

CGJ Year	Report Title [Publication Date]	Recommendation Number [for Finding Number]	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2021 Response	Original 2021 Response Text <i>(provided by CGJ)</i>	2022 Response ⁽¹⁾	2022 Response Text	2023 Response ⁽¹⁾	2023 Response Text
2020-21	Continuity Report [June 15, 2021]	R1 [for F1]	Beginning with the required responses to the 2020-21 Civil Grand Jury recommendations, the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor should direct responding agencies to include timeframes for implementation or completion of further analysis as required by California Penal Code Section 933.05(b).	Mayor [August 14, 2021]	Has been implemented	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 a timeframe for implementation or completion or an explanation of why a recommended timeframe is unattainable.	**		**	
2020-21	Continuity Report [June 15, 2021]	R1 [for F1]	Beginning with the required responses to the 2020-21 Civil Grand Jury recommendations, the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor should direct responding agencies to include timeframes for implementation or completion of further analysis as required by California Penal Code Section 933.05(b).	Board of Supervisors [September 13, 2021]	Has been implemented	Recommendation has been implemented as detailed in the Mayor's response.	**		**	
2020-21	Continuity Report [June 15, 2021]	R2 [for F2]	Beginning with the required responses to the 2020-21 Civil Grand Jury recommendations, the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor should direct responding agencies to coordinate their responses to the same recommendation to ensure they do not conflict.	Mayor [August 14, 2021]	Has been implemented	During the annual Civil Grand Jury response process, the Mayor's Office coordinates with executive departments on responses to findings and recommendations to ensure the City's response is consistent, complies with statutory requirements, and addresses the intent of the findings and recommendations.	**		**	
2020-21	Continuity Report [June 15, 2021]	R2 [for F2]	Beginning with the required responses to the 2020-21 Civil Grand Jury recommendations, the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor should direct responding agencies to coordinate their responses to the same recommendation to ensure they do not conflict.	Board of Supervisors [September 13, 2021]	Has been implemented	Recommendation has been implemented as detailed in the Mayor's response.	**		**	
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R4 [for F1, F4, F6, F7]	The Board of Supervisors should direct all City departments to adopt a policy that all projects that involve underground work in the City's main corridors include, as part of the design process, the use of exploratory potholing, or another equivalent industry best-practice to identify unknown underground obstructions adhering to CI/ASCE 38-02 ("Standard Guideline for the Collection and Depiction of Existing Subsurface Utility Data") Quality Level A. This policy should take effect for all contracts signed after January 1, 2022, and the work should be required to be performed before final construction terms or prices are agreed to.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	One policy for all projects is impractical. 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 more closely with private utilities (e.g., PG&E, Comcast, ATT) during design phase of major projects to account for their utilities, whether active, deactivated, or abandoned.	**		**	
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R4 [for F1, F4, F6, F7]	The Board of Supervisors should direct all City departments to adopt a policy that all projects that involve underground work in the City's main corridors include, as part of the design process, the use of exploratory potholing, or another equivalent industry best-practice to identify unknown underground obstructions adhering to CI/ASCE 38-02 ("Standard Guideline for the Collection and Depiction of Existing Subsurface Utility Data") Quality Level A. This policy should take effect for all contracts signed after January 1, 2022, and the work should be required to be performed before final construction terms or prices are agreed to.	SFMTA Board of Directors [August 27, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	Speaking for the Agency, and not the Board of Supervisors, the SFMTA believes that one policy for all projects, across all departments, is impractical. 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 also works closely with private utilities (e.g., PG&E, Comcast, ATT) during design phase of major projects to account for their utilities, whether active, deactivated, or abandoned.	**		**	
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R4 [for F1, F4, F6, F7]	The Board of Supervisors should direct all City departments to adopt a policy that all projects that involve underground work in the City's main corridors include, as part of the design process, the use of exploratory potholing, or another equivalent industry best-practice to identify unknown underground obstructions adhering to CI/ASCE 38-02 ("Standard Guideline for the Collection and Depiction of Existing Subsurface Utility Data") Quality Level A. This policy should take effect for all contracts signed after January 1, 2022, and the work should be required to be performed before final construction terms or prices are agreed to.	Board of Supervisors [September 26, 2021]	Requires further analysis	Recommendation No. R4 requires further analysis, and hereby urges the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency to analyze options for adopting a dynamic policy setting forth best practices for exploratory potholing or equivalent industry-standard practices for major capital projects, and to deliver its findings to the Board of Supervisors by March 31, 2022.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	SFMTA provided an update on the implementation of Recommendation No. R4 in a memo dated July 6, 2022. SFMTA reports that the recommendation has been 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.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	SFMTA provided an update on the implementation of Recommendation No. R4 in a memo dated July 6, 2022. SFMTA reports that the recommendation has been 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 2024. (There has been no further action on this matter at the Board of Supervisors or its committees; therefore, the 2022 Response still applies.)
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R4 [for F1, F4, F6]	The Board of Supervisors should direct all City departments to adopt a policy that all projects that involve underground work in the City's main corridors include, as part of the design process, the use of exploratory potholing, or another equivalent industry best-practice to identify unknown underground obstructions adhering to CI/ASCE 38-02 ("Standard Guideline for the Collection and Depiction of Existing Subsurface Utility Data") Quality Level A. This policy should take effect for all contracts signed after January 1, 2022, and the work should be required to be performed before final construction terms or prices are agreed to.	General Manager, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission [August 27, 2021]	Has been implemented	Speaking for the Agency, and not the Board of Supervisors, the SFPUC utilizes best practices on capital projects regarding the use of exploratory potholing. Utility best practices dictate that small capital projects on small streets do not require potholing.	**		**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title [Publication Date]	Recommendation Number [for Finding Number]	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2021 Response	Original 2021 Response Text <i>(provided by CGJ)</i>	2022 Response ⁽¹⁾	2022 Response Text	2023 Response ⁽¹⁾	2023 Response Text
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R4 [for F1, F4, F6]	The Board of Supervisors should direct all City departments to adopt a policy that all projects that involve underground work in the City's main corridors include, as part of the design process, the use of exploratory potholing, or another equivalent industry best-practice to identify unknown underground obstructions adhering to CI/ASCE 38-02 ("Standard Guideline for the Collection and Depiction of Existing Subsurface Utility Data") Quality Level A. This policy should take effect for all contracts signed after January 1, 2022, and the work should be required to be performed before final construction terms or prices are agreed to.	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission [August 27, 2021]	Has been implemented	Speaking for the Agency, and not the Board of Supervisors, the SFPUC utilizes best practices on capital projects regarding the use of exploratory potholing. Utility best practices dictate that small capital projects on small streets do not require potholing.	**		**	
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R5 [for F8, F10, F11, F12, F13]	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 contracts industry-standard best practices for management of CMGC projects.	Mayor [August 27, 2021]	Has been implemented	SFMTA will review recommended best practices for future CM/GC projects and apply them, as applicable and as appropriate. It is up to the individual department to determine the applicability of "best practices" to their projects. For example, SFPUC already implements industry-standard best practices in management of their CMGC projects.	**		**	
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R5 [for F8, F10, F11, F12, F13]	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 contracts industry-standard best practices for management of CMGC projects.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	SFMTA will review recommended best practices for future CM/GC projects and apply them, as applicable and as appropriate. It is up to the individual department to determine the applicability of "best practices" to their projects.	**		**	
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R5 [for F8, F10, F11, F12, F13]	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 contracts industry-standard best practices for management of CMGC projects.	SFMTA Board of Board of Supervisors [September 26, 2021]	Will not be implemented Requires further analysis	"Best practices" are a list of general recommendations based on general industry Recommendation No. R5 requires further analysis, and hereby urges the SFMTA to analyze options for adopting a dynamic policy setting forth best practices for CMGC contracts for major capital projects, and to deliver its findings to the Board of Supervisors by March 31, 2022.	** Will Be Implemented in the Future	SFMTA provided an update on the implementation of Recommendation No. R5 in a memo dated July 6, 2022. SFMTA reports that completion is anticipated in the first quarter of 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.	** Will Be Implemented in the Future	SFMTA provided an update on the implementation of Recommendation No. R5 in a memo dated July 6, 2022. SFMTA reports that completion is anticipated in the first quarter of 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 2024. (There has been no further action on this matter at the Board of Supervisors or its committees; therefore, the 2022 Response still applies.)
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R5 [for F8, F11]	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 contracts industry-standard best practices for management of CMGC projects.	General Manager, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission [August 27, 2021]	Has been implemented	The SFPUC is actively implementing best practices on CM/GC projects.	**		**	
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R5 [for F8, F11]	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 contracts industry-standard best practices for management of CMGC projects.	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission [August 27, 2021]	Has been implemented	The SFPUC is actively implementing best practices on CM/GC contracts.	**		**	
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R6 [for F8]	The adopted CMGC management policy should specifically include the industry best practice of awarding the contract before project design continues past 30% completion.	Mayor [August 27, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	While it is optimal to bring in a CMGC contractor on or before 30%, it is equally important to have a qualified, experienced contractor who is able to provide the required services. In the case of a horizontal CMGC project, the technical capability and local experience of the contractor are also important.	**		**	
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R6 [for F8]	The adopted CMGC management policy should specifically include the industry best practice of awarding the contract before project design continues past 30% completion.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	While it is optimal to bring in a CM/GC contractor on or before 30%, it is equally important to have a qualified, experienced contractor who is able to provide the required services. In the case of a horizontal CM/GC project, the technical capability and local experience of the contractor are also important.	**		**	
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R6 [for F8]	The adopted CMGC management policy should specifically include the industry best practice of awarding the contract before project design continues past 30% completion.	SFMTA Board of Directors [August 27, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	While it is optimal to bring in a CM/GC contractor on or before 30%, it is equally important to have a qualified, experienced contractor who is able to provide the required services. In the case of a horizontal CM/GC project, the technical capability and local experience of the contractor are also important.	**		**	
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R6 [for F8]	The adopted CMGC management policy should specifically include the industry best practice of awarding the contract before project design continues past 30% completion.	Board of Supervisors [September 26, 2021]	Requires further analysis	Recommendation No. R6 requires further analysis, and hereby urges the SFMTA to analyze options for adopting a dynamic policy setting forth a standard expectation for CMGC contracts to be awarded no later than at the 30% design stage for major capital projects, and to deliver its findings to the Board of Supervisors by March 31, 2022.	** Will Be Implemented in the Future	SFMTA provided an update on the implementation of Recommendation No. R6 in a memo dated July 6, 2022. SFMTA reports that implementation is in progress. 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.	** Will Be Implemented in the Future	SFMTA provided an update on the implementation of Recommendation No. R6 in a memo dated July 6, 2022. SFMTA reports that implementation is in progress. 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 at the Board of Supervisors or its committees; therefore, the 2022 Response still applies.)
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R7 [for F5]	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.	Mayor [August 27, 2021]	Requires further analysis	We agree with this recommendation, but implementation of the recommendation resides with the Board of Supervisors. In 2015, legislation authorized departments to select CM/GCs based on qualification and cost, as long as the cost criteria is at least 40% of the overall selection, a decrease from the previous requirement that it be 65%. Additionally, in 2016 legislation enabled departments to use best-value contracting methods; this helped departments place more of an emphasis on certain priority components of projects such as timeline goals or technical expertise. However, we recognize that additional steps may be needed to ensure technical expertise is sufficiently prioritized in large capital projects.	** Will Be Implemented in the Future	We still agree with this recommendation however, it requires implementation by the Board of Supervisors (BOS).	** Recommendation Implemented	Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to remove the minimum cost criterion weighting for Design-Build and Construction Manager/General Contractor best value procurements was approved by the Board of Supervisors on May 3, 2023.

