BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date:

September 4, 2025

To:

Honorable Members, Board of Supervisors

From:

Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board

Subject:

2024-2025 CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT

"Techs in the City - Government's Opportunity to Seize the AI Moment"

We are in receipt of required responses to the San Francisco Civil Grand Jury report released June 10, 2025, entitled: "Techs in the City - Government's Opportunity to Seize the AI Moment." Pursuant to California Penal Code, Sections 933 and 933.05, named City Departments shall respond to the report within 60 days of receipt, or no later than August 9, 2025.

The Civil Grand Jury Report identified the following City Departments to submit responses:

- Office of the Mayor
- Office of the City Administrator
- Department of Technology
- Office of Contract Administration

For each finding the Department response shall:

- 1) agree with the finding; or
- 2) disagree with it, wholly or partially, and explain why.

As to each recommendation the Department shall report that:

- 2) the recommendation has been implemented, with a summary explanation; or
- 3) the recommendation has not been implemented but will be within a set timeframe as provided; or
- 4) the recommendation requires further analysis. The officer or agency head must define what additional study is needed. The Grand Jury expects a progress report within six months; or
- 5) the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation.

The required City Departments submitted a consolidated response on August 11, 2025.

These departmental responses are being provided for your information, as received, and may not conform to the parameters stated in California Penal Code, Sections 933.05 et seq. The Government Audit and Oversight Committee will consider the subject report, along with the responses, at a hearing on September 18, 2025.

c: Honorable Rochelle C. East, Presiding Judge Carmen Chu, City Administrator, Office of the City Administrator Sophie Hayward, Office of the City Administrator Vivian Po, Office of the City Administrator Angela Yip, Office of the City Administrator Michael Makstman, Chief Information Officer, Department of Technology Karen Hong Yee, Department of Technology Sailaja Kurella, Director and Purchaser, Office of Contract Administration Rachel Cukierman, Office of Contract Administration Adam Thongsavat, Mayor's Office Brad Russi, Office of the City Attorney Alisa Somera, Office of the Clerk of the Board Nicolas Menard, Office of the Budget and Legislative Analyst Amanda Guma, Office of the Budget and Legislative Analyst Dan Goncher, Office of the Budget and Legislative Analyst Michael Carboy, 2024-2025 Foreperson, San Francisco Civil Grand Jury



August 11, 2025

The Honorable Rochelle C. East Presiding Judge, Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco 400 McAllister Street, Room 008 San Francisco, CA 94102-4512

Dear Judge East,

In accordance with Penal Code 933 and 933.05, the following is in response to the 2024-2025 Civil Grand Jury Report, *Techs in the City -Government's Opportunity to Seize the AI Moment.* We would like to thank the members of the 2024-2025 Civil Grand Jury for their interest in the City's technology portfolio, management structure, and service implementation.

We agree with the core elements of the Jury's findings, particularly regarding the need to aggressively deploy AI technologies to City departments and employees. The City has launched one of the largest public-sector generative AI rollouts in the country, making Microsoft Copilot Chat available to 30,000 City employees. This builds on a successful pilot with over 2,000 staff that demonstrated meaningful time savings through the use of AI assistant tools. We're also piloting targeted AI solutions to improve service delivery in areas like 311 response times and language translation, and are committed to expanding the use of AI technology across the City in the months and years ahead.

Additionally, we agree with the Jury's findings on the federated management structure of technology within the City, and its effects on the deployment and procurement of emerging technologies. The Office the Mayor, the Committee on Information Technology (COIT), and the Department of Technology (DT) are currently working to consolidate IT resources, update technology purchase and cost analysis processes, and identify opportunities for synergistic technology acquisition across departments that do not typically work together. The scope of this work is ambitious; we are committed to meaningful change but will need time to coordinate a transformation of this size.

We do, however, disagree with the Jury's perspective regarding the Committee on Information Technology (COIT) and its committee leadership. While COIT membership is established through the administrative code, and officially is composed of mostly department heads, the individuals doing the work are talented and experienced CIOs, including DT, MTA, the SFPUC, DPH, and other large city agencies. Their leadership and expertise are paramount in ensuring effective implementation of any technology plan. We will continue to work to strengthen and maximize coordination and leadership through the COIT process.

The City takes these findings and recommendations very seriously and is committed to rapidly expanding the role of AI technology and streamlining technology resources to improve city services and employee efficiency.

Detailed responses from the Mayor's Office, Office of the City Administrator, Office of Contract Administration, and Department of Technology are attached.

