC projects. The Board of Supervisors should direct all City departments to adopt, publish, and enforce in all future relationships, the Board of Supervisors should direct all City departments to adopt, publish, and enforce in all future.

By June 2022, and before entering into future CMGC relationships, the Board of Supervisors should direct all City departments to adopt, publish, and enforce in all future relationships, the Board of Supervisors should direct all City departments to adopt, publish, and enforce in all future relationships, the Board of Supervisors should direct all City departments to adopt, publish, and enforce in all future relationships, the Board of Supervisors should direct all City departments to adopt, publish, and enforce in all future relationships, the Board of Supervisors should direct all City departments to adopt, publish, and enforce in all future relationships, the Board of Supervisors should direct all City departments to adopt, publish, and enforce in all future relationships, the Board of Supervisors should direct all City departments to adopt, publish, and enforce in all future relationships, the Board of Supervisors should direct all City departments to adopt, publish, and enforce in all future relationships, the Board of Supervisors should direct all City departments to adopt, publish, and enforce in all future relationships, the Board of Supervisors should direct all City departments to adopt, publish, and enforce in all future relationships, the Board of Supervisors should direct all City departments to adopt, publish, and enforce in all future relationships, the Board of Supervisors should direct all City departments to adopt, publish, and enforce in all future relationships, the Board of Supervisors should direct all City departments to adopt, publish, and enforce in all future.
CMGC project a dedicated in-the-field contractor liaison to support staff to monitor actual progress and site conditions. Beginning January 1, 2022, SFMTA should assign to every conditions by City engineers.

By June 2022, the Board of Supervisors should amend Section 6.68 of the Administrative Code to remove the mandatory cost criterion in awarding CMGC contracts.

The SFMTA agrees with this recommendation, but implementation of the recommendation will be informed in the future. The SFMTA will establish the policy for all future CMGC project types.

** Recommendation Implemented

R7 on March 31, 2022. The GAO committee continues to track this matter and may update and close out its response to this recommendation during a regular meeting in early 2023. (There has been no further action in this matter by the Board of Supervisors or its committees, therefore, the 2020 Response is applicable.)

By June 2022, the Board of Supervisors should amend Section 6.68 of the Administrative Code to remove the mandatory cost criterion in awarding CMGC contracts.

** Recommendation Implemented

The SFMTA agrees with this recommendation, but implementation of the recommendation will be informed in the future. The SFMTA will establish the policy for all future CMGC project types.

** Recommendation Implemented

** Recommendation Implemented

By June 2022, the Board of Supervisors should amend Section 6.68 of the Administrative Code to remove the mandatory cost criterion in awarding CMGC contracts.

** Recommendation Implemented

** Recommendation Implemented

By June 2022, the Board of Supervisors should amend Section 6.68 of the Administrative Code to remove the mandatory cost criterion in awarding CMGC contracts.

** Recommendation Implemented

By June 2022, the Board of Supervisors should amend Section 6.68 of the Administrative Code to remove the mandatory cost criterion in awarding CMGC contracts.

** Recommendation Implemented

** Recommendation Implemented

The GAO committee continues to track this matter and may update and close out its response to this recommendation during a regular meeting in early 2023.

** Recommendation Implemented

** Recommendation Implemented

** Recommendation Implemented

** Recommendation Implemented

** Recommendation Implemented

** Recommendation Implemented

The GAO committee continues to track this matter and may update and close out its response to this recommendation during a regular meeting in early 2023.

** Recommendation Implemented

The GAO committee continues to track this matter and may update and close out its response to this recommendation during a regular meeting in early 2023.

** Recommendation Implemented

The GAO committee continues to track this matter and may update and close out its response to this recommendation during a regular meeting in early 2023.

The GAO committee continues to track this matter and may update and close out its response to this recommendation during a regular meeting in early 2023.

