BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

November 6, 2018

The Honorable Teri Jackson Presiding Judge Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco 400 McAllister Street, Department 206 San Francisco, CA 94102

RE: Civil Grand Jury Report - Mitigating the Housing Crisis: Accessory Dwelling Units and Modular Housing

Dear Judge Jackson:

The Board of Supervisors' Government Audit and Oversight Committee conducted a public hearing on October 3, 2018, to review the findings and recommendations of the 2017-2018 Civil Grand Jury report, entitled "Mitigating the Housing Crisis: Accessory Dwelling Units and Modular Housing."

Prior to the Committee meeting, the following City Departments submitted required responses to the Civil Grand Jury:

- Office of the Controller: Received August 17, 2018 for Recommendation No. R6.
- The Mayor's Office submitted a consolidated response for the following departments:
 - Office of the Mayor;
 - o Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development;
 - Department of Building Inspection;
 - Planning Department;
 - o Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure;
 - o Fire Department;
 - o Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing;
 - o Public Utilities Commission; and
 - Public Works.

Received September 3, 2018, for Finding Nos. F2, F3, F4, F5, F6, F7, F8, F9, F10, F11, F12, F13 and F14; and Recommendation Nos. R1, R4, R5, R6, R7, R8, R9, R10, and R11.

Mitigating the Housing Crisis: Accessory Dwelling Units and Modular Housing Board Response Transmittal November 6, 2018
Page 2

At the October 3, 2017 meeting, the Government Audit and Oversight Committee prepared a resolution responding to the requested findings and recommendations identified in the report. The response was prepared by Resolution No. 342-18, enacted on October 26, 2018.

By this message, the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors is transmitting Resolution No. 342-18 to your attention.

If you have any questions, please contact John Carroll, Government Audit and Oversight Committee Clerk at (415) 554-4445, or via email to john.carroll@sfgov.org.

Sincerely,

Angela Calvillo Clerk of the Board

Honorable Teri L. Jackson, Presiding Judge Kanishka Karunaratne Cheng, Mayor's Office Mawuli Tugbenyoh, Mayor's Office Andres Power, Mayor's Office Marie Valdez, Mayor's Office Kate Hartley, Director, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development Eugene Flannery, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development Amy Chan, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development John Rahaim, Director, Planning Department Scott Sanchez, Planning Department Lisa Gibson, Planning Department Devyani Jain, Planning Department AnMarie Rodgers, Planning Department Dan Sider, Planning Department Aaron Starr, Planning Department Tom Hui, Director, Department of Building Inspection William Strawn, Department of Building Inspection Carolyn Jayin, Department of Building Inspection Joanne Hayes-White, Chief, Fire Department Kelly Alves, Fire Department Mohammed Nuru, Director, Public Works David Steinberg, Public Works Jeremy Spitz, Public Works Jennifer Blot, Public Works

John Thomas, Public Works Lena Liu, Public Works Harlan Kelly, General Manager, San Francisco Public **Utilities Commission** Juliet Ellis, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Donna Hood, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission John Scarpulla, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Christopher Whitmore, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Ben Rosenfield, Office of the Controller Todd Rydstrom, Office of the Controller Peg Stevenson, Office of the Controller Tonia Lediju, Office of the Controller Jeff Kositsky, Director, Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing Emily Cohen, Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing Nadia Sesay, Executive Director, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure Jon Givner, Office of the City Attorney Alisa Somera, Office of the Clerk of the Board Debra Newman, Budget and Legislative Analyst Severin Campbell, Budget and Legislative Analyst Ashley Clark, Budget and Legislative Analyst Lori Campbell, Foreperson, San Francisco Civil

Grand Jury



City and County of San Francisco Certified Copy

City Hall 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Resolution

180702

[Board Response - Civil Grand Jury Report - Mitigating the Housing Crisis: Accessory Dwelling Units and Modular Housing]

Resolution responding to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings and recommendations contained in the 2017-2018 Civil Grand Jury Report, entitled "Mitigating the Housing Crisis: Accessory Dwelling Units and Modular Housing;" and urging the Mayor to cause the implementation of accepted findings and recommendations through his/her department heads and through the development of the annual budget. (Clerk of the Board)

10/16/2018 Board of Supervisors - ADOPTED

Ayes: 11 - Brown, Cohen, Fewer, Kim, Mandelman, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, Tang and Yee

10/26/2018 Mayor - APPROVED

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution is a full, true, and correct copy of the original thereof on file in this office.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the offical seal of the City and County of San Francisco.