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

CGJ Year	Report Title [Publication Date]	Recommendation Number [for Finding Number]	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2021 Response	Original 2021 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2022 Response ⁽¹⁾	2022 Response Text	2023 Response ⁽¹⁾	2023 Response Text
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R7 [for F5]	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.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Requires further analysis	The SFMTA agrees with this recommendation, but implementation of the recommendation resides with the Board of Supervisors.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	SFMTA concurs with the recommendation, however, it requires implementation by the Board of Supervisors (BOS). The SFMTA will support the BOS in its efforts to implement as needed.	Recommendation Implemented	Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to remove the minimum cost criterion weighting for Design-Build and Construction Manager/General Contractor best value procurements was approved by the Board of Supervisors on May 3, 2023.
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R7 [for F5]	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.	SFMTA Board of Directors [August 27, 2021]	Requires further analysis	The SFMTA agrees with this recommendation, but implementation of the recommendation resides with the Board of Supervisors.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	SFMTA concurs with the recommendation, however, it requires implementation by the Board of Supervisors (BOS). The SFMTA will support the BOS in its efforts to implement as needed.	Recommendation Implemented	Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to remove the minimum cost criterion weighting for Design-Build and Construction Manager/General Contractor best value procurements was approved by the Board of Supervisors on May 3, 2023.
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R7 [for F5]	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.	Board of Supervisors [September 26, 2021]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	Recommendation No. R7 has not been implemented but will be implemented, and hereby directs the Budget Government Audit and Oversight Committee and Legislative Analysts to issue a report by March 31, 2022 laying out options and key considerations for an ordinance to amend the Administrative Code to remove the mandatory cost criterion in awarding CMGC contracts.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The BLA provided an analysis of policy options related to Recommendation No. 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.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The BLA provided an analysis of policy options related to Recommendation No. 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 2024. (There has been no further action on this matter at the Board of Supervisors or its committees; therefore, the 2022 Response still applies.)
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R8 [for F7, F9, F10]	SFMTA should establish a policy for review of technical quality of preconstruction and design deliverables, to be used in all CMGC or design contracts signed after January 2022, including in-the-field validation of key assumptions of site conditions by City engineers.	Mayor [August 27, 2021]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	A more formalized process of reviewing and commenting on pre-construction deliverables would be beneficial in the future. The SFMTA will establish the policy for all future CMGC-type projects.	Recommendation Implemented	The Project Operations Manual (POM) Design Phase section addresses engineering best practices requiring in-field validation during project design, including required constructability review (Section 4.4) and peer review of technical quality through quality assurance and quality management practices (Section 9).The Underground Utility Guidelines, which require in-the-field validation of key assumptions of site conditions developed through information gathered via Notification of Intent (NOI) with City agencies and utility companies, were issued on July 8, 2022 by the Acting Director of Capital Programs and Construction (CP&C) and have been implemented.	**	
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R8 [for F7, F9, F10]	SFMTA should establish a policy for review of technical quality of preconstruction and design deliverables, to be used in all CMGC or design contracts signed after January 2022, including in-the-field validation of key assumptions of site conditions by City engineers.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	A more formalized process of reviewing and commenting on pre-construction deliverables would be beneficial in the future. The SFMTA will establish the policy for all future CMGC-type projects.	Recommendation Implemented	The Project Operations Manual (POM) Design Phase section addresses engineering best practices requiring in-field validation during project design, including required constructability review (Section 4.4) and peer review of technical quality through quality assurance and quality management practices (Section 9).The Underground Utility Guidelines, which require in-the-field validation of key assumptions of site conditions developed through information gathered via Notification of Intent (NOI) with City agencies and utility companies, were issued on July 8, 2022 by the Acting Director of Capital Programs and Construction (CP&C) and have been implemented.	**	
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R8 [for F7, F9, F10]	SFMTA should establish a policy for review of technical quality of preconstruction and design deliverables, to be used in all CMGC or design contracts signed after January 2022, including in-the-field validation of key assumptions of site conditions by City engineers.	SFMTA Board of Directors [August 27, 2021]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	A more formalized process of reviewing and commenting on pre-construction deliverables would be beneficial in the future. The SFMTA will establish the policy for all future CMGC-type projects.	Recommendation Implemented	The Project Operations Manual (POM) Design Phase section addresses engineering best practices requiring in-field validation during project design, including required constructability review (Section 4.4) and peer review of technical quality through quality assurance and quality management practices (Section 9).The Underground Utility Guidelines, which require in-the-field validation of key assumptions of site conditions developed through information gathered via Notification of Intent (NOI) with City agencies and utility companies, were issued on July 8, 2022 by the Acting Director of Capital Programs and Construction (CP&C) and have been implemented.	**	
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R8 [for F7, F9, F10]	SFMTA should establish a policy for review of technical quality of preconstruction and design deliverables, to be used in all CMGC or design contracts signed after January 2022, including in-the-field validation of key assumptions of site conditions by City engineers.	Board of Supervisors [September 26, 2021]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	Recommendation No. R8 has not been implemented but will be implemented, and hereby urges the SFMTA to develop a formalized process for reviewing and commenting on pre-construction deliverables by March 31, 2022.	Recommendation Implemented	SFMTA provided an update on the implementation of Recommendation No. R8 in a memo dated July 6, 2022. SFMTA reports that the recommendation been 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.	**	
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R9 [for F12, F13]	Beginning January 1, 2022, SFMTA should assign to every CMGC project a dedicated in-the-field contractor liaison to facilitate collaborative problem resolution, and sufficient support staff to monitor actual progress and site conditions.	Mayor [August 27, 2021]	Has been implemented	It is a long-standing practice in the City that a Resident Engineer is assigned prior to the start of construction on every capital project as the single point of contact with the contractor in the field, and that this is their primary job responsibility during the scope of the project. The Van Ness project includes a complete support staff of City employees (SFMTA, SFPUC, DPW and consultants) to monitor actual progress and site conditions. Future CMGC projects will continue this practice.	**		**	
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R9 [for F12, F13]	Beginning January 1, 2022, SFMTA should assign to every CMGC project a dedicated in-the-field contractor liaison to facilitate collaborative problem resolution, and sufficient support staff to monitor actual progress and site conditions.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Has been implemented	It is a long-standing practice in the City that a Resident Engineer is assigned prior to the start of construction on every capital project as the single point of contact with the contractor in the field. The Van Ness project includes a complete support staff of City employees (SFMTA, SFPUC, DPW and consultants) to monitor actual progress and site conditions. Future CMGC projects will continue this practice.	**		**	
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R9 [for F12, F13]	Beginning January 1, 2022, SFMTA should assign to every CMGC project a dedicated in-the-field contractor liaison to facilitate collaborative problem resolution, and sufficient support staff to monitor actual progress and site conditions.	SFMTA Board of Directors [August 27, 2021]	Has been implemented	It is a long-standing practice in the City that a Resident Engineer is assigned prior to the start of construction on every capital project as the single point of contact with the contractor in the field. The Van Ness project includes a complete support staff of City employees (SFMTA, SFPUC, PW and consultants) to monitor actual progress and site conditions. Future CMGC projects will continue this practice.	**		**	
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R9 [for F12, F13]	Beginning January 1, 2022, SFMTA should assign to every CMGC project a dedicated in-the-field contractor liaison to facilitate collaborative problem resolution, and sufficient support staff to monitor actual progress and site conditions.	Board of Supervisors [September 26, 2021]	Has been implemented		**		**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title [Publication Date]	Recommendation Number [for Finding Number]	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2021 Response	Original 2021 Response Text <i>(provided by CGJ)</i>	2022 Response ⁽¹⁾	2022 Response Text	2023 Response ⁽¹⁾	2023 Response Text
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R10 [for F1, F2, F6, F9]	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 right-of-way should include itemized assessments of risk to projected costs and duration.	Mayor [August 27, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	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 association with changes risk or project duration could negatively impact the bidding or negotiation process.	**		**	
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R10 [for F1, F2, F6, F9]	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 right-of-way should include itemized assessments of risk to projected costs and duration.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	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 association with changes risk or project duration could negatively impact the bidding or negotiation process.	**		**	
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R10 [for F1, F2, F6, F9]	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 right-of-way should include itemized assessments of risk to projected costs and duration.	SFMTA Board of Directors [August 27, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	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 association with changes risk or project duration could negatively impact the bidding or negotiation process.	**		**	
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R10 [for F1, F2, F6, F9]	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 right-of-way should include itemized assessments of risk to projected costs and duration.	Board of Supervisors [September 26, 2021]	Requires further analysis	Recommendation No. R10 requires further analysis, and hereby urges the SFMTA to develop a policy for the public communication of capital project risk assessment and to delivery its findings to the Board of Supervisors by March 31, 2022.	Requires Further Analysis	SFMTA provided an update on the implementation of Recommendation No. R10 in a memo dated July 6, 2022. SFMTA reports that the recommendation requires further analysis. 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.	Requires Further Analysis	SFMTA provided an update on the implementation of Recommendation No. R10 in a memo dated July 6, 2022. SFMTA reports that the recommendation requires further analysis. 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 at the Board of Supervisors or its committees, therefore, the 2022 Response still applies.)