** Recommendation Implemented

** Recommendation Implemented

** Recommendation Implemented
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CGJ Year</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Recommendation Number</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Original 2021 Response</th>
<th>Original 2021 Response Text (provided by CGJ)</th>
<th>2023 Response*</th>
<th>2023 Response**</th>
<th>2023 Response Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue - SFMTA</td>
<td>R10 (for F1, F2, F4, F7)</td>
<td>By June 2022, the City should adopt a policy that any public communication about a planned or in-progress capital project that includes disruption of public services or light-traffic should include itemized assessments of risk to projected costs and deviation.</td>
<td>Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency</td>
<td>[August 27, 2021]</td>
<td>A majority of SFMTA projects are funded by the FTA, which requires the project to assess and monitor project risks in construction on a periodic basis. The department can provide a general list of project risks in public communications, to inform the public of the project status and projected substantial completion. Publishing itemized costs associated with changes in project duration could negatively impact the public’s understanding of the project’s status and projected completion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue - SFMTA</td>
<td>R11 (for F1, F2, F4, F7)</td>
<td>By June 2022, the City should adopt a policy that any public communication about a planned or in-progress capital project that includes disruption of public services or light-traffic should include itemized assessments of risk to projected costs and deviation.</td>
<td>Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SFMTA Board of Directors</td>
<td>[August 27, 2021]</td>
<td>A majority of SFMTA projects are funded by the FTA, which requires the project to assess and monitor project risks in construction on a periodic basis. The department can provide a general list of project risks in public communications, to inform the public of the project status and projected substantial completion. Publishing itemized costs associated with changes in project duration could negatively impact the public’s understanding of the project’s status and projected completion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue - SFMTA</td>
<td>R12 (for F1, F2, F4, F7)</td>
<td>By June 2022, the City should adopt a policy that any public communication about a planned or in-progress capital project that includes disruption of public services or light-traffic should include itemized assessments of risk to projected costs and deviation.</td>
<td>Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>[December 28, 2021]</td>
<td>A majority of SFMTA projects are funded by the FTA, which requires the project to assess and monitor project risks in construction on a periodic basis. The department can provide a general list of project risks in public communications, to inform the public of the project status and projected substantial completion. Publishing itemized costs associated with changes in project duration could negatively impact the public’s understanding of the project’s status and projected completion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue - SFMTA</td>
<td>R13 (for F1, F2, F4, F7)</td>
<td>By June 2022, the City should adopt a policy that any public communication about a planned or in-progress capital project that includes disruption of public services or light-traffic should include itemized assessments of risk to projected costs and deviation.</td>
<td>Has been implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>[August 27, 2021]</td>
<td>This recommendation has been implemented in the Van Ness BRT Project, and will continue to be implemented in the future for all contracts that require pedestrian monitors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue - SFMTA</td>
<td>R14 (for F1, F2, F4, F7)</td>
<td>The Mayor’s Office should determine an appropriate agency for, the Fuel Working Group (“FWG”).</td>
<td>Requires further analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CGJ</td>
<td>[August 27, 2021]</td>
<td>This recommendation requires further analysis, and may update and close out its response to this recommendation during a regular meeting in early 2023.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue - SFMTA</td>
<td>R15 (for F1, F2, F4, F7)</td>
<td>The Mayor’s Office should determine an appropriate agency for, the Fuel Working Group (“FWG”).</td>
<td>Requires further analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CGJ</td>
<td>[August 27, 2021]</td>
<td>This recommendation requires further analysis, and may update and close out its response to this recommendation during a regular meeting in early 2023.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue - SFMTA</td>
<td>R16 (for F1, F2, F4, F7)</td>
<td>The Mayor’s Office should determine an appropriate agency for, the Fuel Working Group (“FWG”).</td>
<td>Requires further analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CGJ</td>
<td>[August 27, 2021]</td>
<td>This recommendation requires further analysis, and may update and close out its response to this recommendation during a regular meeting in early 2023.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue - SFMTA</td>
<td>R17 (for F1, F2, F4, F7)</td>
<td>The Mayor’s Office should determine an appropriate agency for, the Fuel Working Group (“FWG”).</td>
<td>Requires further analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CGJ</td>
<td>[August 27, 2021]</td>
<td>This recommendation requires further analysis, and may update and close out its response to this recommendation during a regular meeting in early 2023.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue - SFMTA</td>
<td>R18 (for F1, F2, F4, F7)</td>
<td>The Mayor’s Office should determine an appropriate agency for, the Fuel Working Group (“FWG”).</td>
<td>Requires further analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CGJ</td>
<td>[August 27, 2021]</td>
<td>This recommendation requires further analysis, and may update and close out its response to this recommendation during a regular meeting in early 2023.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue - SFMTA</td>
<td>R19 (for F1, F2, F4, F7)</td>
<td>The Mayor’s Office should determine an appropriate agency for, the Fuel Working Group (“FWG”).</td>
<td>Requires further analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CGJ</td>
<td>[August 27, 2021]</td>
<td>This recommendation requires further analysis, and may update and close out its response to this recommendation during a regular meeting in early 2023.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue - SFMTA</td>
<td>R20 (for F1, F2, F4, F7)</td>
<td>The Mayor’s Office should determine an appropriate agency for, the Fuel Working Group (“FWG”).</td>
<td>Requires further analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CGJ</td>
<td>[August 27, 2021]</td>
<td>This recommendation requires further analysis, and may update and close out its response to this recommendation during a regular meeting in early 2023.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue - SFMTA</td>
<td>R21 (for F1, F2, F4, F7)</td>
<td>The Mayor’s Office should determine an appropriate agency for, the Fuel Working Group (“FWG”).</td>
<td>Requires further analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CGJ</td>
<td>[August 27, 2021]</td>
<td>This recommendation requires further analysis, and may update and close out its response to this recommendation during a regular meeting in early 2023.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue - SFMTA</td>
<td>R22 (for F1, F2, F4, F7)</td>
<td>The Mayor’s Office should determine an appropriate agency for, the Fuel Working Group (“FWG”).</td>
<td>Requires further analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CGJ</td>
<td>[August 27, 2021]</td>
<td>This recommendation requires further analysis, and may update and close out its response to this recommendation during a regular meeting in early 2023.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue - SFMTA</td>
<td>R23 (for F1, F2, F4, F7)</td>
<td>The Mayor’s Office should determine an appropriate agency for, the Fuel Working Group (“FWG”).</td>
<td>Requires further analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CGJ</td>
<td>[August 27, 2021]</td>
<td>This recommendation requires further analysis, and may update and close out its response to this recommendation during a regular meeting in early 2023.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>Van Ness Avenue - SFMTA</td>
<td>R24 (for F1, F2, F4, F7)</td>
<td>The Mayor’s Office should determine an appropriate agency for, the Fuel Working Group (“FWG”).</td>
<td>Requires further analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CGJ</td>
<td>[August 27, 2021]</td>
<td>This recommendation requires further analysis, and may update and close out its response to this recommendation during a regular meeting in early 2023.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Response not required: Recommendation has been implemented but abandoned.

---

**Status of the Recommendations by the Civil Grand Jury, 2021-22**

2023 Department Responses

Office of the Controller
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Year</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Recommendation Number</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response Required</th>
<th>Original 2021 Response</th>
<th>Original 2021 Response Text</th>
<th>2022 Response(1)</th>
<th>2022 Response Text (provided by OCA)</th>
<th>2023 Response(2)</th>
<th>2023 Response Text(2)</th>
<th>2023 Response Text</th>
<th>2023 Response Text</th>
<th>2023 Response Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>The agency should develop a plan for the quick assessment of local fuel reserves available to City agencies in the event of a disaster, including protocols that ensure incident commanders can assess emergency fuel supply and demand in real-time.</td>
<td>Mayor (August 28, 2021)</td>
<td>Has not yet been implemented</td>
<td>The Fuel Workgroup has developed a survey for departments to use to provide all points of information listed in the recommendation.</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F5</td>
<td>The agency should dedicate staff time each month through December 2022.</td>
<td>City Administrator (August 29, 2021)</td>
<td>Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future</td>
<td>This recommendation will be implemented by December 2022.</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F6</td>
<td>The agency should develop a plan for the quick assessment of local fuel reserves available to City agencies in the event of a disaster, including protocols that ensure incident commanders can assess emergency fuel supply and demand in real-time.</td>
<td>Mayor (August 28, 2021)</td>
<td>Has not yet been implemented</td>
<td>Will be implemented in the future. The estimated timeline for this project is December 2022.</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F7</td>
<td>The agency should dedicate staff time each month through December 2022.</td>
<td>City Administrator (August 29, 2021)</td>
<td>Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future</td>
<td>This recommendation will be implemented by December 2022.</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Office of the Controller
2023 Department Responses