Sincerely,

Daniel Lurie Mayor

Carmen Chu

City Administrator, Office of the City Administrator

Sailaja Kurella

Jennifer Johnston for

Sailaja Kurella

Office of Contract Administration

Nathan Sinclair for

Michael Makstman

Director, Department of Technology

			Response	Response Text
#	Finding	Respondent Assigned by	Agree with the finding	No explanation needed
π	rinding	Assigned by CGJ	Disagree, partially	Specify portion disputed and reason
			Disagree, wholly	Specify disputation and reason
F1	Concerns over the potential risks of AI have led	MYR, ADM,	Agree with the	
	to an overly cautious approach toward emerging	DT	finding	
	technology. The city risks missing opportunities			
	to harness new technology to improve			
F2	governance and delivery of services to citizens.	MAZD A DM	A '41 41	
F2	Governance of technology in the city is	MYR, ADM,	Agree with the	
	hindered because of a federated management	DT	finding	
	structure across departments. Such hindrance has slowed or impaired the ability of the city to			
	efficiently identify, pilot, test, and deploy			
	emerging technologies.			
F3	Procurement of technology in the city is	MYR, DT,	Agree with the	
	hindered because of a federated management	OCA	finding	
	structure across departments. This hinders the			
	ability to find and implement useful, scalable AI			
	and emerging technology solutions, and presents			
	risks to enforcing quality, standardization,			
	privacy and interoperability.			
F4	The Committee on Information Technology	MYR	Disagree, wholly	The members of the Committee on Information
	(COIT) is comprised mostly of non-technical			Technology are appointed through the
	leaders and has insufficient authority and			administrative code, and represent department
	influence over departments' technology plans.			leadership to ensure buy-in. However, the
	As a result, it is falling short of its objective to			individuals that routinely attend COIT and relevant
	streamline ICT policy and roadmapping in San			subcommittees are departmental CIOs or other
	Francisco, which threatens current and emerging			technical leads and have the relevant content and
	technology initiatives alike.			expertise to advise on the COIT agenda. The

	Committee makes recommendations and can set policy; individual departments appropriately make their own procurement decisions in collaboration
	with the Mayor's Budget Office and OCA.

			Response	Response Text
	Recommendation		Has been	Summary regarding implemented action
			implemented	
		Respondent	Will be	Timeframe for implementation
#		Assigned by CGJ	implemented	
			Requires further	Explain scope and parameter of analysis,
			analysis	timeframe (should not exceed 6-months)
			Will not be	Explain thereof
			implemented	
R1.1	By September 30, 2025, the mayor should	MYR	Has not yet been	The Office of Emerging Technologies, in
[for	direct DT to produce a comprehensive AI		implemented but	collaboration with COIT, is working to develop an
F1]	strategy — to be published by June 30, 2026		will be	AI strategy that will reflect the proposed items.
	— outlining near- and long-term		implemented in the	Specific human resource needs are likely to be
	implementation targets for incorporating AI		future	deferred to the budget process rather than the
	into city systems and services. The strategy			strategy document.
	should include guidance on infrastructure, data			
	sharing, ethics, pilot programs and			
	performance evaluation, training and human			
R1.2	resource needs.	ADM, DT	Will not be	DT and DataSE are actively advancing data
	By December 31, 2025, the city administrator	ADM, D1		DT and DataSF are actively advancing data
[for F1]	and DT should produce a report examining the current data governance and data architecture		implemented because it is not	governance and modernizing our data architecture to ensure the City's readiness for generative AI
1.11	of the city, identifying areas of concern or lack		warranted or is not	applications. DataSF and COIT are leading efforts
	of readiness for compatibility with the future		reasonable	to substantially revise the Data Management
	implementation of generative AI applications		Teasonable	Policy for use in AI applications, and are
	such as Microsoft Copilot or other similar			onboarding City departments onto a Unified Data
	applications that would be able to utilize access			Platform powered by Snowflake to enable cross-
	to internal city data to find information,			departmental data integrations and analysis.
	produce insights and make inferences.			