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R11 [for F14]	Beginning immediately, and in all future capital or maintenance projects that require pedestrian monitors, the City should ensure that associated costs are either specifically included in the primary construction contract, or explicitly planned for and funded by the City, before construction begins.	Mayor [August 27, 2021]	Has been implemented	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.	**		**	
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R11 [for F14]	Beginning immediately, and in all future capital or maintenance projects that require pedestrian monitors, the City should ensure that associated costs are either specifically included in the primary construction contract, or explicitly planned for and funded by the City, before construction begins.	Director, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [August 27, 2021]	Has been implemented	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.	**		**	
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R11 [for F14]	Beginning immediately, and in all future capital or maintenance projects that require pedestrian monitors, the City should ensure that associated costs are either specifically included in the primary construction contract, or explicitly planned for and funded by the City, before construction begins.	SFMTA Board of Directors [August 27, 2021]	Has been implemented	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.	**		**	
2020-21	Van Ness Avenue : What Lies Beneath [June 28, 2021]	R11 [for F14]	Beginning immediately, and in all future capital or maintenance projects that require pedestrian monitors, the City should ensure that associated costs are either specifically included in the primary construction contract, or explicitly planned for and funded by the City, before construction begins.	Board of Supervisors [September 26, 2021]	Has been implemented		**		**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R1 [for F3]	The Mayor's Office should determine an appropriate agency sponsor for the Fuel Working Group by December 2021.	Mayor [August 28, 2021]	Has been implemented	The City Administrator's Office has been designated as the sponsor of, and lead agency for, the Fuel Working Group ("FWG").	**		**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R1 [for F3]	The Mayor's Office should determine an appropriate agency sponsor for the Fuel Working Group by December 2021.	City Administrator [August 28, 2021]	Has been implemented	The City Administrator's Office has been designated as the sponsor of, and lead agency for, the Fuel Working Group ("FWG").	**		**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R2 [for F3]	The Fuel Working Group should be reconvened by its agency sponsor by February 2022. The working group should meet at least quarterly thereafter.	Mayor [August 28, 2021]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	Pre-COVID-19, the FWG met monthly. Now that the FWG members are returning to their regular functions following the conclusion of their deployment as Disaster Service Workers to support COVID-19 response, the FWG will resume meeting on a regular basis (no less than quarterly) in the next 90 days.	Recommendation Implemented	The Fuel Working Group ("FWG") was formally reconvened in early 2022 shortly after the Civil Grand Jury Report was issued. The Department of Emergency Management and the City Administrator's Office are the lead agency sponsors, with the Executive Steering Committee meeting on a quarterly basis and working group meetings each month.	**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R2 [for F3]	The Fuel Working Group should be reconvened by its agency sponsor by February 2022. The working group should meet at least quarterly thereafter.	City Administrator [August 28, 2021]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	Pre-COVID-19, the FWG met monthly. Now that the FWG members are returning to their regular functions following the conclusion of their deployment as Disaster Service Workers to support COVID-19 response, the FWG will resume meeting on a regular basis (no less than quarterly) in the next 90 days.	Recommendation Implemented	The Fuel Working Group ("FWG") was formally reconvened in early 2022 shortly after the Civil Grand Jury Report was issued. The Department of Emergency Management and the City Administrator's Office are the lead agency sponsors, with the Executive Steering Committee meeting on a quarterly basis and working group meetings each month.	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title [Publication Date]	Recommendation Number [for Finding Number]	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2021 Response	Original 2021 Response Text <i>(provided by CGJ)</i>	2022 Response ⁽¹⁾	2022 Response Text	2023 Response ⁽¹⁾	2023 Response Text
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R3 [for F4]	The agency sponsor of the Fuel Working Group should select members with strong experience in supply chain logistics and emergency management. The Department of Emergency Management, the Office of Contract Administration, the City Administrator's Office, and other City departments who are significant users of fuel, including SFPUC, SFMTA, and DPW should dedicate staff time each month through December 2024, or until the subsequent recommendations in this report are implemented.	Mayor [August 28, 2021]	Has been implemented	Pre-COVID-19, the FWG met monthly. Members included the emergency managers from: DPW, SFMTA, SFPUC, CAO, DEM, SFFD and subject matter experts from SFO, Central Shops and Public Works. Port staff will be included once the group relaunches its regular meetings in the next 90 days.	**		**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R3 [for F4]	The agency sponsor of the Fuel Working Group should select members with strong experience in supply chain logistics and emergency management. The Department of Emergency Management, the Office of Contract Administration, the City Administrator's Office, and other City departments who are significant users of fuel, including SFPUC, SFMTA, and DPW should dedicate staff time each month through December 2024, or until the subsequent recommendations in this report are implemented.	City Administrator [August 28, 2021]	Has been implemented	Pre-COVID-19, the FWG met monthly. Members included the emergency managers from: DPW, SFMTA, SFPUC, CAO, DEM, SFFD and subject matter experts from SFO, Central Shops and Public Works. Port staff will be included once the group relaunches its regular meetings in the next 90 days.	**		**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R3 [for F4]	The agency sponsor of the Fuel Working Group should select members with strong experience in supply chain logistics and emergency management. The Department of Emergency Management, the Office of Contract Administration, the City Administrator's Office, and other City departments who are significant users of fuel, including SFPUC, SFMTA, and DPW should dedicate staff time each month through December 2024, or until the subsequent recommendations in this report are implemented.	Public Utilities Commission [August 28, 2021]	Has been implemented	Pre-COVID-19, the FWG met monthly. Members included the emergency managers from: DPW, SFMTA, SFPUC, CAO, DEM, SFFD and subject matter experts from SFO, Central Shops and Public Works. Port staff will be included once the group relaunches its regular meetings in the next 90 days.	**		**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R4 [for F5]	By December 2022, the Department of Emergency Management should compile an inventory of generators critical to life safety in the City and their locations, portability, fuel needs, tank storage capacities, and burn rates. This inventory should be updated at least annually thereafter. The inventory should include information including generator location, fuel type, connection type, and any access codes needed for emergency delivery.	Mayor [August 28, 2021]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	This recommendation will be implemented by December 2022.	Recommendation Implemented	The Fuel Workgroup has updated the City's inventory of generators, inclusive of all points of information listed in the recommendation.	**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R4 [for F5]	By December 2022, the Department of Emergency Management should compile an inventory of generators critical to life safety in the City and their locations, portability, fuel needs, tank storage capacities, and burn rates. This inventory should be updated at least annually thereafter. The inventory should include information including generator location, fuel type, connection type, and any access codes needed for emergency delivery.	Department of Emergency Management [August 28, 2021]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	This recommendation will be implemented by December 2022.	Recommendation Implemented	The Fuel Workgroup has updated the City's inventory of generators, inclusive of all points of information listed in the recommendation.	**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R5 [for F6]	By June 2023, the Department of Emergency Management should perform a team exercise to estimate likely ranges of fuel usage for critical generators in the City's inventory in the aftermath of a plausible disaster in which those usage needs would have to be met from local sources. The exercise should give lower and upper bounds stemming from possible variations in which generators would have to run and for how long.	Mayor [August 28, 2021]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	This recommendation will be implemented by June 2023.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	The estimated timeline for this project is December 2023.	Recommendation Implemented	Through a facilitated discussion and exercise, the Fuel Workgroup utilized information provided on the City Generator Inventory to estimate fuel usage rates for critical facilities. Upper bounds are established by manufacturer and/or engineering specifications and were incorporated into the exercise. Lower bounds were not considered as they are baseline standard for use and would not be conducive to planning for generators' fuel consumption. The Executive Committee for the Fuel Workgroup was briefed on this item in June 2023.
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R5 [for F6]	By June 2023, the Department of Emergency Management should perform a team exercise to estimate likely ranges of fuel usage for critical generators in the City's inventory in the aftermath of a plausible disaster in which those usage needs would have to be met from local sources. The exercise should give lower and upper bounds stemming from possible variations in which generators would have to run and for how long.	Department of Emergency Management [August 28, 2021]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	This recommendation will be implemented by December 2022.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Estimated timeline December 2023.	Recommendation Implemented	Through a facilitated discussion and exercise, the Fuel Workgroup utilized information provided on the City Generator Inventory to estimate fuel usage rates for critical facilities. Upper bounds are established by manufacturer and/or engineering specifications and were incorporated into the exercise. Lower bounds were not considered as they are baseline standard for use and would not be conducive to planning for generators' fuel consumption. The Executive Committee for the Fuel Workgroup was briefed on this item in June 2023.
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R6 [for F7]	By December 2023, the Department of Emergency Management should develop and test a plan for the quick assessment of local fuel reserves available to City agencies in a disaster, including protocols that ensure incident commanders can assess emergency fuel supply and demand in real-time citywide.	Mayor [August 28, 2021]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	This recommendation will be implemented by December 2023 in coordination with the City Administrator's Office.	Recommendation Implemented	The Fuel Workgroup has developed a survey for departments to use to provide real time. This was tested on October 28, 2022.	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title [Publication Date]	Recommendation Number [for Finding Number]	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2021 Response	Original 2021 Response Text <i>(provided by CGJ)</i>	2022 Response ⁽¹⁾	2022 Response Text	2023 Response ⁽¹⁾	2023 Response Text
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R6 [for F7]	By December 2023, the Department of Emergency Management should develop and test a plan for the quick assessment of local fuel reserves available to City agencies in a disaster, including protocols that ensure incident commanders can assess emergency fuel supply and demand in real-time citywide.	Department of Emergency Management [August 28, 2021]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	This recommendation will be implemented by December 2023 in coordination with the City Administrator's Office.	Recommendation Implemented	The Fuel Workgroup has developed a survey for departments to use to provide real time. This was tested on October 28, 2022.	**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R7 [for F8, F9]	By December 2023, the City should build, retrofit, or purchase a minimum of two additional tanker trucks that can each extract up to 2,500 gallons of fuel from a tank, even in the absence of grid power, and transport it to where it is needed. These vehicles should have the ability to transport both gasoline and diesel fuel.	City Administrator [August 28, 2021]	Requires further analysis	Central Shops is currently in the process of building one tanker truck to support refueling of critical vehicles and generators. This will supplement the existing SFFD fuel tanker truck and the one that is being purchased by the Department of Public Works. Further analysis is needed to determine the number of tanker trucks needed, the availability of additional tanker trucks if mutual aid can be exercised, and available funding. The analysis will be completed by January 31, 2023.	Recommendation Implemented	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 2000 gallons of diesel fuel in the event that 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.	**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R7 [for F9]	By December 2023, the City should build, retrofit, or purchase a minimum of two additional tanker trucks that can each extract up to 2,500 gallons of fuel from a tank, even in the absence of grid power, and transport it to where it is needed. These vehicles should have the ability to transport both gasoline and diesel fuel.	Office of Contract Administration [August 28, 2021]	Requires further analysis	Central Shops is currently in the process of building one tanker truck to support refueling of critical vehicles and generators. This will supplement the existing SFFD fuel tanker truck and the one that is being purchased by the Department of Public Works. Further analysis is needed to determine the number of tanker trucks needed, the availability of additional tanker trucks if mutual aid can be exercised, and available funding. The analysis will be completed by January 31, 2023.	Recommendation Implemented	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 2000 gallons of diesel fuel in the event that 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.	**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R8 [for F10]	By December 2022, the City should enter into Memoranda of Understanding or contracts with a minimum of two local private gas station operators to ensure that emergency vehicles can access fuel stored at their stations, including making that fuel technically accessible even in the event of a grid power outage. The operators chosen should be prioritized based on criteria relevant for usefulness in a disaster, such as: • Amount of fuel stored at the station • Availability of both gas and diesel • 24/7 staffed operation • Ability to dispense fuel without relying on grid power • Proximity to priority routes • Geographical distribution of stations (i.e., not all in the same place)	City Administrator [August 28, 2021]	Requires further analysis	By March 2022, the City will provide an analysis addressing opportunities and constraints for utilizing private gas stations for emergency use. The scope of the analysis shall include, but not be limited to: -Identification of emergency vehicles currently with and without access to private gas stations, including both City and private emergency fleet (for example, two private ambulance companies currently do utilize private gas stations): --Type --Number --Fuel needs --Analysis of private stations to identify: --Amount of fuel stored at the station --Availability of both gas and diesel --Fuel suppliers and suppliers' locations --Staffing, and self-serve capabilities --Availability of generators on-site to power pumps without grid power --Proximity to priority routes --Geographical distribution of stations in relation to potential priority routes --Ability to siphon fuel -Determination of whether private fueling locations should be added to the City's fuel plan	Requires Further Analysis	This item is still being researched within the Office of Contract Administration and the City Administrator's Office. The majority of private gas stations do not have generators and when they lose grid power and/or internet access, the gas station cannot pump fuel and shuts down. Furthermore, a mobile generator cannot simply be brought to a gas station and "plugged in." A "tap box" or other electrical connection point would need to be built into the gas station in order for a generator to be brought to the station, installed and the gas station operator allow the distribution of vehicle fuel. The new GSA-Central Shops tanker truck has the capability to remove fuel from any fuel tank, regardless of the station having electricity and transport and dispense that fuel to where its needed most. Most tanker trucks need to be fueled by a vendor and can only dispense into a tank; however, our new truck allows us to be partially independent from our fuel vendors and maximize the City-owned fuel already in City-owned tanks. Over the next 6-12 months, Central Shops will be running compatibility tests with other City agencies, ensuring that if this tanker truck will be needed, that all the mechanical components (nozzles, hose length, fixtures) are compatible with City fuel infrastructure, such as dispensing into Fire Trucks and building generators as well as removing fuel from City-owned under ground and above ground tanks. This vehicle can also pickup fuel from our vendors if there is a reduced number of vendor-provided tanker truck drivers or trucks. OCA will work the Controller's Office to see if City purchase cards can be used for this purpose instead of creating a MOU or contract.	Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual contracts with local stations would be impractical and unnecessary. Contracts would require solicitation and contract negotiations under Administrative Code Chapter 21 regulations. It is unlikely that any major corporate gasoline brand that operates stations in San Francisco would find it worthwhile to pursue the City's highly complex solicitation and contract negotiations process without any guarantee of business. The recommended alternative solution is for the City to utilize credit cards should it need to procure fuel from local private gas stations during a local emergency. City policy allows for departments to utilize Purchasing Cards (P-Cards) in emergency situations, which can be deployed by the Controller's Office (subject to the Controller's Office's approval and requirements for use). P-Cards function as normal credit cards that can be used at any entity that accepts credit card payment. Another option is for the City to procure Fleet/Fuel Cards. Fleet/Fuel Cards are also credit cards, but can be used solely at gas stations. Fleet/Fuel Cards offer the most flexibility for the City, as the card-offering companies themselves contract with hundreds of gas station brands across the country, negating the need for the City to contract with such entities, and the cards can be deployed more broadly than P-Cards (linked to individual vehicles if needed). Additionally, in the event that any particular private gas station goes down and cannot service the City, any other gas station that is still operational anywhere in the Bay Area would be available for use. The use of Fleet Cards or P-Cards, therefore allows the City much more flexibility than entering into a contract with a single supplier. Further research is needed to better understand various Fleet/Fuel Card program options, the feasibility and costs to the City to maintain Fleet/Fuel Card accounts for use solely during a local emergency, and timeframe for deployment of individual cards if needed during an emergency.