November 05, 2018

Date

Plank of the Roard

AMENDED IN COMMITTEE 10/3/18

FILE NO. 180702

I I D

RESOLUTION NO. 342-18

[Board Response - Civil Grand Jury Report - Mitigating the Housing Crisis: Accessory Dwelling Units and Modular Housing]

Resolution responding to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings and recommendations contained in the 2017-2018 Civil Grand Jury Report, entitled

and recommendations contained in the 2017-2018 Civil Grand Jury Report, entitled "Mitigating the Housing Crisis: Accessory Dwelling Units and Modular Housing;" and urging the Mayor to cause the implementation of accepted findings and recommendations through his/her department heads and through the development of the annual budget.

WHEREAS, Under California Penal Code, Section 933 et seq., the Board of Supervisors must respond, within 90 days of receipt, to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings and recommendations contained in Civil Grand Jury Reports; and

WHEREAS, In accordance with California Penal Code, Section 933.05(c), if a finding or recommendation of the Civil Grand Jury addresses budgetary or personnel matters of a county agency or a department headed by an elected officer, the agency or department head and the Board of Supervisors shall respond if requested by the Civil Grand Jury, but the response of the Board of Supervisors shall address only budgetary or personnel matters over which it has some decision making authority; and

WHEREAS, Under San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 2.10(a), the Board of Supervisors must conduct a public hearing by a committee to consider a final report of the findings and recommendations submitted, and notify the current foreperson and immediate past foreperson of the civil grand jury when such hearing is scheduled; and

WHEREAS, In accordance with San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 2.10(b), the Controller must report to the Board of Supervisors on the implementation of

recommendations that pertain to fiscal matters that were considered at a public hearing held by a Board of Supervisors Committee; and

WHEREAS, The 2017-2018 Civil Grand Jury Report, entitled "Mitigating the Housing Crisis: Accessory Dwelling Units and Modular Housing" ("Report") is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 180701, which is hereby declared to be a part of this Resolution as if set forth fully herein; and

WHEREAS, The Civil Grand Jury has requested that the Board of Supervisors respond to Finding Nos. F2, F6, and F7, as well as Recommendation Nos. R2 and R3, contained in the subject Report; and

WHEREAS, Finding No. F2 states: "Construction of ADUs can add a meaningful number of moderately priced rental housing units in San Francisco, with no significant burden on City finances. Therefore, encouraging ADU development is of value to San Francisco;" and

WHEREAS, Finding No. F6 states: "The City's ADU program acknowledges the value to the City of increasing ADU construction. Homeowners who construct ADUs do so voluntarily and at their own expense. The additional burden of heavy permit fees is counterproductive to the City's goal of increasing the rate of ADU construction, in that it represents an additional barrier to building ADUs for single family homeowners, and therefore likely reduces the number of applications;" and

WHEREAS, Finding No. F7 states: "Cities that lower permitting fees for ADUs, as Portland, Seattle and Vancouver, BC have done, see an increase in the number of permit applications by single family homeowners; if San Francisco reduces permitting fees for that type of ADU permit applications, they are likely to increase;" and

WHEREAS, Recommendation No. R2 states: "Recommends the Board of Supervisors amend existing City codes and ordinances, before June 30, 2019, to waive or reduce ADU

permit fees, with the understanding that reduced departmental revenues would be made up from the City's general fund;" and

WHEREAS, Recommendation No. R3 states: "Recommends the Board of Supervisors structure fees separately for ADUs in single family residences and ADUs in multi-unit buildings, specifically designed to ease the permitting costs for single family homeowners;" and

WHEREAS, In accordance with California Penal Code, Section 933.05(c), the Board of Supervisors must respond, within 90 days of receipt, to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on Finding Nos. F2, F6, and F7, as well as Recommendation Nos. R2 and R3 contained in the subject Report; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court that they agree with Finding No. F2 for reason as follows: San Francisco is currently in an affordable housing crisis and the majority of the new accessory dwelling housing stock will offer rent controlled units; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court that they disagree partially with Finding No. F6 for reason as follows: making the ADU application more affordable may remove a barrier for homeowners interested in building an ADU, but will require further analysis; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court that they agree with Finding No. F7 for reason as follows: making ADU permitting more affordable for homeowners may incentivize them to build ADUs; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation No. R2 requires further analysis, the Budget and Legislative Analyst Office, the San Francisco Planning Department, and the Office of the Controller should study the correlation between a reduction in permitting fees and an increase in ADU construction; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation No. R3 further analysis, the Budget and Legislative Analyst Office, the San Francisco Planning Department, and the Office of the Controller should study the correlation between a reduction in permitting fees and an increase in ADU construction; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors urges the Mayor to cause the implementation of the accepted findings and recommendations through her department heads and through the development of the annual budget.