A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience – June 29, 2021

By December 2022, the City will provide a plan for implementing and prioritizing criteria relevant for usefulness in a fuel resiliency plan. The plan will prioritize local stations that are able to dispense fuel without relying on grid power, and provide 24/7 staffed operation. The City will prioritize local stations that are able to dispense fuel without relying on grid power and provide 24/7 staffed operation. The City will place contracts with local stations that can transport fuel to where it is needed.

The City Administrator’s Office is pleased to report that its GSA-Central Shops division was able to procure and build a fuel tanker truck at the beginning of October 2022. This fuel tanker truck is critical to the City’s fuel resilience, as it can hold and transport up to 2,500 gallons of diesel fuel for the City’s fuel supply is jeopardized. The City is currently planning and coordinating an ongoing series of exercises that will ensure appropriate use of the tanker truck to the fullest extent possible when needed.

The City Administrator’s Office is pleased to report that its GSA-Central Shops division was able to procure and build a fuel tanker truck at the beginning of October 2022. This fuel tanker truck is critical to the City’s fuel resilience, as it can hold and transport up to 2,500 gallons of diesel fuel for the City’s fuel supply is jeopardized. The City is currently planning and coordinating an ongoing series of exercises that will ensure appropriate use of the tanker truck to the fullest extent possible when needed.

This year is still being reviewed within the Office of Contract Administration and the City Administrator’s Office. As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual

As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual
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**2020-21**

**A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Infrastructure**

June 29, 2021

**Recommendation:**
- Identify an alternate site for an additional fueling station, if the Southeast Treatment Plant (SEP) for fuel storage, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) is completing a SEP Campus Plan to determine how to best utilize the space at SEP. Any analysis of using SEP for fuel infrastructure must include evaluating fuel needs and identify potential fuel storage project scopes, costs, and target dates to understand if there are locations in SEP that are suitable for a fuel storage project. The analysis should include looking at the fuel needs and potential fuel storage locations for City infrastructure located outside of San Francisco, such as the Hetch Hetchy Regional Water System. Regarding the potential use of the Southern State Park (SSP) for fuel storage, the SFPUC is completing a Southern State Park Campus Plan to determine how to best utilize the space at SSP. Any analysis of using SSP for fuel storage will need to include completing the content of the SSP Campus Plan, and must include evaluating fuel needs for all City facilities. In addition, the SFPUC is completing the Central Shops Campus Plan to determine how to best utilize the space at Central Shops. Any analysis of using Central Shops for fuel storage will need to include completing the content of the Central Shops Campus Plan, and must include evaluating fuel needs for all City facilities.

**2022-23**

**A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Infrastructure**

June 29, 2021

**Recommendation:**
- Identify an alternate site for an additional fueling station, if the Southeast Treatment Plant (SEP) for fuel storage, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) is completing a SEP Campus Plan to determine how to best utilize the space at SEP. Any analysis of using SEP for fuel infrastructure must include evaluating fuel needs and identify potential fuel storage project scopes, costs, and target dates to understand if there are locations in SEP that are suitable for a fuel storage project. The analysis should include looking at the fuel needs and potential fuel storage locations for City infrastructure located outside of San Francisco, such as the Hetch Hetchy Regional Water System. Regarding the potential use of the Southern State Park (SSP) for fuel storage, the SFPUC is completing a Southern State Park Campus Plan to determine how to best utilize the space at SSP. Any analysis of using SSP for fuel storage will need to include completing the content of the SSP Campus Plan, and must include evaluating fuel needs for all City facilities. In addition, the SFPUC is completing the Central Shops Campus Plan to determine how to best utilize the space at Central Shops. Any analysis of using Central Shops for fuel storage will need to include completing the content of the Central Shops Campus Plan, and must include evaluating fuel needs for all City facilities.

**Reasonable**

**2023 Response**

The City has determined not to build a fueling station at Southeast Treatment Plant. Likewise, the City has not identified an alternative space that would be appropriate for the fueling station, particularly in light of safety concerns, social implications, and higher priority needs for space and funding resources.

**Reasonable**

**2022 Response**

The item is still being researched within the Office of Contract Administration and the City Administrator’s Office. The majority of private gas station operators do not have generators and when they do they lack power and/or internet access, the gas station cannot pump fuel and shut down. Furthermore, a single generator cannot power a building as large as Central Shops, therefore the feasibility of operating a fueling station without electricity and internet access is highly unlikely. The City currently has no plans to build a fueling station at SEP, and any new plans will require a feasibility study to determine if it is possible to build a fueling station at SEP.

**Reasonable**

**2022 Response**

The item is still being researched within the Office of Contract Administration and the City Administrator’s Office. The majority of private gas station operators do not have generators and when they do they lack power and/or internet access, the gas station cannot pump fuel and shut down. Furthermore, a single generator cannot power a building as large as Central Shops, therefore the feasibility of operating a fueling station without electricity and internet access is highly unlikely. The City currently has no plans to build a fueling station at SEP, and any new plans will require a feasibility study to determine if it is possible to build a fueling station at SEP.

**Reasonable**

**2022 Response**

The item is still being researched within the Office of Contract Administration and the City Administrator’s Office. The majority of private gas station operators do not have generators and when they do they lack power and/or internet access, the gas station cannot pump fuel and shut down. Furthermore, a single generator cannot power a building as large as Central Shops, therefore the feasibility of operating a fueling station without electricity and internet access is highly unlikely. The City currently has no plans to build a fueling station at SEP, and any new plans will require a feasibility study to determine if it is possible to build a fueling station at SEP.