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

CGJ Year	Report Title [Publication Date]	Recommendation Number [for Finding Number]	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2021 Response	Original 2021 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2022 Response ⁽¹⁾	2022 Response Text	2023 Response ⁽¹⁾	2023 Response Text
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R8 [for F10]	By December 2022, the City should enter into Memoranda of Understanding or contracts with a minimum of two local private gas station operators to ensure that emergency vehicles can access fuel stored at their stations, including making that fuel technically accessible even in the event of a grid power outage. The operators chosen should be prioritized based on criteria relevant for usefulness in a disaster, such as: • Amount of fuel stored at the station • Availability of both gas and diesel • 24/7 staffed operation • Ability to dispense fuel without relying on grid power • Proximity to priority routes • Geographical distribution of stations (i.e., not all in the same place)	Office of Contract Administration [August 28, 2021]	Requires further analysis	By March 2022, the City will provide an analysis addressing opportunities and constraints for utilizing private gas stations for emergency use. The scope of the analysis shall include, but not be limited to: -Identification of emergency vehicles currently with and without access to private gas stations, including both City and private emergency fleet (for example, two private ambulance companies currently do utilize private gas stations): --Type --Number --Fuel needs -Analysis of private stations to identify: --Amount of fuel stored at the station --Availability of both gas and diesel --Fuel suppliers and suppliers' locations --Staffing, and self-serve capabilities --Availability of generators on-site to power pumps without grid power --Proximity to priority routes --Geographical distribution of stations in relation to potential priority routes --Ability to siphon fuel -Determination of whether private fueling locations should be added to the City's fuel plan	Requires Further Analysis	This item is still being researched within the Office of Contract Administration and the City Administrator's Office. The majority of private gas stations do not have generators and when they lose grid power and/or internet access, the gas station cannot pump fuel and shuts down. Furthermore, a mobile generator cannot simply be brought to a gas station and "plugged in." A "tap box" or other electrical connection point would need to be built into the gas station in order for a generator to be brought to the station, installed and the gas station operator allow the distribution of vehicle fuel. The new GSA-Central Shops tanker truck has the capability to remove fuel from any fuel tank, regardless of the station having electricity and transport and dispense that fuel to where its needed most. Most tanker trucks need to be fueled by a vendor and can only dispense into a tank; however, our new truck allows us to be partially independent from our fuel vendors and maximize the City-owned fuel already in City-owned tanks. Over the next 6-12 months, Central Shops will be running compatibility tests with other City agencies, ensuring that if this tanker truck will be needed, that all the mechanical components (nozzles, hose length, fixtures) are compatible with City fuel infrastructure, such as dispensing into Fire Trucks and building generators as well as removing fuel from City-owned under ground and above ground tanks. This vehicle can also pickup fuel from our vendors if there is a reduced number of vendor-provided tanker truck drivers or trucks. OCA will work the Controller's Office to see if City purchase cards can be used for this purpose instead of creating a MOU or contract.	Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	As a result of our research and analysis, OCA has determined that individual contracts with local stations would be impractical and unnecessary. Contracts would require solicitation and contract negotiations under Administrative Code Chapter 21 regulations. It is unlikely that any major corporate gasoline brand that operates stations in San Francisco would find it worthwhile to pursue the City's highly complex solicitation and contract negotiations process without any guarantee of business. The recommended alternative solution is for the City to utilize credit cards should it need to procure fuel from local private gas stations during a local emergency. City policy allows for departments to utilize Purchasing Cards (P-Cards) in emergency situations, which can be deployed by the Controller's Office (subject to the Controller's Office's approval and requirements for use). P-Cards function as normal credit cards that can be used at any entity that accepts credit card payment. Another option is for the City to procure Fleet/Fuel Cards. Fleet/Fuel Cards are also credit cards, but can be used solely at gas stations. Fleet/Fuel Cards offer the most flexibility for the City, as the card-offering companies themselves contract with hundreds of gas station brands across the country, negating the need for the City to contract with such entities, and the cards can be deployed more broadly than P-Cards (linked to individual vehicles if needed). Additionally, in the event that any particular private gas station goes down and cannot service the City, any other gas station that is still operational anywhere in the Bay Area would be available for use. The use of Fleet Cards or P-Cards, therefore allows the City much more flexibility than entering into a contract with a single supplier. Further research is needed to better understand various Fleet/Fuel Card program options, the feasibility and costs to the City to maintain Fleet/Fuel Card accounts for use solely during a local emergency, and timeframe for deployment of individual cards if needed during an emergency.
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R9 [for F11]	In the 2023 Capital Plan, the City should commit to building an additional fueling station with five-ten thousand gallon storage capacity for both gasoline and diesel fuels in the space to be freed up at the Southeast Treatment Plant when the digester replacement work is done, or to identify an alternate site for an additional fueling station if the Southeast plant is not available.	Mayor [August 28, 2021]	Requires further analysis	The City Administrator's Office (ADM), 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 understand if there are locations in San Francisco that are viable for such a storage project. This 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 Southeast Treatment Plant (SEP) for fuel storage, the SFPUC is completing a SEP Campus Plan to determine how to best utilize the space at SEP. Any analysis of using SEP for fuel storage will need to be completed in the context of the SEP Campus Plan, and must include analysis around future SFPUC Wastewater and Recycled Water plans for SEP, the safety of storing large amounts of fuel in the same footprint as a wastewater treatment plant, and ensure consistency and compliance with the SFPUC's Racial Justice Resolution and Environmental Justice Policies regarding land use equity objectives. The analysis will be completed by January 31, 2023 for consideration in the FY 2024-33 Capital Plan.	Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	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 fuel storage, particularly in light of safety concerns, social implications, and higher priority needs for space and funding resources.	**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R9 [for F11]	In the 2023 Capital Plan, the City should commit to building an additional fueling station with five-ten thousand gallon storage capacity for both gasoline and diesel fuels in the space to be freed up at the Southeast Treatment Plant when the digester replacement work is done, or to identify an alternate site for an additional fueling station if the Southeast plant is not available.	City Administrator [August 28, 2021]	Requires further analysis	The City Administrator's Office (ADM), 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 understand if there are locations in San Francisco that are viable for such a storage project. This 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 Southeast Treatment Plant (SEP) for fuel storage, the SFPUC is completing a SEP Campus Plan to determine how to best utilize the space at SEP. Any analysis of using SEP for fuel storage will need to be completed in the context of the SEP Campus Plan, and must include analysis around future SFPUC Wastewater and Recycled Water plans for SEP, the safety of storing large amounts of fuel in the same footprint as a wastewater treatment plant, and ensure consistency and compliance with the SFPUC's Racial Justice Resolution and Environmental Justice Policies regarding land use equity objectives. The analysis will be completed by January 31, 2023 for consideration in the FY 2024-33 Capital Plan.	Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	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 fuel storage, particularly in light of safety concerns, social implications, and higher priority needs for space and funding resources.	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title [Publication Date]	Recommendation Number [for Finding Number]	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2021 Response	Original 2021 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2022 Response ⁽¹⁾	2022 Response Text	2023 Response ⁽¹⁾	2023 Response Text
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R9 [for F11]	In the 2023 Capital Plan, the City should commit to building an additional fueling station with five-ten thousand gallon storage capacity for both gasoline and diesel fuels in the space to be freed up at the Southeast Treatment Plant when the digester replacement work is done, or to identify an alternate site for an additional fueling station if the Southeast plant is not available.	Office of Resilience and Capital Planning [August 28, 2021]	Requires further analysis	The City Administrator's Office (ADM), 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 understand if there are locations in San Francisco that are viable for such a storage project. This 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 Southeast Treatment Plant (SEP) for fuel storage, the SFPUC is completing a SEP Campus Plan to determine how to best utilize the space at SEP. Any analysis of using SEP for fuel storage will need to be completed in the context of the SEP Campus Plan, and must include analysis around future SFPUC Wastewater and Recycled Water plans for SEP, the safety of storing large amounts of fuel in the same footprint as a wastewater treatment plant, and ensure consistency and compliance with the SFPUC's Racial Justice Resolution and Environmental Justice Policies regarding land use equity objectives. The analysis will be completed by January 31, 2023 for consideration in the FY 2024-33 Capital Plan.	Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	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 fuel storage, particularly in light of safety concerns, social implications, and higher priority needs for space and funding resources.	**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R9 [for F11]	In the 2023 Capital Plan, the City should commit to building an additional fueling station with five-ten thousand gallon storage capacity for both gasoline and diesel fuels in the space to be freed up at the Southeast Treatment Plant when the digester replacement work is done, or to identify an alternate site for an additional fueling station if the Southeast plant is not available.	Public Utilities Commission [August 28, 2021]	Requires further analysis	The City Administrator's Office (ADM), 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 understand if there are locations in San Francisco that are viable for such a storage project. This 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 Southeast Treatment Plant (SEP) for fuel storage, the SFPUC is completing a SEP Campus Plan to determine how to best utilize the space at SEP. Any analysis of using SEP for fuel storage will need to be completed in the context of the SEP Campus Plan, and must include analysis around future SFPUC Wastewater and Recycled Water plans for SEP, the safety of storing large amounts of fuel in the same footprint as a wastewater treatment plant, and ensure consistency and compliance with the SFPUC's Racial Justice Resolution and Environmental Justice Policies regarding land use equity objectives. The analysis will be completed by January 31, 2023 for consideration in the FY 2024-33 Capital Plan.	Requires Further Analysis	As provided in the SFPUC 2021 response to the Controller, SFPUC has been analyzing the use of the Southeast Treatment Plant (SEP) for fuel storage. The analysis will be completed in the context of the SEP Campus Plan. The plan will include an examination of future SFPUC Wastewater and Recycled Water plans for SEP, the safety of storing large amounts of fuel in the same footprint as a wastewater treatment plant, and impact of the plan on land use equity objectives under the SFPUC's Racial Justice Resolution and Environmental Justice Policies. The analysis will be completed by January 31, 2023, for consideration in the FY 2024-33 Capital Plan.	Requires Further Analysis	The SFPUC has been analyzing the use of the Southeast Treatment Plant (SEP) for fuel storage. The analysis will be completed in the context of the SEP Campus Plan. The plan will include an examination of future SFPUC Wastewater and Recycled Water plans for SEP, the safety of storing large amounts of fuel in the same footprint as a wastewater treatment plant, and impact of the plan on land use equity objectives under the SFPUC's Racial Justice Resolution and Environmental Justice Policies. The analysis has been delayed due to recent management turnover and will be completed by June 30, 2024.
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R9 [for F11]	In the 2023 Capital Plan, the City should commit to building an additional fueling station with five-ten thousand gallon storage capacity for both gasoline and diesel fuels in the space to be freed up at the Southeast Treatment Plant when the digester replacement work is done, or to identify an alternate site for an additional fueling station if the Southeast plant is not available.	Board of Supervisors [September 27, 2021]	Requires further analysis	Recommendation No. R9 requires further analysis by the City Administrator's Office, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, and the Fuel Working Group for alternative sites as the Southeast Treatment Plant is not an appropriate location given the community's long fought efforts for environmental justice to remove toxins and pollutants from District 10 and any alternate sites should consider cumulative environmental impacts on vulnerable and impacted communities, which should be considered concurrently with the City Administrator's planned analysis.	Requires Further Analysis	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.	Requires further analysis	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 at the Board of Supervisors or its committees; therefore, the 2022 Response still applies.)