R1.3 [for F1]	By December 31, 2025, DT should put forward a plan outlining i) the forecasted demand for Microsoft Copilot, ChatGPT, or other generative AI licenses for city workers and ii) potential sustainable financing sources, including requests from the general fund, to be submitted in the next budget cycle.	DT	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	DT will continue to monitor and evaluate City employee usage, demand, and the effectiveness of Microsoft Copilot, ChatGPT, and other generative AI tools, and consider this in our proposed FY 26-27 budget. Our team will negotiate cost-effective licenses for required AI tools, explore opportunities for potential grant funding or partnerships, and collaborate with the Mayor's Budget Office to identify sustainable financing sources. However, budgetary decisions are made on a Citywide basis through work with the Mayor's Office and Board of Supervisors.
R1.4 [for F1]	As part of completing the legislatively mandated AI inventory per Chapter 22J (due January 19, 2026), DT should work with departments to produce public reporting on the city's website with agreed upon key performance indicators (KPIs) for piloted AI technology identified in the AI inventory, as well as establish a cost/benefit framework based on identified KPIs. Software pilots should have productivity measurements, and hardware pilots should be measured against status quo metrics for problems they seek to address.	DT	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	The Department of Technology, in coordination with COIT, will work to develop a framework for evaluating the value of an ongoing AI investment or tool toward achieving a cost-effective service delivery goal. This may not be a KPI model in particular. Individual departments will ultimately be responsible for determining the effectiveness of AI technology.
R1.5 [for F1]	By December 31, 2025, DT should establish a program to identify AI champions in city government departments, "train the trainer" programs, and broader education opportunities for city employees. This could be managed by city employees or in partnership with local	DT	Has been implemented	DT has engaged in significant employee training and has fostered an internal GenAI community of over 3,300 staff members to encourage peer-topeer learning and experimentation. Through our recent ChatGPT pilot, we delivered over 50 hours of AI-focused workshops, webinars, and hackathons, reaching more than 4,000 city staff.

	higher education institutions or private sector organizations.			We have also partnered with the nonprofit InnovateUS to deploy specialized AI courses accessible to all city employees via DHR's SFLearning Portal. Over the next 6-12 months, we will expand and enhance our citywide AI training. We plan to organize an "AI Day" to highlight practical use cases, showcase available tools, and generate interest in emerging AI opportunities among city leaders and staff.
R1.6 [for F1]	By September 30, 2025, the CIO should designate the emerging technologies director as the formal ambassador from SF to the GovAI coalition and should appoint other representatives to the coalition at their discretion. They should work to attend all formal gatherings of the coalition and report periodically on findings from their involvement in the coalition that could improve AI implementation in San Francisco's government.	DT	Has been implemented	Both the CIO and Emerging Technologies Director actively engage with the GovAI coalition, and they will continue to involve relevant DT staff in these activities.
R2.1 [for F2]	By December 31, 2025, the mayor and city administrator should adopt a plan for unifying more technology-related organizations within DT, including digital services and other technology functions under the city administrator.	MYR, ADM	Requires further analysis	The Mayor's Office is working with the City Administrator, Department of Technology, Digital Services, DataSF and others to review and analyze the City's IT governance and delivery structure. The City expects to make recommendations to improve efficient service delivery by Spring 2026.
R2.2 [for F2]	By December 31, 2025, the mayor's office should undertake a review of current IT headcount in departments outside of the city administrator and adopt a plan for unifying IT resourcing within DT, including but not limited	MYR	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	See answer 2.1

	to relocating IT job classifications to DT and reallocating departmental assignment of IT resources.			
R2.3 [for F2]	The mayor should mandate that departmental CIOs and other IT leaders be required to meet with DT leadership in a regular structured forum, hosted and organized by DT, to collaborate with DT leadership on IT initiatives, roadmaps and other matters. These meetings should begin by September 30, 2025. By June 30, 2026, the mayor and CIO should	MYR, DT	Has been implemented Will not be	Mayor Lurie has prioritized inter-departmental collaboration in his first 6 months. This collaboration continues to happen both through the COIT process and in direct work between DT and its peer departments. The Office of Contract Administration has a
[for F3]	jointly conduct a detailed review and adopt new procurement guidelines for city department technology purchasing such that technology that meets certain criteria (cost, strategic relevance, overall risk level) should be prioritized, purchased and implemented through DT in accordance with the ICT plan, as affirmed by DT. The CIO and emerging technologies director should have the ability to definitively reject purchases deemed incompatible with ICT policy or vendor strategy, and/or propose alternative purchases that are better aligned with ICT strategy. Purchase orders with vendors deemed not compatible with ICT objectives should be cancelled.		implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	robust procurement review process, which in many cases includes a technology and surveillance review. OCA and DT may work to update that process to ensure that AI tools are procured responsibly and intentionally without additional administrative burden.
R3.2 [for F3]	By June 30, 2026, the emerging technologies director, in partnership with the CIO and OCA, should complete a review and update of	DT, OCA	Will not be implemented because it is not	See answer 3.1
_	policies and resources to facilitate procurement of emerging technology that meets city		warranted or is not reasonable	