**Reasonable**

**2022 Response**

The item is still being researched within the Office of Contract Administration and the City Administrator’s Office. The majority of private gas station operators do not have generators and when they do they lack power and/or internet access, the gas station cannot pump fuel and shut down. Furthermore, a single generator cannot power a building as large as Central Shops, therefore the feasibility of operating a fueling station without electricity and internet access is highly unlikely. The City currently has no plans to build a fueling station at SEP, and any new plans will require a feasibility study to determine if it is possible to build a fueling station at SEP.

**Reasonable**

**2022 Response**

The item is still being researched within the Office of Contract Administration and the City Administrator’s Office. The majority of private gas station operators do not have generators and when they do they lack power and/or internet access, the gas station cannot pump fuel and shut down. Furthermore, a single generator cannot power a building as large as Central Shops, therefore the feasibility of operating a fueling station without electricity and internet access is highly unlikely. The City currently has no plans to build a fueling station at SEP, and any new plans will require a feasibility study to determine if it is possible to build a fueling station at SEP.
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Status of the Recommendations from the Civil Grand Jury
2019-21

2020-21 A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 26, 2021]

Office of Contract Administration (OCA), Office of Resilience and Capital Planning (ORCP), Department of Emergency Management (DEM), and San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) will need to complete analysis of the City’s fuel needs and identify potential fuel storage project scopes, costs, and target dates to determine if the City should build a fuel storage location for the Southeast Treatment Plant. If the analysis indicates that the City will have sufficient fuel storage capacity at the Southeast Treatment Plant, or to identify an alternate site for an additional fueling station if the Southeast Treatment Plant site is not available.

Response Required
2021 Response Text

WILL BE IMPLEMENTED

San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 26, 2021]

The GAO committee continues to track this matter and may update and close out its response to this recommendation during a regular meeting in 2024. (There has been no further action on this matter in the Board of Supervisors or its committees; therefore, the 2022 Response is listed as “Pending”)

2023 Response

WILL BE IMPLEMENTED

San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 26, 2021]

The City has determined not to build a fueling station at Southeast Treatment Plant. Likewise, the City does not view it as an alternative to be used for fuel storage, particularly in light of safety concerns, social implications, and higher priority needs for space and funding resources.

2023 Response

** Response not required: Recommendation has been fully implemented or abandoned.
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2023 Department Responses

Status of the Recommendations by the City Grand Jury 2020-21

2020-21
A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]

Recommendation
Office of the Controller (August 28, 2021)

City has yet to be implemented but will be implemented in the future.

The California Energy Commission has not yet prepared such an assessment. The Office of Contract Administration (OCA) and the FWG will conduct outreach to determine if an assessment exists. If it does not, OCA, in coordination with the FWG, will provide a site chain vulnerability assessment by June 2022.

2020-21
A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]

City has yet to be implemented but will be implemented in the future.

OCA has identified major fuel suppliers outside of the Bay Area as part of our research for the new fuel contracts. However, OCA does not believe a contract with these suppliers is warranted or is warranted or is required at this time. OCA has determined that at least one of the City's current suppliers would be able to deliver fuel during an emergency without the need for a contract, and additional fuel vendors can be identified that would remain available if the current suppliers become inaccessible. OCA has not yet identified any potential alternative fuel vendors, and any potential alternative fuel vendors must be evaluated and approved before any contract with an alternative fuel vendor could proceed. The City can procure from any supplier that is able to deliver in the event of an emergency, without the need for a contract. The procurement approach is to: a) utilize the City's emergency procurement authority to purchase P-Cards and Fleet/Fuel Cards for delivery by incident supplier and from any other suppliers outside of the City based on ability to deliver and on-the-ground conditions, to seek State and Federal assistance for continued fuel deliveries, and to seek out on-the-ground conditions from nearby jurisdictions that are not impacted by the emergency. OCA has spent time on contracts as a result of this requirement. We agree, however, that OCA should conduct further research for the new fuel contracts. However, OCA does not believe a contract with these suppliers is warranted or is warranted or is required at this time. OCA has determined that at least one of the City's current suppliers would be able to deliver fuel during an emergency without the need for a contract, and additional fuel vendors can be identified that would remain available if the current suppliers become inaccessible. OCA has not yet identified any potential alternative fuel vendors, and any potential alternative fuel vendors must be evaluated and approved before any contract with an alternative fuel vendor could proceed. The City can procure from any supplier that is able to deliver in the event of an emergency, without the need for a contract. The procurement approach is to: a) utilize the City's emergency procurement authority to purchase P-Cards and Fleet/Fuel Cards for delivery by incident supplier and from any other suppliers outside of the City based on ability to deliver and on-the-ground conditions, to seek State and Federal assistance for continued fuel deliveries, and to seek out on-the-ground conditions from nearby jurisdictions that are not impacted by the emergency. OCA has not yet identified any potential alternative fuel vendors, and any potential alternative fuel vendors must be evaluated and approved before any contract with an alternative fuel vendor could proceed. The City can procure from any supplier that is able to deliver in the event of an emergency, without the need for a contract. The procurement approach is to: a) utilize the City's emergency procurement authority to purchase P-Cards and Fleet/Fuel Cards for delivery by incident supplier and from any other suppliers outside of the City based on ability to deliver and on-the-ground conditions, to seek State and Federal assistance for continued fuel deliveries, and to seek out on-the-ground conditions from nearby jurisdictions that are not impacted by the emergency.
By December 2021, the City’s Fleet Working Group should ask each Department to provide two potential alternative delivery sites for fuel supply. The City should request information about the logistics and economic feasibility of the new delivery methods and identify any potential risks. By December 2023, the City should have identified the most viable alternative delivery sites.

By December 2022, the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning should request information from the Department of Emergency Management about the status of the earthquake assessment of each capital project. The Port of San Francisco should complete an earthquake assessment of its capital projects by the end of 2022.