City and County of San Francisco Tails

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

City Hall

Resolution

File Number:

180702

Date Passed: October 16, 2018

Resolution responding to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings and recommendations contained in the 2017-2018 Civil Grand Jury Report, entitled "Mitigating the Housing Crisis: Accessory Dwelling Units and Modular Housing," and urging the Mayor to cause the implementation of accepted findings and recommendations through his/her department heads and through the development of the annual budget.

October 03, 2018 Government Audit and Oversight Committee - AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME TITLE

October 03, 2018 Government Audit and Oversight Committee - RECOMMENDED AS **AMENDED**

October 16, 2018 Board of Supervisors - ADOPTED

Ayes: 11 - Brown, Cohen, Fewer, Kim, Mandelman, Peskin, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, Tang and Yee

File No. 180702

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED on 10/16/2018 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

Clerk of the Board

Angela Calvillo

London N. Breed Mayor

Date Approved



OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Ben Rosenfield Controller Todd Rydstrom Deputy Controller

August 17, 2018

The Honorable Terri L. Jackson Presiding Judge, Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco 400 McAllister Street, Room 008 San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Judge Jackson:

Pursuant to Penal Code sections 933 and 933.05, the following is in reply to the 2017-18 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury reports, *Open Source Voting in San Francisco* and *Accessory Dwelling Units and Modular Housing.* We would like to thank the Civil Grand Jury for their work.

The Civil Grand Jury's reports provided important findings and recommendations on each of the topics reported on in this session. We will use this work to inform future audit and project planning and communication with leadership, stakeholders, and the public on these issues.

If you have any questions about this response, please contact me or Deputy Controller Todd Rydstrom at 415-554-7500.

Respectfully submitted,

Ben Rosenfield Controller

cc: Todd Rydstrom

Civil Grand Jury Report: Accessory Dwelling Units and Modular Housing

Required Responses to Recommendation 6:

Recommendation 6. Recommends the Department of Building Inspection work with the Department of the Controller to develop meaningful, outcome-based performance metrics on ADU permit approval duration, to be reported on OpenData starting January 2019. (F3, F4)

Response: The recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future.

We will work with the Department of Building Inspection to develop one or more metrics on permitting of ADUs by January 2019. Depending on the data sources, content or related factors, we may publish such metrics in the Performance Scorecard section of the Controller's website, or in another accessible format, to be determined in consultation with stakeholders.

Office of the Mayor san francisco



LONDON N. BREED MAYOR

September 3, 2018

The Honorable Teri L. Jackson Presiding Judge, Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco 400 McAllister Street, Room 008 San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Judge Jackson:

Pursuant to Penal Code sections 933 and 933.05, the following is in reply to the 2017-18 Civil Grand Jury report, *Mitigating the Housing Crisis: Accessory Dwelling Units and Modular Housing*. We would like to thank the members of the Civil Grand Jury for their efforts to promote innovative methods to alleviate the City's housing crisis.

We strongly agree with premise of the report: that the City must build significantly more housing to meet the needs of a growing City. We agree that non-traditional types of building, like Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and modular housing, have tremendous potential to add to the City's housing supply while requiring less public subsidy, less time to build, and fewer of the impacts to neighborhood character that often generate opposition to new housing. We agree that for both ADUs and modular housing, the City needs to take concrete action to facilitate the adoption of the technology through smart public policy and comprehensive community outreach.

With regards to ADUs, we acknowledge that the lengthy permitting process and strict building codes are one reason more ADUs have not been built. Through better coordination between City departments, permitting times have already fallen significantly. We will continue to strive for more improvement. The City has already taken significant action to make the planning, building, and fire codes less of an obstacle for property owners who wish to build ADUs in their building. That is why the Mayor issued an Executive Directive on Thursday, August 30th to both speed up the process of approving new ADU applications and clear the backlog of older applications. From this point forward, it should only takes four months for the City to review a completed application to construct an ADU and only six months to clear the 900 unit backlog of permits. There exists significant potential to make the building codes less restrictive and more flexible – allowing easier and more affordable construction of ADUs with no diminished safety for residents. However, elements of the building and fire code that are governed by the State code do not allow the City to make our local code less restrictive. This remains a significant challenge.