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R10 [for F12]	By December 2022, the Office of Contract Administration should prepare a supply chain vulnerability assessment of the City's two contracted fuel suppliers.	City Administrator [August 28, 2021]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	The California Energy Commission may have already 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 supply chain vulnerability assessment by June 2022.	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	Draft in progress.	Recommendation Implemented	Major fuel vendors provide thousands of gallons of gasoline and diesel fuel to Bay Area jurisdiction. As is the case with any ground-transportable product, the entire chain is susceptible to interruptions due to direct and indirect impacts, including those unrelated to a local emergency (e.g. labor shortages, equipment breakdowns, etc.). That said, OCA has determined that at least one of the City's current fuel suppliers located in the East Bay does have the ability to ship fuel to the City via barge. Further, many fuel suppliers can also provide "wet hosing," whereby tanker trucks can directly fuel individual vehicles and equipment, providing a more mobile, flexible option for fueling. Port locations for docking a barge, requirements for further transport of fuel from a barge, and requirements for wet-hosing still need to be determined. Note also that OCA is expected to enter into contract shortly with a gasoline supplier that can deliver fuel from various locations across the Bay Area, including from the Peninsula (the current contracts for diesel fuel will also be ending shortly and will be re-bid). OCA will consider vulnerabilities with any new fuel suppliers. However, it's important to note that delivery requirements and capabilities when utilizing any delivery method with any supplier during a local emergency will be heavily dictated by conditions on the ground during the emergency - availability of electricity, labor, unobstructed routes, and undamaged piers and City fueling stations, among others. The City can procure what it needs from any supplier in the event of an emergency, without the need for a contract. Should an emergency occur, OCA would immediately identify any and all suppliers that have the capability to provide fuel based on conditions on the ground and market conditions at that time. If the contracted supplier(s) at that time cannot deliver, OCA would procure from any suppliers that can deliver to the City by any available transport methods. The City would also seek State and Federal assistance for continued fuel deliveries, and mutual aid from nearby jurisdictions that are not impacted by the emergency. Finally, as noted above, the City can additionally procure fuel from vendors within the city via P-Cards and Fleet/Fuel Cards.

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

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

CGJ Year	Report Title [Publication Date]	Recommendation Number [for Finding Number]	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2021 Response	Original 2021 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2022 Response ⁽¹⁾	2022 Response Text	2023 Response ⁽¹⁾	2023 Response Text
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R10 [for F12]	By December 2022, the Office of Contract Administration should prepare a supply chain vulnerability assessment of the City's two contracted fuel suppliers.	Office of Contract Administration [August 28, 2021]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	The California Energy Commission may have already 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 supply chain vulnerability assessment by June 2022.	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	Draft in progress.	Recommendation Implemented	Major fuel vendors provide thousands of gallons of gasoline and diesel fuel to Bay Area jurisdiction. As is the case with any ground-transportable product, the entire chain is susceptible to interruptions due to direct and indirect impacts, including those unrelated to a local emergency (e.g. labor shortages, equipment breakdowns, etc.). That said, OCA has determined that at least one of the City's current fuel suppliers located in the East Bay does have the ability to ship fuel to the City via barge. Further, many fuel suppliers can also provide "wet hosing," whereby tanker trucks can directly fuel individual vehicles and equipment, providing a more mobile, flexible option for fueling. Port locations for docking a barge, requirements for further transport of fuel from a barge, and requirements for wet-hosing still need to be determined. Note also that OCA is expected to enter into contract shortly with a gasoline supplier that can deliver fuel from various locations across the Bay Area, including from the Peninsula (the current contracts for diesel fuel will also be ending shortly and will be re-bid). OCA will consider vulnerabilities with any new fuel suppliers. However, it's important to note that delivery requirements and capabilities when utilizing any delivery method with any supplier during a local emergency will be heavily dictated by conditions on the ground during the emergency - availability of electricity, labor, unobstructed routes, and undamaged piers and City fueling stations, among others. The City can procure what it needs from any supplier in the event of an emergency, without the need for a contract. Should an emergency occur, OCA would immediately identify any and all suppliers that have the capability to provide fuel based on conditions on the ground and market conditions at that time. If the contracted supplier(s) at that time cannot deliver, OCA would procure from any suppliers that can deliver to the City by any available transport methods. The City would also seek State and Federal assistance for continued fuel deliveries, and mutual aid from nearby jurisdictions that are not impacted by the emergency. Finally, as noted above, the City can additionally procure fuel from vendors within the city via P-Cards and Fleet/Fuel Cards.
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R11 [for F13]	If the two contracted fuel suppliers are found to have joint vulnerabilities that cannot be mitigated adequately, the Office of Contract Administration should enter into a Memorandum of Understanding by December 2023 for emergency backup delivery with a vendor whose facilities and equipment are based outside of the Bay Area.	City Administrator [August 28, 2021]	Requires further analysis	Within six months, the City will undertake an analysis to identify vulnerabilities of current fuel vendors (Western States Oil and Golden Gate Petroleum) and assessing potential alternative vendors outside of the Bay Area. The scope of the analysis shall include, but not be limited to: •Locations of fuel depots for each current vendor, and assessment of vulnerabilities at each location •Current vendors' fuel transport/delivery options should any of their fuel depots become inaccessible, including assessment of deliveries by road/highway and water (barge). •City's fuel transport options from within the Bay Area should vendors be unable to deliver, including ability for new City fuel truck(s) to transport from the fuel depots within region •Identification and assessment of fuel vendors outside the Bay Area, including locations/distance, transportation options, fuel types, and potential delivery volumes and turnaround time.	Requires Further Analysis	Research underway.	Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	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 for emergency fuel deliveries is the right approach, as such contract would be difficult to procure (major suppliers would not pursue a contract without guarantee of business) and would become stagnant since it would not take current on-the-ground conditions into account. Given that 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 recommended multi-pronged procurement approach is to: a) utilize the City's emergency procurement authority to purchase via P-Cards or Fleet/Fuel Cards for in-city fueling and/or procure from any other suppliers outside of the City based on ability to deliver and on-the-ground conditions, b) seek State and Federal assistance for continued fuel deliveries, and c) seek mutual aid from nearby jurisdictions that are not impacted by the emergency.
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R11 [for F13]	If the two contracted fuel suppliers are found to have joint vulnerabilities that cannot be mitigated adequately, the Office of Contract Administration should enter into a Memorandum of Understanding by December 2023 for emergency backup delivery with a vendor whose facilities and equipment are based outside of the Bay Area.	Office of Contract Administration [August 28, 2021]	Requires further analysis	Within six months, the City will undertake an analysis to identify vulnerabilities of current fuel vendors (Western States Oil and Golden Gate Petroleum) and assessing potential alternative vendors outside of the Bay Area. The scope of the analysis shall include, but not be limited to: •Locations of fuel depots for each current vendor, and assessment of vulnerabilities at each location •Current vendors' fuel transport/delivery options should any of their fuel depots become inaccessible, including assessment of deliveries by road/highway and water (barge). •City's fuel transport options from within the Bay Area should vendors be unable to deliver, including ability for new City fuel truck(s) to transport from the fuel depots within region •Identification and assessment of fuel vendors outside the Bay Area, including locations/distance, transportation options, fuel types, and potential delivery volumes and turnaround time	Requires Further Analysis	Research underway.	Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	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 for emergency fuel deliveries is the right approach, as such contract would be difficult to procure (major suppliers would not pursue a contract without guarantee of business) and would become stagnant since it would not take current on-the-ground conditions into account. Given that 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 recommended multi-pronged procurement approach is to: a) utilize the City's emergency procurement authority to purchase via P-Cards or Fleet/Fuel Cards for in-city fueling and/or procure from any other suppliers outside of the City based on ability to deliver and on-the-ground conditions, b) seek State and Federal assistance for continued fuel deliveries, and c) seek mutual aid from nearby jurisdictions that are not impacted by the emergency.
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R12 [for F14]	By December 2021, the Fuel Working Group should ask each City-contracted fuel supplier to send a qualified representative to the Group's planning meetings, field simulations, and other events where the technical advice and operational experience of fuel distributors are needed to help secure disaster readiness.	Mayor [August 28, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	The City has continuously engaged with its fuel vendors in fuel resilience discussions, planning and exercises in numerous ways over the years. Our vendors have informally participated in fuel exercises, and provide ongoing guidance and technical advice and assistance in improving our fuel resilience and developing our fuel plans. However, we do not agree that it would be appropriate to include them formally in the City's exercises because there is often confidential information relayed on the City's critical infrastructure. In addition, there may be additional costs incurred on contracts as a result of this requirement. We agree, however, that we should explore additional ways to engage our vendors in assisting the City proactively plan for events and strengthen fuel resiliency. This will be formally included in a future FWG agenda for consideration and recommendation to DEM.	**		**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title [Publication Date]	Recommendation Number [for Finding Number]	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2021 Response	Original 2021 Response Text <i>(provided by CGJ)</i>	2022 Response ⁽¹⁾	2022 Response Text	2023 Response ⁽¹⁾	2023 Response Text
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R12 [for F14]	By December 2021, the Fuel Working Group should ask each City-contracted fuel supplier to send a qualified representative to the Group's planning meetings, field simulations, and other events where the technical advice and operational experience of fuel distributors are needed to help secure disaster readiness.	City Administrator [August 28, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	The City has continuously engaged with its fuel vendors in fuel resilience discussions, planning and exercises in numerous ways over the years. Our vendors have informally participated in fuel exercises, and provide ongoing guidance and technical advice and assistance in improving our fuel resilience and developing our fuel plans. However, we do not agree that it would be appropriate to include them formally in the City's exercises because there is often confidential information relayed on the City's critical infrastructure. In addition, there may be additional costs incurred on contracts as a result of this requirement. We agree, however, that we should explore additional ways to engage our vendors in assisting the City proactively plan for events and strengthen fuel resiliency. This will be formally included in a future FWG agenda for consideration and recommendation to DEM.	**		**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R13 [for F15]	By December 2023, as part of a Fleet Week live exercise, the Department of Emergency Management and the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning should test a scenario in which the City's normal supply line is damaged and delivery by water is necessary. This exercise should include a full demonstration of marine cargo delivery, readiness of the staging area, performance of the transfer-storage-filling equipment, and performance of the tanker trucks.	Mayor [August 28, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	The San Francisco Fleet Week Exercise Program is developed jointly between San Francisco emergency managers, local first responder stakeholders, and state and federal military partners based on mutual need to test shared vulnerabilities. Fuel delivery and resilience was exercised in 2018 and 2019 and response to many other risks need to be examined, practiced and tested. Therefore, it is unlikely that fuel resilience will be tested again before December 2023.	**		**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R13 [for F15]	By December 2023, as part of a Fleet Week live exercise, the Department of Emergency Management and the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning should test a scenario in which the City's normal supply line is damaged and delivery by water is necessary. This exercise should include a full demonstration of marine cargo delivery, readiness of the staging area, performance of the transfer-storage-filling equipment, and performance of the tanker trucks.	City Administrator [August 28, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	The San Francisco Fleet Week Exercise Program is developed jointly between San Francisco emergency managers, local first responder stakeholders, and state and federal military partners based on mutual need to test shared vulnerabilities. Fuel delivery and resilience was exercised in 2018 and 2019 and response to many other risks need to be examined, practiced and tested. Therefore, it is unlikely that fuel resilience will be tested again before December 2023.	**		**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R13 [for F15]	By December 2023, as part of a Fleet Week live exercise, the Department of Emergency Management and the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning should test a scenario in which the City's normal supply line is damaged and delivery by water is necessary. This exercise should include a full demonstration of marine cargo delivery, readiness of the staging area, performance of the transfer-storage-filling equipment, and performance of the tanker trucks.	Department of Emergency Management [August 28, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	The San Francisco Fleet Week Exercise Program is developed jointly between San Francisco emergency managers, local first responder stakeholders, and state and federal military partners based on mutual need to test shared vulnerabilities. Fuel delivery and resilience was exercised in 2018 and 2019 and response to many other risks need to be examined, practiced and tested. Therefore, it is unlikely that fuel resilience will be tested again before December 2023.	