By December 2022, the City should have completed an earthquake assessment of the Port of San Francisco’s capital projects. The City should then prioritize the implementation of resilience improvements based on the earthquake assessment results.

By December 2022, the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning should request information from the Department of Emergency Management about the status of the earthquake assessment of each capital project. The Port of San Francisco should complete an earthquake assessment of its capital projects by the end of 2022.

By December 2022, the City should have completed an earthquake assessment of the Port of San Francisco’s capital projects. The City should then prioritize the implementation of resilience improvements based on the earthquake assessment results.

By December 2022, the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning should request information from the Department of Emergency Management about the status of the earthquake assessment of each capital project. The Port of San Francisco should complete an earthquake assessment of its capital projects by the end of 2022.

By December 2022, the City should have completed an earthquake assessment of the Port of San Francisco’s capital projects. The City should then prioritize the implementation of resilience improvements based on the earthquake assessment results.

By December 2022, the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning should request information from the Department of Emergency Management about the status of the earthquake assessment of each capital project. The Port of San Francisco should complete an earthquake assessment of its capital projects by the end of 2022.

By December 2022, the City should have completed an earthquake assessment of the Port of San Francisco’s capital projects. The City should then prioritize the implementation of resilience improvements based on the earthquake assessment results.

By December 2022, the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning should request information from the Department of Emergency Management about the status of the earthquake assessment of each capital project. The Port of San Francisco should complete an earthquake assessment of its capital projects by the end of 2022.

By December 2022, the City should have completed an earthquake assessment of the Port of San Francisco’s capital projects. The City should then prioritize the implementation of resilience improvements based on the earthquake assessment results.

By December 2022, the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning should request information from the Department of Emergency Management about the status of the earthquake assessment of each capital project. The Port of San Francisco should complete an earthquake assessment of its capital projects by the end of 2022.

By December 2022, the City should have completed an earthquake assessment of the Port of San Francisco’s capital projects. The City should then prioritize the implementation of resilience improvements based on the earthquake assessment results.

By December 2022, the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning should request information from the Department of Emergency Management about the status of the earthquake assessment of each capital project. The Port of San Francisco should complete an earthquake assessment of its capital projects by the end of 2022.

By December 2022, the City should have completed an earthquake assessment of the Port of San Francisco’s capital projects. The City should then prioritize the implementation of resilience improvements based on the earthquake assessment results.

By December 2022, the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning should request information from the Department of Emergency Management about the status of the earthquake assessment of each capital project. The Port of San Francisco should complete an earthquake assessment of its capital projects by the end of 2022.

By December 2022, the City should have completed an earthquake assessment of the Port of San Francisco’s capital projects. The City should then prioritize the implementation of resilience improvements based on the earthquake assessment results.

By December 2022, the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning should request information from the Department of Emergency Management about the status of the earthquake assessment of each capital project. The Port of San Francisco should complete an earthquake assessment of its capital projects by the end of 2022.

By December 2022, the City should have completed an earthquake assessment of the Port of San Francisco’s capital projects. The City should then prioritize the implementation of resilience improvements based on the earthquake assessment results.

By December 2022, the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning should request information from the Department of Emergency Management about the status of the earthquake assessment of each capital project. The Port of San Francisco should complete an earthquake assessment of its capital projects by the end of 2022.

By December 2022, the City should have completed an earthquake assessment of the Port of San Francisco’s capital projects. The City should then prioritize the implementation of resilience improvements based on the earthquake assessment results.

By December 2022, the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning should request information from the Department of Emergency Management about the status of the earthquake assessment of each capital project. The Port of San Francisco should complete an earthquake assessment of its capital projects by the end of 2022.

By December 2022, the City should have completed an earthquake assessment of the Port of San Francisco’s capital projects. The City should then prioritize the implementation of resilience improvements based on the earthquake assessment results.
A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Fuel Plan developed in collaboration with the City's Capital Planning Committee.

The timeline presented in the recommendation is unrealistic. The San Francisco Emergency Fuel Plan and other corresponding documents that outline the key resilience measures will be published by December 2022.

---

By June 2022, the City Administrator's Office should publish a recommendation response to the San Francisco Fuel Plan developed in collaboration with the City's Capital Planning Committee.

The Fuel Plan should cover key resilience measures such as:

- Processes and timelines for identifying fuel as in need of City maintenance.
- Easing procedures for maintaining fuel resources in available tankers (e.g., keeping fleet vehicles topped up at the end of each work day, reserve requirements for generator tanks).
- Efficient maintenance of pump stations in normal and possible emergency scenarios.
- Information centralization for key sources and users of fuel.
- Scheduling drills around emergency fuel deliveries including re-supplying locations.
- Functional evaluation of city assets needed for emergency fuel delivery (e.g., pumps, modifications, and equipment).
- Developing specifications for equipment that needs to be purchased.

The Fuel Plan should also incorporate logistical lessons learned from the COVID pandemic.

---

By June 2022, the City Administrator's Office should publish a recommendation response to the San Francisco Fuel Plan developed in collaboration with the City's Capital Planning Committee.

The timeline presented in the recommendation is unrealistic. The San Francisco Emergency Fuel Plan and other corresponding documents that outline the key resilience measures will be published by December 2022.

---

By June 2022, the City Administrator's Office should publish a recommendation response to the San Francisco Fuel Plan developed in collaboration with the City's Capital Planning Committee.

The timeline presented in the recommendation is unrealistic. The San Francisco Emergency Fuel Plan and other corresponding documents that outline the key resilience measures will be published by December 2022.

---
A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience

Office of the Controller
2020-21

June 29, 2021

Resilience
Improve Fuel
San Francisco Must
June 29, 2021

Recommendation
Response Required
Original 2021 Response
Original 2021 Response (provided by CGJ)
Implementation
Reasonable
Warranted or Not
Will Not Be
Recommendation No. [R18] will not be implemented as it is not within the purview of the Board of Supervisors to require such an implementation. The recommendation will be completed by January 31, 2023 for consideration in the FY 2024-33 Capital Plan.