With regards to modular housing, we are supportive of the establishment of a union-staffed modular housing factory in the City limits. This will ensure a sufficient supply of housing units to serve the City's affordable housing pipeline for formerly homeless individuals while guaranteeing quality control and code compliance. Furthermore, it will leverage the skills and capacity of our local building trades, protecting local jobs while delivering housing in a shorter time at a lower cost.

While we are not named as respondants to the report's Finding 1, we wanted to take this opportunity to respond to the Finding, which states that San Francisco "has produced more than the required market rate housing to satisfy demand, but not nearly enough below market rate housing." We agree that production of below market rate housing has not met minimum targets in the Regional Housing Needs Assessment

(RHNA) and has not met the needs of tens of thousands of low and moderate income households that are cost burdened or face other housing challenges. Regarding production of market rate housing, however, we believe that meeting minimum production targets in RHNA is not the same as meeting market demand and that there is ample evidence that demand from higher income households has exceeded production, placing greater pressures on the City's housing stock and residents with low to middle incomes. Therefore, the need to facilitate housing production highlighted in the report extends to housing for all income groups.

A detailed response from the Mayor's Office, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, Department of Building Inspection, Department of City Planning, Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, Department of Public Works, Fire Department, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, and Public Utilities Commission to the Civil Grand Jury's findings and recommendations are attached.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on this Civil Grand Jury report.

Sincerely,

London N. Breed Mayor

Director, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community

Development

Director, Department of **Building Inspection**

Director, Plaining Department

Executive Director, Office of Community Investment and

Infrastructure

Chief, Fire Department

Director, Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing

Harla 2 Milly.

General Manager, Public Utilities Commission

Director, Public Works

Finding	Respondent Assigned by	Finding Response	Finding Response Text	R#	Recommendation	Respondent Assigned by	Recommendation	Recommendation Re
(text may be duplicated due to spanning and	CGJ	(Agree/Disagree)		[for F#]	(text may be duplicated due to spanning and	CG1	Response	
multiple respondent effects) The City has produced more than the required market rate housing to satisfy market demand using traditional building practices, but not nearly enough below market rate housing. Taking better advantage of alternative construction methods can increase the City's	[Response Due Date]				multiple respondent effects)	[Response Due Date]	(Implementation)	
ability to narrow the below-market housing gap.							1 1 1 1 1	i i
Construction of ADUs can add a meaningful number of moderately priced rental housing units in San Francisco, with no significant burden on City finances. Therefore, encouraging ADU development is of value to San Francisco.	3, 2018]	Agree with the finding		R1 [F2, F8]	Department of Building Inspection jointly review	Planning Department [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Will be implemented	Over the last six months, DBI, Plannii Public Works-BSM and representativ and Board of Supervisors have been and develop recommendations to er Through this interagency working gripelimenary checklists for each respirequirements to expedite and strear rounds of amendments have increas owners to add units to their propertically further analysis is warranted to further recommendations. Planning their codes and submit joint recomm Supervisors no later than April 1, 201 designed to encourage homeowners
Construction of ADUs can add a meaningful number of moderately priced rental housing units in San Francisco, with no significant burden on City finances. Therefore, encouraging ADU development is of value to San Francisco.	Department of Building Inspection [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Agree with the finding		R1 [F2, F8]	Recommends the Planning Department and the Department of Building Inspection jointly review their codes and submit joint recommendations to the Board of Supervisors no later than April 1, 2019 for code amendments designed to encourage homeowners to build more ADUs.	Inspection [Response due: September	Will be implemented	Over the last six months, DBI, Planni Public Works-BSM and representative and Board of Supervisors have been and develop recommendations to error Through this interagency working grow prelimenary checklists for each respective manual representation of the previous process to include other cit Works-BSM, Fire Department and Planning and DBI will jointly review the recommendations to the Board of St April 1, 2019 for code amendments homeowners to build more ADU's.