**		**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R13 [for F15]	By December 2023, as part of a Fleet Week live exercise, the Department of Emergency Management and the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning should test a scenario in which the City's normal supply line is damaged and delivery by water is necessary. This exercise should include a full demonstration of marine cargo delivery, readiness of the staging area, performance of the transfer-storage-filling equipment, and performance of the tanker trucks.	Office of Resilience and Capital Planning [August 28, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	The San Francisco Fleet Week Exercise Program is developed jointly between San Francisco emergency managers, local first responder stakeholders, and state and federal military partners based on mutual need to test shared vulnerabilities. Fuel delivery and resilience was exercised in 2018 and 2019 and response to many other risks need to be examined, practiced and tested. Therefore, it is unlikely that fuel resilience will be tested again before December 2023.	**		**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R14 [for F15]	By December 2023, the Department of Emergency Management, the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning, and the Port should prepare a seismic vulnerability assessment of likely delivery sites for emergency fuel delivery by water, including Pier 96, Pier 80, Pier 50, and at least one alternative delivery site.	Mayor [August 28, 2021]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	The Port completed an earthquake and flood risk assessment of all northern waterfront facilities in November 2020 and commenced an earthquake assessment of Piers 50, 80, and 94/96 that is scheduled for completion in fall 2021. The new earthquake assessment information will inform a joint Port and DEM disaster response exercise focused on evaluating missions and capabilities including fuel supply. Results are expected by the end of 2021 and will help inform Port investments in earthquake resilience and disaster response.	Recommendation Implemented	Results from the Multi-Hazard Risk Assessment and joint Port and DEM disaster response exercise have informed Port project planning and investments in earthquake resilience and disaster response, including Embarcadero Early Projects and the FY2024-33 Capital Plan. Results from the joint Port and DEM exercise and next steps were presented at the June 22, 2022 Lifelines Council Meeting.	**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R14 [for F15]	By December 2023, the Department of Emergency Management, the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning, and the Port should prepare a seismic vulnerability assessment of likely delivery sites for emergency fuel delivery by water, including Pier 96, Pier 80, Pier 50, and at least one alternative delivery site.	City Administrator [August 28, 2021]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	The Port completed an earthquake and flood risk assessment of all northern waterfront facilities in November 2020 and commenced an earthquake assessment of Piers 50, 80, and 94/96 that is scheduled for completion in fall 2021. The new earthquake assessment information will inform a joint Port and DEM disaster response exercise focused on evaluating missions and capabilities including fuel supply. Results are expected by the end of 2021 and will help inform Port investments in earthquake resilience and disaster response.	Recommendation Implemented	Results from the Multi-Hazard Risk Assessment and joint Port and DEM disaster response exercise have informed Port project planning and investments in earthquake resilience and disaster response, including Embarcadero Early Projects and the FY2024-33 Capital Plan. Results from the joint Port and DEM exercise and next steps were presented at the June 22, 2022 Lifelines Council Meeting.	**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R14 [for F15]	By December 2023, the Department of Emergency Management, the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning, and the Port should prepare a seismic vulnerability assessment of likely delivery sites for emergency fuel delivery by water, including Pier 96, Pier 80, Pier 50, and at least one alternative delivery site.	Department of Emergency Management [August 28, 2021]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	The Port completed an earthquake and flood risk assessment of all northern waterfront facilities in November 2020 and commenced an earthquake assessment of Piers 50, 80, and 94/96 that is scheduled for completion in fall 2021. The new earthquake assessment information will inform a joint Port and DEM disaster response exercise focused on evaluating missions and capabilities including fuel supply. Results are expected by the end of 2021 and will help inform Port investments in earthquake resilience and disaster response.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Estimated timeline December 2023.	Requires Further Analysis	The Port of San Francisco has done significant work in conducting seismic assessments of all facilities through the Waterfront Resilience Project. Further analysis is necessary to determine whether this recommendation is necessary as there is no over-water bulk liquid transfer or storage capability in the City and County of San Francisco.
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R14 [for F15]	By December 2023, the Department of Emergency Management, the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning, and the Port should prepare a seismic vulnerability assessment of likely delivery sites for emergency fuel delivery by water, including Pier 96, Pier 80, Pier 50, and at least one alternative delivery site.	Office of Resilience and Capital Planning [August 28, 2021]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	The Port completed an earthquake and flood risk assessment of all northern waterfront facilities in November 2020 and commenced an earthquake assessment of Piers 50, 80, and 94/96 that is scheduled for completion in fall 2021. The new earthquake assessment information will inform a joint Port and DEM disaster response exercise focused on evaluating missions and capabilities including fuel supply. Results are expected by the end of 2021 and will help inform Port investments in earthquake resilience and disaster response.	Recommendation Implemented	Results from the Multi-Hazard Risk Assessment and joint Port and DEM disaster response exercise have informed Port project planning and investments in earthquake resilience and disaster response, including Embarcadero Early Projects and the FY2024-33 Capital Plan. Results from the joint Port and DEM exercise and next steps were presented at the June 22, 2022 Lifelines Council Meeting.	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title [Publication Date]	Recommendation Number [for Finding Number]	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2021 Response	Original 2021 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2022 Response ⁽¹⁾	2022 Response Text	2023 Response ⁽¹⁾	2023 Response Text
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R15 [for F16]	By December 2022, the Department of Emergency Management should publish an analysis of the priority routes determining whether they will allow sufficiently reliable refueling of critical backup generators and fleet vehicles.	Mayor [August 28, 2021]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	This recommendation will be implemented by December 2022.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Estimated timeline December 2023.	Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The Department of Emergency Management has already developed a priority routes map through the city's Disaster Debris Management Plan. The Department also maintains a critical facilities list and map within ArcGIS which is consistently updated. However, since the impacts of any catastrophic incident are unknown, it is not warranted to conduct and publish an analysis of our existing priority routes; the existing priority routes are already an indication of San Francisco's best efforts to work within the confines of hazard-based assumptions and were selected with the most important priorities in mind, including fueling of fleet and backup generators.
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R15 [for F16]	By December 2022, the Department of Emergency Management should publish an analysis of the priority routes determining whether they will allow sufficiently reliable refueling of critical backup generators and fleet vehicles.	Department of Emergency Management [August 28, 2021]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	This recommendation will be implemented by December 2022.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	Estimated timeline December 2023.	Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The Department of Emergency Management has already developed a priority routes map through the city's Disaster Debris Management Plan. The Department also maintains a critical facilities list and map within ArcGIS which is consistently updated. However, since the impacts of any catastrophic incident are unknown, it is not warranted to conduct and publish an analysis of our existing priority routes; the existing priority routes are already an indication of San Francisco's best efforts to work within the confines of hazard-based assumptions and were selected with the most important priorities in mind, including fueling of fleet and backup generators.
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R16 [for F1, F2, F17]	By June 2022, the City Administrator's Office should publish a San Francisco Fuel Plan developed in collaboration with the Fuel Working Group. The Fuel Plan should cover key resilience measures such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Processes and timescales for identifying fuel on hand in City-accessible storage Citywide policies for maintaining fuel reserves in available tanks (e.g., keeping fleet vehicles topped up at the end of each day, reserve requirements for generator tanks) Keeping track of burn rates in normal and plausible emergency scenarios Information centralization for key sources and users of fuel, (e.g., types of hose connections used by fuel tanks) Scheduling drills around emergency fuel deliveries including surrounding counties Functional evaluation of city assets needed for emergency fuel delivery (e.g., piers, roadways, and equipment) Reviewing city contracts with fuel vendors Developing specifications for equipment that needs to be purchased The Fuel Plan should also incorporate logistical lessons learned from the COVID pandemic.	Mayor [August 28, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	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.	**	**		
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R16 [for F17]	By June 2022, the City Administrator's Office should publish a San Francisco Fuel Plan developed in collaboration with the Fuel Working Group. The Fuel Plan should cover key resilience measures such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Processes and timescales for identifying fuel on hand in City-accessible storage Citywide policies for maintaining fuel reserves in available tanks (e.g., keeping fleet vehicles topped up at the end of each day, reserve requirements for generator tanks) Keeping track of burn rates in normal and plausible emergency scenarios Information centralization for key sources and users of fuel, (e.g., types of hose connections used by fuel tanks) Scheduling drills around emergency fuel deliveries including surrounding counties Functional evaluation of city assets needed for emergency fuel delivery (e.g., piers, roadways, and equipment) Reviewing city contracts with fuel vendors Developing specifications for equipment that needs to be purchased The Fuel Plan should also incorporate logistical lessons learned from the COVID pandemic.	City Administrator [August 28, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	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.	**	**		
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R17 [for F18]	In the 2023 Capital Plan, the City should commit to funding capital projects that are identified in the Fuel Plan as a high priority to improve fuel resilience in the City over the subsequent ten years.	Mayor [August 28, 2021]	Requires further analysis	Fuel resilience is critical to City operations. When developing the City's Capital Plan, the City should consider available alternative methods to building fuel resilience as well as other immediate/critical citywide capital needs. The analysis 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 be more efficient and appropriate in a disaster, the Capital Planning Committee dedicated funding to fuel storage tank replacement and strengthening in existing locations in the FY22-23 Capital Budget.	**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R17 [for F18]	In the 2023 Capital Plan, the City should commit to funding capital projects that are identified in the Fuel Plan as a high priority to improve fuel resilience in the City over the subsequent ten years.	City Administrator [August 28, 2021]	Requires further analysis	Fuel resilience is critical to City operations. When developing the City's Capital Plan, the City should consider available alternative methods to building fuel resilience as well as other immediate/critical citywide capital needs. The analysis 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 be more efficient and appropriate in a disaster, the Capital Planning Committee dedicated funding to fuel storage tank replacement and strengthening in existing locations in the FY22-23 Capital Budget.	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title [Publication Date]	Recommendation Number [for Finding Number]	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2021 Response	Original 2021 Response Text <i>(provided by CGJ)</i>	2022 Response ⁽¹⁾	2022 Response Text	2023 Response ⁽¹⁾	2023 Response Text
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R17 [for F18]	In the 2023 Capital Plan, the City should commit to funding capital projects that are identified in the Fuel Plan as a high priority to improve fuel resilience in the City over the subsequent ten years.	Office of Resilience and Capital Planning [August 28, 2021]	Requires further analysis	Fuel resilience is critical to City operations. When developing the City's Capital Plan, the City should consider available alternative methods to building fuel resilience as well as other immediate/critical citywide capital needs. The analysis 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 be more efficient and appropriate in a disaster, the Capital Planning Committee dedicated funding to fuel storage tank replacement and strengthening in existing locations in the FY22-23 Capital Budget.	**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R17 [for F18]	In the 2023 Capital Plan, the City should commit to funding capital projects that are identified in the Fuel Plan as a high priority to improve fuel resilience in the City over the subsequent ten years.	Board of Supervisors [September 27, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	Recommendation No. R17 will not be implemented as it is not within the purview of the Board of Supervisors due to our agency's lack of direct jurisdiction over projects within the City's Capital Plan.	**		**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R18 [for F19]	In the 2023 Capital Plan, the City should specify how it will provide at least \$10 million in dedicated funding for fuel resilience capital projects within the next ten years using general obligation bond revenue.	Mayor [August 28, 2021]	Requires further analysis	Fuel resilience is critical to City operations. When developing the City's Capital Plan, the City should consider available alternative methods to building fuel resilience as well as other immediate/critical citywide capital needs. The analysis will be completed by January 31, 2023 for consideration in the FY 2024-33 Capital Plan.	Will Not Be Implemented: Not Reasonable	The City has not agreed to commit \$10 million to fuel resilience, however we have acquired a tanker truck and funded fuel storage tank replacement and strengthening. There will be an opportunity re-evaluate future priorities with the 2027 Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response (ESER) Bond.	**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R18 [for F19]	In the 2023 Capital Plan, the City should specify how it will provide at least \$10 million in dedicated funding for fuel resilience capital projects within the next ten years using general obligation bond revenue.	