**Recommendation implemented.**

Although the City determined that mobile fuel resources would more efficiently and appropriately address an emergency, the Capital Planning Committee declined funding for fuel storage tank replacement and strengthening in existing locations in the FY-23 Capital Budget.
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Resilience
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Recommendation
Response Required
Original 2021 Response
Original 2021 Response (provided by CGJ)
Implementation
Reasonable
Warranted or Not
Will Not Be
City Administrator
City Administrator
City Administrator
City Administrator
City Administrator
City Administrator
City Administrator
City Administrator

By December 2024, the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning should publish a feasibility study on replacing current City backup generators with battery backup installations or other zero-emission technology by 2050. The study should examine costs, risks, and alternatives, including the potential of utilizing general obligation bond revenue.

**Recommendation implemented.**

The Office of Resilience and Capital Planning has therefore referred this recommendation to the Department of the Environment for further review and action as appropriate.

By December 2024, the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning should publish a feasibility study on replacing current City backup generators with battery backup installations or other zero-emission technology by 2050. The study should examine costs, risks, and alternatives, including the potential of utilizing general obligation bond revenue.

**Recommendation implemented.**

The Office of Resilience and Capital Planning has therefore referred this recommendation to the Department of the Environment for further review and action as appropriate.

This recommendation requires further analysis. Specifically, the analysis will offer the recommendation a reasonable range of future projections for V2I in the City. It will define an inventory of existing V2I installations in the City. It will also identify the vehicles types / cohort of mixed vehicles ideal for vehicle-to-grid applications (case studies, technologies) and their barriers / how to overcome them. It recommends further analysis with key City stakeholders to determine a clear scope and identify funding. This analysis will be completed by December 31, 2022.

**Recommendation implemented.**

The Office of Resilience and Capital Planning has therefore referred this recommendation to the Department of the Environment for further review and action as appropriate.

This recommendation requires further analysis. Specifically, the analysis will offer the recommendation a reasonable range of future projections for vehicle-to-grid (V2I) in the City. It will define an inventory of existing V2I installations in the City. It will also identify the vehicles types / cohort of mixed vehicles ideal for vehicle-to-grid applications (case studies, technologies) and their barriers / how to overcome them. This recommendation requires further analysis with key City stakeholders to determine a clear scope and identify funding. This analysis will be completed by December 31, 2022.

**Recommendation implemented.**

The Office of Resilience and Capital Planning has therefore referred this recommendation to the Department of the Environment for further review and action as appropriate.

This recommendation requires further analysis. Specifically, the analysis will offer the recommendation a reasonable range of future projections for vehicle-to-grid (V2I) in the City. It will define an inventory of existing V2I installations in the City. It will also identify the vehicles types / cohort of mixed vehicles ideal for vehicle-to-grid applications (case studies, technologies) and their barriers / how to overcome them. This recommendation requires further analysis with key City stakeholders to determine a clear scope and identify funding. This analysis will be completed by December 31, 2022.

**Recommendation implemented.**

The Office of Resilience and Capital Planning has therefore referred this recommendation to the Department of the Environment for further review and action as appropriate.

This recommendation requires further analysis. Specifically, the analysis will offer the recommendation a reasonable range of future projections for vehicle-to-grid (V2I) in the City. It will define an inventory of existing V2I installations in the City. It will also identify the vehicles types / cohort of mixed vehicles ideal for vehicle-to-grid applications (case studies, technologies) and their barriers / how to overcome them. This recommendation requires further analysis with key City stakeholders to determine a clear scope and identify funding. This analysis will be completed by December 31, 2022.

**Recommendation implemented.**

The Office of Resilience and Capital Planning has therefore referred this recommendation to the Department of the Environment for further review and action as appropriate.

This recommendation requires further analysis. Specifically, the analysis will offer the recommendation a reasonable range of future projections for vehicle-to-grid (V2I) in the City. It will define an inventory of existing V2I installations in the City. It will also identify the vehicles types / cohort of mixed vehicles ideal for vehicle-to-grid applications (case studies, technologies) and their barriers / how to overcome them. This recommendation requires further analysis with key City stakeholders to determine a clear scope and identify funding. This analysis will be completed by December 31, 2022.

**Recommendation implemented.**

The Office of Resilience and Capital Planning has therefore referred this recommendation to the Department of the Environment for further review and action as appropriate.

This recommendation requires further analysis. Specifically, the analysis will offer the recommendation a reasonable range of future projections for vehicle-to-grid (V2I) in the City. It will define an inventory of existing V2I installations in the City. It will also identify the vehicles types / cohort of mixed vehicles ideal for vehicle-to-grid applications (case studies, technologies) and their barriers / how to overcome them. This recommendation requires further analysis with key City stakeholders to determine a clear scope and identify funding. This analysis will be completed by December 31, 2022.

**Recommendation implemented.**

The Office of Resilience and Capital Planning has therefore referred this recommendation to the Department of the Environment for further review and action as appropriate.

This recommendation requires further analysis. Specifically, the analysis will offer the recommendation a reasonable range of future projections for vehicle-to-grid (V2I) in the City. It will define an inventory of existing V2I installations in the City. It will also identify the vehicles types / cohort of mixed vehicles ideal for vehicle-to-grid applications (case studies, technologies) and their barriers / how to overcome them. This recommendation requires further analysis with key City stakeholders to determine a clear scope and identify funding. This analysis will be completed by December 31, 2022.

**Recommendation implemented.**

The Office of Resilience and Capital Planning has therefore referred this recommendation to the Department of the Environment for further review and action as appropriate.

This recommendation requires further analysis. Specifically, the analysis will offer the recommendation a reasonable range of future projections for vehicle-to-grid (V2I) in the City. It will define an inventory of existing V2I installations in the City. It will also identify the vehicles types / cohort of mixed vehicles ideal for vehicle-to-grid applications (case studies, technologies) and their barriers / how to overcome them. This recommendation requires further analysis with key City stakeholders to determine a clear scope and identify funding. This analysis will be completed by December 31, 2022.