Finding	Respondent Assigned by	Finding Response	Finding Response Text	R#	Recommendation	Respondent Assigned by	Recommendation	Recommendation Re
(text may be duplicated due to spanning and	CGJ	(Agree/Disagree)		[for F#]	(text may be duplicated due to spanning and	CGJ	Response	
multiple respondent effects)	[Response Due Date]			************	multiple respondent effects)	[Response Due Date]	(Implementation)	100000000000000000000000000000000000000
Construction of ADUs can add a meaningful	Planning Department	Agree with the		R4	Recommends the five agencies involved with	Planning Department	Has been	DBI, Planning, SFFD, DPW, and PUC
	• •	finding		[F2, F4, F5]	ADU permitting establish a shared meeting	[Response due: September	Implemented	members located together at a shar
	3, 2018]			1	space by January 1, 2019, and not wait for the	3, 2018]		fifth floor at 1660 Mission Street to
burden on City finances. Therefore, encouraging					completion of the new shared agency building.		2 25 25	approval process.
ADU development is of value to San Francisco.		1.			This space would be used by point persons from			
		14.44			each of the five permitting agencies to expedite			
					the ADU permit approval process.	1		
Construction of ADUs can add a meaningful	Department of Building	Agree with the		R4	Recommends the five agencies involved with	Department of Building	Has been	DBI, Planning, SFFD, DPW, and PUC
1	Inspection	finding		[F2, F4, F5]	ADU permitting establish a shared meeting	Inspection	implemented	members located together at a shar
, , , ,	[Response due: September	, and the second		[,,]	space by January 1, 2019, and not wait for the	[Response due: September		fifth floor at 1660 Mission Street to
burden on City finances. Therefore, encouraging					1	3, 2018]		approval process.
ADU development is of value to San Francisco.	5, 2010)	6 7 3 4 5 5			This space would be used by point persons from	5, 2010,		approvar process:
The development is of raide to samma follows:					each of the five permitting agencies to expedite		the first	
					the ADU permit approval process.			
Construction of ADUs can add a meaningful	Fire Department	Agree with the		P.4	Recommends the five agencies involved with	Fire Department	Haa baan	DRI Blanning CEED DRIV 1210
_	'			R4	, ,	Fire Department	Has been	DBI, Planning, SFFD, DPW, and PUC
number of moderately priced rental housing	[Response due: September	finding		[F2, F4, F5]	ADU permitting establish a shared meeting	[Response due: September	implemented	members located together at a shar
units in San Francisco, with no significant	3, 2018]	11.5			space by January 1, 2019, and not wait for the	3, 2018]		fifth floor at 1660 Mission Street to
burden on City finances. Therefore, encouraging			· ·		completion of the new shared agency building.			approval process.
ADU development is of value to San Francisco.					This space would be used by point persons from			
					each of the five permitting agencies to expedite			
					the ADU permit approval process.		1111	
Construction of ADUs can add a meaningful	Department of Public	Agree with the		R4	Recommends the five agencies involved with	Department of Public	Has been	DBI, Planning, SFFD, DPW, and PUC
number of moderately priced rental housing	Works	finding		[F2, F4, F5]	ADU permitting establish a shared meeting	Works	implemented	members located together at a share
units in San Francisco, with no significant	[Response due: September				space by January 1, 2019, and not wait for the	[Response due: September	14471745	fifth floor at 1660 Mission Street to
burden on City finances. Therefore, encouraging	3, 2018]				completion of the new shared agency building.	3, 2018]		approval process,
ADU development is of value to San Francisco.					This space would be used by point persons from			
					each of the five permitting agencies to expedite			:
					the ADU permit approval process.			
Construction of ADUs can add a meaningful	Public Utilities Commission	Agree with the		R4	Recommends the five agencies involved with	Public Utilities Commission	Has been	DBI, Planning, SFFD, DPW, and PUC
number of moderately priced rental housing	[Response due: September	1 -		[F2, F4, F5]	ADU permitting establish a shared meeting	[Response due: September	implemented	members located together at a shar
units in San Francisco, with no significant	3, 2018]			[,,]	space by January 1, 2019, and not wait for the	3, 2018	IIII Pioriticia a	fifth floor at 1660 Mission Street to
burden on City finances. Therefore, encouraging	[5,2020]				completion of the new shared agency building.	5, 2020,		approval process.
ADU development is of value to San Francisco.			1		This space would be used by point persons from		1 38 11 6	approvar process.
The development is of talue to salfy full closes,				ĺ	each of the five permitting agencies to expedite		N. N. A. A. A.	
					the ADU permit approval process.			
Construction of ADUs can add a meaningful	Planning Department	Agree with the		R9	Recommends the Planning Department waive	Planning Department	Has been	The Planning Code does not require
number of moderately priced rental housing	[Response due: September			[F2, F8]	· ·	- '		
-	1" '	imaing	,	[12, 18]	parking space requirements for ADUs built in	1	implemented	unit to any building. This control wa
units in San Francisco, with no significant	3, 2018]				single-family residences,	3, 2018]		before the ADU program. The ADU
burden on City finances. Therefore, encouraging								not requiring parking for ADUs, eve
ADU development is of value to San Francisco.				1.				is proposed at one property. The Pl
		·.					100	through the provision of bicycle par
	'	1 4 4 1					Large Anna	through the granting of an administ
			·				1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	parking requirement per the ADU p
							1 × 1 × 1 ×	made removing existing required pa
		1 1 2 2 2 2 2						provision was built into the ADU pro
							1 11 5 1 1	inception in 2014. The Planning Cod
		The second second						provision of bicycle parking at the p
		1 144	1	1		1	1 - 3 - 2 - 2 - 2	granting of an administrative except
								requirement per the ADU program.
	i .	i .	I .		a contract of the contract of	1	1	