	standards and objectives. This may include			
	drafting new vendor standards for AI-related			
	technology procurement (addressing model			
	training, privacy, etc.), template vendor			
	contracts specific to AI technology, and the			
	negotiation of enterprise agreements with AI			
	vendors who meet city ICT standards.			
R3.3	As part of completing the legislatively	DT	Will not be	See answer 3.1
[for	mandated AI inventory (due January 19, 2026),		implemented	
F3]	DT should provide procurement		because it is not	
	recommendations specifying whether		warranted or is not	
	identified technologies should continue to be		reasonable	
	purchased, and/or moved to a different vendor.			
R3.4	By September 30, 2025, the mayor should	MYR	Has been	The City has established robust forums that fulfill
[for	issue guidance to all departments mandating		implemented	the intent of this recommendation through existing
F3]	both that i) departmental procurement leads			governance structures. The Committee on
	should be required to attend a regular forum			Information Technology (COIT) and its Budget &
	with DT to discuss technology procurement			Performance Subcommittee meet regularly,
	goals and initiatives, and ii) DT host such			providing a structured platform for technology
	forums on a regular (monthly, quarterly,			leadership and city leadership to discuss
	semiannual) basis.			technology procurement goals, initiatives, and
				strategic priorities. DT also hosts a biannual
				Citywide Technology Procurement Forums for
				department procurement leads and CIOs.
R3.5	By June 30, 2026, the emerging technologies	DT	Has not yet been	COIT and DT agree with this recommendation.
[for	director and CIO should submit a formal report		implemented but	DT has made significant progress implementing
F3]	to COIT (or a successor body) recommending		will be	the Chapter 22J reporting requirements and will
	updates to the 22 AI inventory questions		implemented in the	use this practical experience to inform potential
	outlined in recent legislation, with the aim of		future	changes to the reporting process. DT will seek to
	streamlining the inventory process.			submit recommended updates to the Chapter 22J
				process to COIT by Jun 30, 2026 and COIT will
		_		review the recommendations after submission.

R4.1	By June 30, 2026, the city should enact an	MYR	Will not be	The City Administrator disagrees with this
[for	ordinance amending the Administrative Code	1,111	implemented	recommendation. COIT serves a vital role,
F4]	to eliminate COIT and centralize a replacement		because it is not	providing independent oversight, strategic
1 ',	advisory body under DT. This ordinance could		warranted or is not	guidance, and cross-departmental coordination for
	be enacted through the customary legislative		reasonable	the city's technology initiatives. COIT also
	process established in the Charter. In the		Teasonaute	provides a forum for consensus building on
	alternative, by December 31, 2025, the mayor			
				technology policy and brings visibility to
	and the board of supervisors should each			technology planning and funding decisions. This
	recommend to the Commission Streamlining			important function would benefit from enhanced
	Task Force (established by Proposition E,			authority, clearer mandate definition, and
	November 2024) that it include COIT in an			improved resource allocation. We recommend
	ordinance the Task Force would introduce to			focusing on structural improvements to increase
	eliminate certain commissions.			COIT's effectiveness rather than dissolution.
R4.2	By December 31, 2025, the mayor should	MYR	Has been	The Committee on Information Technology
[for	mandate that all departments produce a		implemented	already publishes a coordinated technology
F4]	technology roadmap in a form and substance to			roadmap in the form of its annual Information and
	be agreed with DT, which would include			Communications Technology (ICT) Plan. The
	departmental technology initiatives as well as			Mayor has asked COIT to update this roadmap to
	automation goals and potential applications for			include additional accountability measures.
	AI and emerging technology. Roadmaps that			
	contain milestones and deadlines for major			
	initiatives should be submitted to DT and			
	refreshed on an annual basis.			
R4.3	By December 31, 2025, the city should pass an	MYR	Has not yet been	The City supports this recommendation and will
[for	ordinance amending the Administrative Code		implemented but	begin the necessary steps to implement the
F4]	to create a permanent seat on COIT for the		will be	creation of a permanent seat on COIT for the
,	emerging technologies director, pending its		implemented in the	emerging technologies director. Implementation
	action related to Recommendation 4.1.		future	will require amending Section 22A.3 of the
	The second secon			Administrative Code, which currently defines
				COIT's membership composition, to formally add
				the emerging technologies director as a voting
				member of the committee. COIT will work with
				member of the committee. Corr will work with

FY 2024-2025	Civil Gran	d Jury Repo	ort
--------------	-------------------	-------------	-----

the City Attorney's Office to draft the necessary ordinance amendments and aims to introduce the legislation to the Board of Supervisors well in
advance of December 31, 2025, to allow for
sufficient time for the legislative process to be
completed.