City Administrator [August 28, 2021]	Requires further analysis	Fuel resilience is critical to City operations. When developing the City's Capital Plan, the City should consider available alternative methods to building fuel resilience as well as other immediate/critical citywide capital needs. The analysis will be completed by January 31, 2023 for consideration in the FY 2024-33 Capital Plan.	Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The City has not agreed to commit \$10 million to fuel resilience, however we have acquired a tanker truck and funded fuel storage tank replacement and strengthening. There will be an opportunity re-evaluate future priorities with the 2027 Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response (ESER) Bond.	**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R18 [for F19]	In the 2023 Capital Plan, the City should specify how it will provide at least \$10 million in dedicated funding for fuel resilience capital projects within the next ten years using general obligation bond revenue.	Office of Resilience and Capital Planning [August 28, 2021]	Requires further analysis	Fuel resilience is critical to City operations. When developing the City's Capital Plan, the City should consider available alternative methods to building fuel resilience as well as other immediate/critical citywide capital needs. The analysis will be completed by January 31, 2023 for consideration in the FY 2024-33 Capital Plan.	Will Not Be Implemented: Not Reasonable	The City has not agreed to commit \$10 million to fuel resilience, however we have acquired a tanker truck and funded fuel storage tank replacement and strengthening. There will be an opportunity re-evaluate future priorities with the 2027 Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response (ESER) Bond.	**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R18 [for F19]	In the 2023 Capital Plan, the City should specify how it will provide at least \$10 million in dedicated funding for fuel resilience capital projects within the next ten years using general obligation bond revenue.	Board of Supervisors [September 27, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	Recommendation No. [R18] will not be implemented as it is not within the purview of the Board of Supervisors due to our agency's lack of direct jurisdiction over funding mechanisms for projects within the City's Capital Plan.	**		**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R19 [for F20]	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 mobile and stationary battery sources, taking into account not only the present state of battery technology but likely future developments in upcoming decades.	City Administrator [August 28, 2021]	Requires further analysis	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 (ORCP) has evaluated this recommendation and determined that it is not an appropriate charge for ORCP. ORCP has therefore referred this recommendation to the Department of the Environment for further review and action as appropriate.	**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R19 [for F20]	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 mobile and stationary battery sources, taking into account not only the present state of battery technology but likely future developments in upcoming decades.	Office of Resilience and Capital Planning [August 28, 2021]	Requires further analysis	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 (ORCP) has evaluated this recommendation and determined that it is not an appropriate charge for ORCP. ORCP has therefore referred this recommendation to the Department of the Environment for further review and action as appropriate.	**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R20 [for F21]	By December 2024, the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning should publish a plan for achieving disaster resilience with a zero-emissions City vehicle fleet. This plan should analyze the stationary backup power sources that might be needed to recharge critical response vehicles in the event of a disaster and how bidirectional charging technology might be used to enable the batteries in City fleet vehicles to serve as mobile backup power sources analogous to mobile backup generators but also likely future developments.	City Administrator [August 28, 2021]	Requires further analysis	This recommendation needs further analysis. Specifically, the analysis will inform the recommended plan. For instance, the analysis will identify bi-directional charging applications (case studies, technologies) and their barriers / how to overcome them. It will also identify the vehicle types / cohort of mixed vehicles ideal for vehicle-to-infrastructure (V2I), as well as location of those vehicles and general, preliminary estimates of any grid and City facility electrical upgrades necessary to support V2I. Additionally, it should address the various emergency infrastructure and automation required to enable V2I - as well as their costs. Finally, the analysis must include participation from the SFPUC because subject matter expertise in behind-the-meter electrical infrastructure and jurisdiction over City facility connections to the electric grid. This analysis will be completed by December 31, 2022.	Recommendation Implemented	ORCP has evaluated this recommendation and determined that it is not an appropriate charge for ORCP. ORCP has therefore referred this recommendation to the Department of the Environment for further review and action as appropriate.	**	
2020-21	A Fluid Concern: San Francisco Must Improve Fuel Resilience [June 29, 2021]	R20 [for F21]	By December 2024, the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning should publish a plan for achieving disaster resilience with a zero-emissions City vehicle fleet. This plan should analyze the stationary backup power sources that might be needed to recharge critical response vehicles in the event of a disaster and how bidirectional charging technology might be used to enable the batteries in City fleet vehicles to serve as mobile backup power sources analogous to mobile backup generators but also likely future developments.	Office of Resilience and Capital Planning [August 28, 2021]	Requires further analysis	This recommendation needs further analysis. Specifically, the analysis will inform the recommended plan. For instance, the analysis will identify bi-directional charging applications (case studies, technologies) and their barriers / how to overcome them. It will also identify the vehicle types / cohort of mixed vehicles ideal for vehicle-to-infrastructure (V2I), as well as location of those vehicles and general, preliminary estimates of any grid and City facility electrical upgrades necessary to support V2I. Additionally, it should address the various emergency infrastructure and automation required to enable V2I - as well as their costs. Finally, the analysis must include participation from the SFPUC because subject matter expertise in behind-the-meter electrical infrastructure and jurisdiction over City facility connections to the electric grid. This analysis will be completed by December 31, 2022.	Recommendation Implemented	ORCP has evaluated this recommendation and determined that it is not an appropriate charge for ORCP. ORCP has therefore referred this recommendation to the Department of the Environment for further review and action as appropriate.	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title [Publication Date]	Recommendation Number [for Finding Number]	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2021 Response	Original 2021 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2022 Response ⁽¹⁾	2022 Response Text	2023 Response ⁽¹⁾	2023 Response Text
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R1 [for F1]	The Board of Supervisors should reinstate the Committee on 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.	Office of Economic and Workforce Development [August 29, 2021]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	We plan to do the following in response to Recommendation #1: 1. Directly address this finding with our Workforce Alignment Committee at our next meeting tentatively scheduled for the Fall of 2021.2. Inquire with the City Attorney regarding the potential for the Workforce Alignment Committee to allow participation beyond City Departments. This action will take place immediately, and we will be able to offer an update on the aforementioned within 90 days.	Will Not Be Implemented; Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	The Board of Supervisors passed ordinance #209-22, which re-established the Committee on City Workforce Alignment on 9/27/22. City College was not included in the final legislation approved by the Board and the Mayor because it is not a City and County of SF department and because City College sits on OEWD's Workforce Investment SF (WISF) Board, and OEWD meets regularly with City College through our quarterly WIOA One-Stop Operator meetings. The Board of Supervisors and OEWD in consultation with stakeholders agreed that the alignment committee should focus on City and County of San Francisco workforce department services coordination and the WISF Board should continue to focus on the workforce system citywide.	**	
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R1 [for F1]	The Board of Supervisors should reinstate the Committee on 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.	City College of San Francisco [August 29, 2021]		Agree. City College looks forward to joining the Committee on City Workforce Alignment should it be reinstated by the Board of Supervisors.	Will Not Be Implemented; Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	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 but collaborates with OEWD in several other spaces, including the Workforce Investment San Francisco (WISF) Board and meetings convened by OEWD for programs such as CityBuild, TechSF, and the HealthCare Academy.	**	
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R1 [for F1]	The Board of Supervisors should reinstate the Committee on 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.	City College of San Francisco Board of Trustees [August 29, 2021]		Agree. City College looks forward to joining the Committee on City Workforce Alignment should it be reinstated by the Board of Supervisors.	Will Not Be Implemented; Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	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 but collaborates with OEWD in several other spaces, including the Workforce Investment San Francisco (WISF) Board and meetings convened by OEWD for programs such as CityBuild, TechSF, and the HealthCare Academy.	**	
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R1 [for F1]	The Board of Supervisors should reinstate the Committee on 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.	Board of Supervisors [September 28, 2021]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	Recommendation No. R1 has not been implemented but will be implemented in the future by February 2022.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	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.	Will Be Implemented in the Future	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 at the Board of Supervisors or its committees; therefore, the 2022 Response still applies.)
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R2 [for F2]	City College's Dean for Workforce Development should begin submitting quarterly reports that outline and seek input on specific Career Technical Education program needs to the Curriculum Committee beginning in January 2022.	City College of San Francisco [August 29, 2021]		Partially Agree. City College's Dean of Workforce Development will attend Curriculum Committee meetings and ask the committee what additional information will be helpful to report.	Recommendation Implemented	August 25, 2021, the Dean of Workforce Development began regularly attending Curriculum Committee meetings as a permanent Resource Member and engages with the committee's Workforce Squad on workforce topics and reports.	**	
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R2 [for F2]	City College's Dean for Workforce Development should begin submitting quarterly reports that outline and seek input on specific Career Technical Education program needs to the Curriculum Committee beginning in January 2022.	City College of San Francisco Board of Trustees [August 29, 2021]		Partially Agree. City College's Dean of Workforce Development will attend Curriculum Committee meetings and ask the committee what additional information will be helpful to report.	Recommendation Implemented	August 25, 2021, the Dean of Workforce Development began regularly attending Curriculum Committee meetings as a permanent Resource Member and engages with the committee's Workforce Squad on workforce topics and reports.	**	
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R3 [for F3]	OEWD should convene a joint working group to review current Career Technical Education course offerings at City College and make recommendations to develop content that aligns with the needs of the OEWD participants by December 2021. The joint working group should include City College's Dean for Workforce Development, the City's Director of Sector and Workforce Development, and the Eligible Training Provider List Coordinator for Workforce Development Comprehensive Job Centers.	Office of Economic and Workforce Development [August 29, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	We do not think it is necessary to convene an additional working group with CCSF. We currently coordinate with our Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act (WIOA) partners, inclusive of CCSF, by convening quarterly and on an ad-hoc basis. Action to Address Finding— We will work with CCSF to develop content that aligns with the needs of OEWD program participants by December 2021, within the context of our current meeting framework.	**		**	
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R3 [for F3]	OEWD should convene a joint working group to review current Career Technical Education course offerings at City College and make recommendations to develop content that aligns with the needs of the OEWD participants by December 2021. The joint working group should include City College's Dean for Workforce Development, the City's Director of Sector and Workforce Development, and the Eligible Training Provider List Coordinator for Workforce Development Comprehensive Job Centers.	City College of San Francisco [August 29, 2021]		Partially Agree. We do not think it is necessary for OEWD to convene an additional working group for this purpose. CCSF can work with OEWD to develop content that aligns with the needs of OEWD participants, within the context of our current meeting framework. This work is ongoing beyond December 2021 to respond to emerging needs.	Will Not Be Implemented; Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	In lieu of the joint working group, CCSF and OEWD have meetings on a monthly basis to collaborate on CTE program development that aligns with the needs of OEWD participants.	**	
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R3 [for F3]	OEWD should convene a joint working group to review current Career Technical Education course offerings at City College and make recommendations to develop content that aligns with the needs of the OEWD participants by December 2021. The joint working group should include City College's Dean for Workforce Development, the City's Director of Sector and Workforce Development, and the Eligible Training Provider List Coordinator for Workforce Development Comprehensive Job Centers.	City College of San Francisco Board of Trustees [August 29, 2021]		Partially Agree. We do not think it is necessary for OEWD to convene an additional working group for this purpose. CCSF can work with OEWD to develop content that aligns with the needs of OEWD participants, within the context of our current meeting framework. This work is ongoing beyond December 2021 to respond to emerging needs.	Will Not Be Implemented; Not Warranted or Not Reasonable	In lieu of the joint working group, CCSF and OEWD have meetings on a monthly basis to collaborate on CTE program development that aligns with the needs of OEWD participants.	**	