Respondent Assigned by	Finding Response	Finding Response Text	R#	Recommendation	Respondent Assigned by	Recommendation	Recommendation Re
CGJ	(Agree/Disagree)		[for F#]	(text may be duplicated due to spanning and		Response	
			224040400000				53454
	-						To date, the Planning Department
I	finding		[F2, F9]	,		implemented	to market and publicize the ADU p
				homeowner awareness of ADU opportunities.	3, 2018]		handbook that include six ADU pro
							video, created user friendly Fact Si
							attended public events to present
							common public questions. Moving
							team received a grant for commur
							City Planning (FOCP) for \$29,000 to
		•					materials, and facilitate communit
							is for contracting a consultant to u
							updated prototypes to reflect Code
		•					updated financial analysis. Anticip
				·		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	is late Fall of 2018*. This ADU Han
*							resource, and is used by design pro
							to learn about how an ADU could
							as used as a resource at outreach
							Furthermore, Planning will create
							resource portal anticipated by end
							be aimed to single family homeow
							unit homeowner audience.
						a Name for a	unit nomeowner addience.
						train exects	The community outreach (Plannin
						5.75	timeline is as follows:
							o To design professionals fall 2018
							o To single-family homeowners Q4
	1000						-
	The state of the s						*Predicated on DBI & Fire mutual
Department of Building	Agree with the		Ř6	Recommends the Department of Building	Department of Building	Will be	The Department of Building Inspe
Inspection	finding		[F3, F4]	Inspection work with the Department of the	Inspection	implemented	Department of the Controller to d
[Response due: September					[Response due: September		based performance metrics on AL
1					3, 2018]		to be reported on OpenData start
-,,							
_				Starting Sandary Louis			
Planning Department	Agree with the		R4	Recommends the five agencies involved with	Planning Department	Has been	DBI, Planning, SFFD, DPW, and PU
lea to a to t	finding		[F2, F4, F5]	ADU permitting establish a shared meeting	[Response due: September	implemented	members located together at a sh
[Response due: September	Junuang.						fifth floor at 1660 Mission Street
[Response due: September 3, 2018]	IIIIuiiig			space by January 1, 2019, and not wait for the	3, 2018]		
	linum g			space by January 1, 2019, and not wait for the completion of the new shared agency building.	3, 2018]		approval process.
	I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I			completion of the new shared agency building.	3, 2018]		A Company of the Comp
				completion of the new shared agency building. This space would be used by point persons from	3, 2018]		A Company of the Comp
	Illium			completion of the new shared agency building. This space would be used by point persons from each of the five permitting agencies to expedite	3, 2018]		I .
3, 2018]				completion of the new shared agency building. This space would be used by point persons from each of the five permitting agencies to expedite the ADU permit approval process.			approval process.
3, 2018] Department of Building	Agree with the		R4	completion of the new shared agency building. This space would be used by point persons from each of the five permitting agencies to expedite the ADU permit approval process. Recommends the five agencies involved with	Department of Building	Has been	approval process. DBI, Planning, SFFD, DPW, and PU
3, 2018] Department of Building Inspection	Agree with the finding		1	completion of the new shared agency building. This space would be used by point persons from each of the five permitting agencies to expedite the ADU permit approval process. Recommends the five agencies involved with ADU permitting establish a shared meeting	Department of Building	Has been implemented	approval process. DBI, Planning, SFFD, DPW, and Planming of the process of the p