**Recommendation implemented.**

The Office of Resilience and Capital Planning has therefore referred this recommendation to the Department of the Environment for further review and action as appropriate.

This recommendation requires further analysis. Specifically, the analysis will offer the recommendation a reasonable range of future projections for vehicle-to-grid (V2I) in the City. It will define an inventory of existing V2I installations in the City. It will also identify the vehicles types / cohort of mixed vehicles ideal for vehicle-to-grid applications (case studies, technologies) and their barriers / how to overcome them. This recommendation requires further analysis with key City stakeholders to determine a clear scope and identify funding. This analysis will be completed by December 31, 2022.

**Recommendation implemented.**

The Office of Resilience and Capital Planning has therefore referred this recommendation to the Department of the Environment for further review and action as appropriate.

This recommendation requires further analysis. Specifically, the analysis will offer the recommendation a reasonable range of future projections for vehicle-to-grid (V2I) in the City. It will define an inventory of existing V2I installations in the City. It will also identify the vehicles types / cohort of mixed vehicles ideal for vehicle-to-grid applications (case studies, technologies) and their barriers / how to overcome them. This recommendation requires further analysis with key City stakeholders to determine a clear scope and identify funding. This analysis will be completed by December 31, 2022.

**Recommendation implemented.**

The Office of Resilience and Capital Planning has therefore referred this recommendation to the Department of the Environment for further review and action as appropriate.

This recommendation requires further analysis. Specifically, the analysis will offer the recommendation a reasonable range of future projections for vehicle-to-grid (V2I) in the City. It will define an inventory of existing V2I installations in the City. It will also identify the vehicles types / cohort of mixed vehicles ideal for vehicle-to-grid applications (case studies, technologies) and their barriers / how to overcome them. This recommendation requires further analysis with key City stakeholders to determine a clear scope and identify funding. This analysis will be completed by December 31, 2022.

**Recommendation implemented.**

The Office of Resilience and Capital Planning has therefore referred this recommendation to the Department of the Environment for further review and action as appropriate.

This recommendation requires further analysis. Specifically, the analysis will offer the recommendation a reasonable range of future projections for vehicle-to-grid (V2I) in the City. It will define an inventory of existing V2I installations in the City. It will also identify the vehicles types / cohort of mixed vehicles ideal for vehicle-to-grid applications (case studies, technologies) and their barriers / how to overcome them. This recommendation requires further analysis with key City stakeholders to determine a clear scope and identify funding. This analysis will be completed by December 31, 2022.

**Recommendation implemented.**

The Office of Resilience and Capital Planning has therefore referred this recommendation to the Department of the Environment for further review and action as appropriate.

This recommendation requires further analysis. Specifically, the analysis will offer the recommendation a reasonable range of future projections for vehicle-to-grid (V2I) in the City. It will define an inventory of existing V2I installations in the City. It will also identify the vehicles types / cohort of mixed vehicles ideal for vehicle-to-grid applications (case studies, technologies) and their barriers / how to overcome them. This recommendation requires further analysis with key City stakeholders to determine a clear scope and identify funding. This analysis will be completed by December 31, 2022.

**Recommendation implemented.**

The Office of Resilience and Capital Planning has therefore referred this recommendation to the Department of the Environment for further review and action as appropriate.

This recommendation requires further analysis. Specifically, the analysis will offer the recommendation a reasonable range of future projections for vehicle-to-grid (V2I) in the City. It will define an inventory of existing V2I installations in the City. It will also identify the vehicles types / cohort of mixed vehicles ideal for vehicle-to-grid applications (case studies, technologies) and their barriers / how to overcome them. This recommendation requires further analysis with key City stakeholders to determine a clear scope and identify funding. This analysis will be completed by December 31, 2022.

**Recommendation implemented.**

The Office of Resilience and Capital Planning has therefore referred this recommendation to the Department of the Environment for further review and action as appropriate.

This recommendation requires further analysis. Specifically, the analysis will offer the recommendation a reasonable range of future projections for vehicle-to-grid (V2I) in the City. It will define an inventory of existing V2I installations in the City. It will also identify the vehicles types / cohort of mixed vehicles ideal for vehicle-to-grid applications (case studies, technologies) and their barriers / how to overcome them. This recommendation requires further analysis with key City stakeholders to determine a clear scope and identify funding. This analysis will be completed by December 31, 2022.

**Recommendation implemented.**

The Office of Resilience and Capital Planning has therefore referred this recommendation to the Department of the Environment for further review and action as appropriate.
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The Board of Supervisors should reinstate the Committee on City Workforce Alignment to Chapter 30 of the Administrative Code and City College as a member. The reinstitution should be completed no later than February 2022. The joint working group should include City College's Dean for Workforce Development, the City's Director of Comprehensive Job Centers, and the City Workforce Alignment Committee on 9/27/22. The reinstatement should be completed no later than February 2022.

City College of San Francisco is not currently part of the Workforce Alignment Committee. The Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court that they partially disagree with Finding No. F1 for reason as follows: City College of San Francisco is not currently part of the Workforce Alignment Committee.

City Workforce Alignment to Chapter 30 of the Administrative Code and add City College as a member. The reinstatement should be completed no later than February 2022. The Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court that they partially disagree with Finding No. F1 for reason as follows: City College of San Francisco is not currently part of the Workforce Alignment Committee.

The Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court that they partially disagree with Finding No. F1 for reason as follows: City College of San Francisco is not currently part of the Workforce Alignment Committee.

City College of San Francisco is not currently part of the Workforce Alignment Committee.

City Workforce Alignment to Chapter 30 of the Administrative Code and add City College as a member. The reinstatement should be completed no later than February 2022. The Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court that they partially disagree with Finding No. F1 for reason as follows: City College of San Francisco is not currently part of the Workforce Alignment Committee.

The Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court that they partially disagree with Finding No. F1 for reason as follows: City College of San Francisco is not currently part of the Workforce Alignment Committee.

The Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court that they partially disagree with Finding No. F1 for reason as follows: City College of San Francisco is not currently part of the Workforce Alignment Committee.

The Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court that they partially disagree with Finding No. F1 for reason as follows: City College of San Francisco is not currently part of the Workforce Alignment Committee.
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(1) **Response not required: Recommendation has been fully implemented or abandoned.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Original 2021 Response</th>
<th>Original 2021 Response (provided by CCSF)</th>
<th>2022 Response</th>
<th>2023 Response</th>
<th>2023 Response Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City College should enhance the number of short-term certificate training programs by February 2022, and these courses should be developed in collaboration with business or community-based organizations receiving OEWD funding. (This would include an increase in the number of CTE course offerings during City College’s summer semester to six.)</td>
<td>Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable</td>
<td>City College and Workforce Development (August 29, 2021)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City College should verify and update the Eligible Provider Training List. Priority registration should begin with the Fall 2022 semester.</td>
<td>Verified by the Civil Grand Jury</td>
<td>Office of Economic and Workforce Development (December 2021)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City College should allow priority registration for OEWD or community-based organizations receiving OEWD funding.</td>
<td>Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable</td>
<td>City College or San Francisco Board of Supervisors (September 28, 2021)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City College should propose an increase in the number of CTE course offerings during City College’s summer semester to six.</td>
<td>City College should enhance its number of short-term certificate training programs by February 2022, and these courses should be developed in collaboration with business or community-based organizations receiving OEWD funding. (This would include an increase in the number of CTE course offerings during City College’s summer semester to six.)</td>
<td>Original 2021 Response</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City College should convene a workgroup to identify and rectify course descriptions, schedules, and registration priorities issued in the Eligible Provider Training List that are not reflective of the needs of community partners.</td>
<td>Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable</td>
<td>City College (September 28, 2021)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City College should convene a workgroup to identify and rectify course descriptions, schedules, and registration priorities issued in the Eligible Provider Training List that are not reflective of the needs of community partners.</td>
<td>Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable</td>
<td>City College (August 29, 2021)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(1) **Response not required: Recommendation has been fully implemented or abandoned.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Original 2021 Response</th>
<th>Original 2021 Response (provided by CCSF)</th>
<th>2022 Response</th>
<th>2023 Response</th>
<th>2023 Response Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City College should enhance the number of short-term certificate training programs by February 2022, and these courses should be developed in collaboration with business or community-based organizations receiving OEWD funding. (This would include an increase in the number of CTE course offerings during City College’s summer semester to six.)</td>
<td>Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable</td>
<td>City College and Workforce Development (August 29, 2021)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City College should verify and update the Eligible Provider Training List. Priority registration should begin with the Fall 2022 semester.</td>
<td>Verified by the Civil Grand Jury</td>
<td>Office of Economic and Workforce Development (December 2021)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City College should allow priority registration for OEWD or community-based organizations receiving OEWD funding.</td>
<td>Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable</td>
<td>City College or San Francisco Board of Supervisors (September 28, 2021)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City College should propose an increase in the number of CTE course offerings during City College’s summer semester to six.</td>
<td>City College should enhance its number of short-term certificate training programs by February 2022, and these courses should be developed in collaboration with business or community-based organizations receiving OEWD funding. (This would include an increase in the number of CTE course offerings during City College’s summer semester to six.)</td>
<td>Original 2021 Response</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City College should convene a workgroup to identify and rectify course descriptions, schedules, and registration priorities issued in the Eligible Provider Training List that are not reflective of the needs of community partners.</td>
<td>Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable</td>
<td>City College (September 28, 2021)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City College should convene a workgroup to identify and rectify course descriptions, schedules, and registration priorities issued in the Eligible Provider Training List that are not reflective of the needs of community partners.</td>
<td>Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable</td>
<td>City College (August 29, 2021)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2020-21 Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage

Recommendation Number: 9

Objective: Develop an overview document that outlines the ways businesses and community-based organizations can partner in offering training to their employees and clients.

Status of the Recommendations

** Recommendation

2020-21 Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage

1. The College should convene a workshop to identify and correct inaccuracies in the course descriptions, schedules, and costs included on the Eligible Provider Training List by January 2022.

2. OEWD should work with stakeholders who coordinate the Eligible Provider Training List to develop an outreach program that encourages clients to pursue City College certificate programs. The outreach plan should be approved by the Director of Workforce Development and implemented by April 2022.

3. OEWD should not create an outreach team to enroll students in a system, CCSF, and work with stakeholders who coordinate the Eligible Provider Training List to develop an outreach plan that encourages clientele to pursue City College certificate programs. The outreach plan should be approved by the Director of Workforce Development and implemented by April 2022.

4. OEWD should work with stakeholders who coordinate the Eligible Provider Training List to develop an outreach program that encourages clients to pursue City College certificate programs. The outreach plan should be approved by the Director of Workforce Development and implemented by April 2022.

5. OEWD should not create an outreach team to enroll students in a system, CCSF, and work with stakeholders who coordinate the Eligible Provider Training List to develop an outreach plan that encourages clientele to pursue City College certificate programs. The outreach plan should be approved by the Director of Workforce Development and implemented by April 2022.

6. OEWD should work with stakeholders who coordinate the Eligible Provider Training List to develop an outreach program that encourages clients to pursue City College certificate programs. The outreach plan should be approved by the Director of Workforce Development and implemented by April 2022.

7. OEWD should not create an outreach team to enroll students in a system, CCSF, and work with stakeholders who coordinate the Eligible Provider Training List to develop an outreach plan that encourages clientele to pursue City College certificate programs. The outreach plan should be approved by the Director of Workforce Development and implemented by April 2022.

8. OEWD should work with stakeholders who coordinate the Eligible Provider Training List to develop an outreach program that encourages clients to pursue City College certificate programs. The outreach plan should be approved by the Director of Workforce Development and implemented by April 2022.

9. The College should convene a workshop to identify and correct inaccuracies in the course descriptions, schedules, and costs included on the Eligible Provider Training List by January 2022.