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R3 [for F3]	OEWD should convene a joint working group to review current Career Technical Education course offerings at City College and make recommendations to develop content that aligns with the needs of the OEWD participants by December 2021. The joint working group should include City College's Dean for Workforce Development, the City's Director of Sector and Workforce Development, and the Eligible Training Provider List Coordinator for Workforce Development Comprehensive Job Centers.	Board of Supervisors [September 28, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	While the Board agrees that OEWD and City College of San Francisco should collaborate on building Career Technical Education course offerings that aligns with the needs of OEWD participants, OEWD and City College of San Francisco should be allowed to utilize their existing meeting frameworks to perform this work.	**		**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title [Publication Date]	Recommendation Number [for Finding Number]	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2021 Response	Original 2021 Response Text (provided by CGJ)	2022 Response ⁽¹⁾	2022 Response Text	2023 Response ⁽¹⁾	2023 Response Text
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R4 [for F4]	City College should enhance its number of short-term certificate training programs by February 2022, and these courses should be developed in collaboration with businesses or community-based organizations receiving OEWD funding. This should include an increase in the number of CTE course offerings during City College's summer semester to six.	Office of Economic and Workforce Development [August 29, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	We believe that if CCSF offered more short-term certificate programs with hours inclusive of evenings, it would assist in removing an enrollment barrier for OEWD participants that are working and/or participating in our workforce system programs. Due to OEWD participant schedules, short-term certificate programs that take place in the evening offer OEWD participants greater access to educational coursework. Additionally, certificate programs assist in upskilling jobseekers and lead to higher earnings. Though we agree with this feedback, this is a recommendation that is specific to CCSF. Due to our inability to implement the Recommendation, we responded to the Recommendation with Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable. Action to Address Finding— We are currently discussing your Recommendation, with CCSF, to enhance the number of courses provided by CCSF. Should CCSF choose to develop additional short-term certificate training programs, we will support and coordinate with CCSF in the creation of those programs.	**		**	
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R4 [for F4]	City College should enhance its number of short-term certificate training programs by February 2022, and these courses should be developed in collaboration with businesses or community-based organizations receiving OEWD funding. This should include an increase in the number of CTE course offerings during City College's summer semester to six.	City College of San Francisco [August 29, 2021]		Disagree. While the College is engaging in conversations about creating more short-term training opportunities, it may not be feasible to meet the requirement of offering at least six of these short-term programs during summer. Contract Education may be a more feasible approach, due to its flexibility, and timing and scope would depend on the needs of community partners.	**		**	
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R4 [for F4]	City College should enhance its number of short-term certificate training programs by February 2022, and these courses should be developed in collaboration with businesses or community-based organizations receiving OEWD funding. This should include an increase in the number of CTE course offerings during City College's summer semester to six.	City College of San Francisco Board of Trustees [August 29, 2021]		Disagree. While the College is engaging in conversations about creating more short-term training opportunities, it may not be feasible to meet the requirement of offering at least six of these short-term programs during summer. Contract Education may be a more feasible approach, due to its flexibility, and timing and scope would depend on the needs of community partners.	**		**	
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R4 [for F4]	City College should enhance its number of short-term certificate training programs by February 2022, and these courses should be developed in collaboration with businesses or community-based organizations receiving OEWD funding. This should include an increase in the number of CTE course offerings during City College's summer semester to six.	Board of Supervisors [September 28, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	While the Board of Supervisors agrees that City College of San Francisco should increase the number of short-term training opportunities, it is unclear whether it has sufficient budget allocations to do so at the requested scale, or within the suggested timeline, as of this Board's response.	**		**	
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R5 [for F5]	City College should allow priority registration for OEWD clientele enrolling in certificate program courses on the Eligible Provider Training List. Priority registration should begin with the Fall 2022 semester.	Office of Economic and Workforce Development [August 29, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	We responded with Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable because only CCSF can allow priority registration for their classes, and we do not fully agree with the Finding. Moreover, our department is not the only City department that offers workforce development programming— there are approximately 300 workforce development programs administered across 22 departments in San Francisco. If we are to extend priority enrollment for individuals enrolled in workforce development programming, we should extend this across all departments with workforce development programming.	**		**	
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R5 [for F5]	City College should allow priority registration for OEWD clientele enrolling in certificate program courses on the Eligible Provider Training List. Priority registration should begin with the Fall 2022 semester.	City College of San Francisco [August 29, 2021]		Disagree. This would be subject to approval by the College's Academic Senate, and any updates to registration priorities must comply with the California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Section 58108. While the College could explore this, we are unable to commit to fulfilling this recommendation.	**		**	
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R5 [for F5]	City College should allow priority registration for OEWD clientele enrolling in certificate program courses on the Eligible Provider Training List. Priority registration should begin with the Fall 2022 semester.	City College of San Francisco Board of Trustees [August 29, 2021]		Disagree. This would be subject to approval by the College's Academic Senate, and any updates to registration priorities must comply with the California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Section 58108. While the College could explore this, we are unable to commit to fulfilling this recommendation.	**		**	
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R5 [for F5]	City College should allow priority registration for OEWD clientele enrolling in certificate program courses on the Eligible Provider Training List. Priority registration should begin with the Fall 2022 semester.	Board of Supervisors [September 28, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	The recommendation regards policies internal to City College of San Francisco and falls outside of the Board's purview.	**		**	
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R6 [for F6]	City College should convene a workgroup to identify and correct inaccuracies in the course descriptions, schedules, and costs included on the Eligible Provider Training List by January 2022.	Office of Economic and Workforce Development [August 29, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	It would be helpful to our OEWD participants if the ETPL programs were accurately reflected on the Cal Jobs website. As written, the Recommendation places the responsibility on CCSF to convene a working group. We responded to this Recommendation with Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable because we cannot implement this Recommendation. Action to Address Finding— We will work with City College to support their correction of the inaccuracies in the ETPL. We will also make this Finding a recurring agenda item during our quarterly meetings with WIOA partners and CCSF to address the inaccuracies in the ETPL.	**		**	
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R6 [for F6]	City College should convene a workgroup to identify and correct inaccuracies in the course descriptions, schedules, and costs included on the Eligible Provider Training List by January 2022.	City College of San Francisco [August 29, 2021]		Agree. CCSF staff are already working on verifying and updating information on the Eligible Training Provider List and will complete this work by January 2022.	Recommendation Implemented	December 2021. CCSF verified and updated all information on the ETPL and verifies updates on an annual basis.	**	
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R6 [for F6]	City College should convene a workgroup to identify and correct inaccuracies in the course descriptions, schedules, and costs included on the Eligible Provider Training List by January 2022.	City College of San Francisco Board of Trustees [August 29, 2021]		Agree. CCSF staff are already working on verifying and updating information on the Eligible Training Provider List and will complete this work by January 2022.	Recommendation Implemented	December 2021. CCSF verified and updated all information on the ETPL and verifies updates on an annual basis.	**	

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

CGJ Year	Report Title [Publication Date]	Recommendation Number [for Finding Number]	Recommendation	Response Required	Original 2021 Response	Original 2021 Response Text <i>(provided by CGJ)</i>	2022 Response ⁽¹⁾	2022 Response Text	2023 Response ⁽¹⁾	2023 Response Text
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R6 [for F6]	City College should convene a workgroup to identify and correct inaccuracies in the course descriptions, schedules, and costs included on the Eligible Provider Training List by January 2022.	Board of Supervisors [September 28, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	The recommendation asks City College of San Francisco to convene an internal workgroup, which falls outside of the Board's purview. The Board of Supervisors concur with the recommendation that any inaccuracies are promptly corrected, but defers to CCSF as to the process for achieving that result.	**		**	
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R7 [for F7]	OEWD should work with stakeholders who coordinate the Eligible Provider Training List to develop an outreach program 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.	Office of Economic and Workforce Development [August 29, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	OEWD should not create an outreach team to enroll students in a system, CCSF, that is not a part of our WIOA funding outcomes or requirements. We are committed to serving San Franciscans in our workforce system through participation in our programs and the placement in employment opportunities. As appropriate, OEWD-funded providers refer participants to CCSF to upskill for careers if they demonstrate interest in specific CCSF coursework. Action to Address Finding-- We will discuss with CCSF the possibility of having a point of contact to assist OEWD participants in navigating the CCSF system. This would be inclusive of admission, financial aid, and enrollment processes, and bolster enrollment for our participants.	**		**	
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R7 [for F7]	OEWD should work with stakeholders who coordinate the Eligible Provider Training List to develop an outreach program 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.	City College of San Francisco [August 29, 2021]		Disagree. OEWD should not create an outreach program to enroll students in a system, CCSF that is not a part of its WIOA funding outcomes or requirements. CCSF is committed to serving San Franciscans through participation in our programs and partners with OEWD and its funded providers on placement in employment opportunities. As appropriate, OEWD-funded providers refer participants to CCSF to upskill for careers if they demonstrate interest in specific CCSF coursework.	**		**	
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R7 [for F7]	OEWD should work with stakeholders who coordinate the Eligible Provider Training List to develop an outreach program 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.	City College of San Francisco Board of Trustees [August 29, 2021]		Disagree. OEWD should not create an outreach program to enroll students in a system, CCSF that is not a part of its WIOA funding outcomes or requirements. CCSF is committed to serving San Franciscans through participation in our programs and partners with OEWD and its funded providers on placement in employment opportunities. As appropriate, OEWD-funded providers refer participants to CCSF to upskill for careers if they demonstrate interest in specific CCSF coursework.	**		**	
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R7 [for F7]	OEWD should work with stakeholders who coordinate the Eligible Provider Training List to develop an outreach program 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.	Board of Supervisors [September 28, 2021]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	While San Franciscans would benefit from encouraging OEWD clientele to enroll in City College of San Francisco, the proposed outreach plan is not aligned with current OEWD funding outcomes. However, OEWD and City College of San Francisco should continue to collaborate and coordinate outreach to the greatest extent feasible.	**		**	
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R8 [for F8]	Contract Education and Instructional Services at City College should establish formal outreach guidelines for collaborating with local businesses to develop customized training programs. The outreach guidelines should be submitted for review to City College's Vice Chancellor for Academic and Institutional Affairs by February 2022. The outreach guidelines should be implemented by March 2022.	City College of San Francisco [August 29, 2021]		Agree. The College plans to develop an overview of the ways in which local businesses and CBOs can partner in offering training to their employees/clients (includes Contract Education, Continuing Education, Instructional Service Agreements, Apprenticeship Programs, etc.). The College already collaborates with many local employers, including the City and County of San Francisco, to develop customized training programs. The College recommends expanding our partnership with the City to provide preference points to Civil Service job applicants who completed a degree or certificate at City College.	Recommendation Implemented	February 2022. The college developed an overview document that outlines the ways businesses and community-based organizations can partner in offering training to their employees and clients. The overview document was shared with employers at the Chancellor's Industry Forum in March 2022 and is published on the CCSF website.	**	
2020-21	Strategic Alignment: Breaking Through to a Living Wage [June 30, 2021]	R8 [for F8]	Contract Education and Instructional Services at City College should establish formal outreach guidelines for collaborating with local businesses to develop customized training programs. The outreach guidelines should be submitted for review to City College's Vice Chancellor for Academic and Institutional Affairs by February 2022. The outreach guidelines should be implemented by March 2022.	City College of San Francisco Board of Trustees [August 29, 2021]		Agree. The College plans to develop an overview of the ways in which local businesses and CBOs can partner in offering training to their employees/clients (includes Contract Education, Continuing Education, Instructional Service Agreements, Apprenticeship Programs, etc.). The College already collaborates with many local employers, including the City and County of San Francisco, to develop customized training programs. The College recommends expanding our partnership with the City to provide preference points to Civil Service job applicants who completed a degree or certificate at City College.	Recommendation Implemented	February 2022. The college developed an overview document that outlines the ways businesses and community-based organizations can partner in offering training to their employees and clients. The overview document was shared with employers at the Chancellor's Industry Forum in March 2022 and is published on the CCSF website.	**	

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