3, 2018] Department of Building	Agree with the finding		1	completion of the new shared agency building. This space would be used by point persons from each of the five permitting agencies to expedite the ADU permit approval process. Recommends the five agencies involved with	Department of Building	1	approval process. DBI, Planning, SFFD, DPW, and PUmembers located together at a si
3, 2018] Department of Building Inspection	Agree with the finding		1	completion of the new shared agency building. This space would be used by point persons from each of the five permitting agencies to expedite the ADU permit approval process. Recommends the five agencies involved with ADU permitting establish a shared meeting	Department of Building	1	approval process. DBI, Planning, SFFD, DPW, and PUmembers located together at a si
3, 2018] Department of Building Inspection [Response due: September	Agree with the finding		1	completion of the new shared agency building. This space would be used by point persons from each of the five permitting agencies to expedite the ADU permit approval process. Recommends the five agencies involved with ADU permitting establish a shared meeting space by January 1, 2019, and not wait for the	Department of Building Inspection [Response due: September	1	approval process. DBI, Planning, SFFD, DPW, and PU members located together at a sh fifth floor at 1660 Mission Street t
3, 2018] Department of Building Inspection [Response due: September	Agree with the finding		1	completion of the new shared agency building. This space would be used by point persons from each of the five permitting agencies to expedite the ADU permit approval process. Recommends the five agencies involved with ADU permitting establish a shared meeting space by January 1, 2019, and not wait for the completion of the new shared agency building.	Department of Building Inspection [Response due: September	1	approval process. DBI, Planning, SFFD, DPW, and PUmembers located together at a sififth floor at 1660 Mission Street
	CGJ Response Due Date Planning Department [Response due: September 3, 2018] Department of Building Inspection [Response due: September 3, 2018]	IResponse Due Date Planning Department [Response due: September 3, 2018] Department of Building Inspection [Response due: September 3, 2018] Agree with the finding finding Agree with the finding Agree with the Agree with the finding	Response Due Date Planning Department (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding Inspection (Response due: September 3, 2018] Agree with the finding Inspection (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding Inspection (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding Inspection (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding Inspection (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding Inspection (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding Inspection (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding Inspection (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding Inspection (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding Inspection (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding (Response due: September 3, 2018) Agree with the finding (Resp	Response Due Data Planning Department of Building Inspection Response due: September Agree with the finding Inspection Response due: September Response due: Sept	CG (Agree/Disagree) (For Fil) (text may be duplicated due to spanning and its public accordance in Each of Market (Response due: September 3, 2018) (Agree with the finding may be duplicated as the Planning Department expandity by the finding may be duplicated due to spanning and its public outreach on ADUs to increase homeowner awareness of ADU opportunities.	CG (fer Fil) (text may be duplicated due to spanning and multiplic respondent effects) (feeponse Due Data)	Resonance bin Data Response

Finding (text may be duplicated due to spanning and	Respondent Assigned by CGJ	Finding Response (Agree/Disagree)	Finding Response Text	R# [for F#]	Recommendation (text may be duplicated due to spanning and	Respondent Assigned by CGJ	Recommendation Response	Recommendation Re
multiple respondent effects) The length of the permitting process for ADUs is a major factor in limiting the speed of bringing ADUs to market to help meet the housing shortage. Shortening the ADU permitting process both expedites and encourages ADU construction.	Response Due Date Fire Department [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Agree with the finding			multiple respondent effects) Recommends the five agencies involved with ADU permitting establish a shared meeting space by January 1, 2019, and not wait for the completion of the new shared agency building. This space would be used by point persons from each of the five permitting agencies to expedite the ADU permit approval process.	Resnonse Due Datel Fire Department [Response due: September 3, 2018]	(Implementation) Has been Implemented	DBI, Planning, SFFD, DPW, and PUC of members located together at a share fifth floor at 1660 Mission Street to e approval process.
The length of the permitting process for ADUs is a major factor in limiting the speed of bringing ADUs to market to help meet the housing shortage. Shortening the ADU permitting process both expedites and encourages ADU construction.	Department of Public Works [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Agree with the finding		R4 [F2, F4, F5]	Recommends the five agencies involved with ADU permitting establish a shared meeting space by January 1, 2019, and not wait for the completion of the new shared agency building. This space would be used by point persons from each of the five permitting agencies to expedite the ADU permit approval process.	Department of Public Works [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Has been implemented	DBI, Planning, SFFD, DPW, and PUC of members located together at a shar fifth floor at 1660 Mission Street to a approval process.
The length of the permitting process for ADUs is a major factor in limiting the speed of bringing ADUs to market to help meet the housing shortage. Shortening the ADU permitting process both expedites and encourages ADU construction.	Public Utilities Commission [Response due: September 3, 2018]			R4 [F2, F4, F5]	Recommends the five agencies involved with ADU permitting establish a shared meeting space by January 1, 2019, and not wait for the completion of the new shared agency building. This space would be used by point persons from each of the five permitting agencies to expedite the ADU permit approval process.	Public Utilities Commission [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Has been implemented	DBI, Planning, SFFD, DPW, and PUC of members located together at a share fifth floor at 1660 Mission Street to 6 approval process.
The length of the permitting process for ADUs is a major factor in limiting the speed of bringing ADUs to market to help meet the housing shortage. Shortening the ADU permitting process both expedites and encourages ADU construction.	Department of Building Inspection [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Agree with the finding		R6 [F3, F4]	Recommends the Department of Building Inspection work with the Department of the Controller to develop meaningful, outcome-based performance metrics on ADU permit approval duration, to be reported on OpenData starting January 2019.	Department of Building Inspection [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Will be implemented	The Department of Building Inspecti Department of the Controller to dev based performance metrics on ADU to be reported on OpenData starting
The Planning Department expects to establish a one-stop permit center in its new building, which would bring together all agencies involved in the permit process, and thereby expedite approvals, but the new building won't be ready until 2020; therefore, interim measures to expedite ADU approvals are needed.	Planning Department [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Disagree, partially	The Department is in agreement that interim measures to expedite ADU approvals are needed ahead of the opening of the one stop permit center in 2020. The Department disagrees with the characterization that the Planning Department will be the entity establishing the one stop permit center and the characterization that the new building will belong to the planning department. Rather, the one stop permit center will be established and run by the City Administrator. The building at 48 South Van Ness will belong to the City and will be managed by the Department of Real Estate.		Recommends the five agencies involved with ADU permitting establish a shared meeting space by January 1, 2019, and not wait for the completion of the new shared agency building. This space would be used by point persons from each of the five permitting agencies to expedite the ADU permit approval process.	Planning Department [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Has been implemented	DBI, Planning, SFFD, DPW, and PUC of members located together at a share fifth floor at 1660 Mission Street to eapproval process.
The Planning Department expects to establish a one-stop permit center in its new building, which would bring together all agencies involved in the permit process, and thereby expedite approvals, but the new building won't be ready until 2020; therefore, interim measures to expedite ADU approvals are needed.	Department of Building Inspection [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Disagree, partially	The Department is in agreement that interim measures to expedite ADU approvals are needed ahead of the opening of the one stop permit center in 2020. The Department disagrees with the characterization that the Planning Department will be the entity establishing the one stop permit center and the characterization that the new building will belong to the planning department, Rather, the one stop permit center will be established and run by the City Administrator. The building at 45 South Van Ness will belong to the City and will be managed by the Department of Real Estate.		Recommends the five agencies involved with ADU permitting establish a shared meeting space by January 1, 2019, and not wait for the completion of the new shared agency building. This space would be used by point persons from each of the five permitting agencies to expedite the ADU permit approval process.	Department of Building Inspection [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Has been implemented	DBI, Planning, SFFD, DPW, and PUC members located together at a shar fifth floor at 1660 Mission Street to approval process.

Finding (text may be duplicated due to spanning and multiple respondent effects)	Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]	Finding Response (Agree/Disagree)	Finding Response Text	R# [for F#]	Recommendation (text may be duplicated due to spanning and multiple respondent effects)	Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]	Recommendation Response	Recommendation Re
The Planning Department expects to establish a one-stop permit center in its new building, which would bring together all agencies involved in the permit process, and thereby expedite approvals, but the new building won't be ready until 2020; therefore, interim measures to expedite ADU approvals are needed.	Fire Department [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Disagree, partially	The Department is in agreement that interim measures to expedite ADU approvals are needed ahead of the opening of the one stop permit center in 2020. The Department disagrees with the characterization that the Planning Department will be the entity establishing the one stop permit center and the characterization that the new building will belong to the planning department. Rather, the one stop permit center will be established and run by the City Administrator. The building at 49 South Van Ness will belong to the City and will be managed by the Department of Real Estate.		Recommends the five agencies involved with ADU permitting establish a shared meeting space by January 1, 2019, and not wait for the completion of the new shared agency building. This space would be used by point persons from each of the five permitting agencies to expedite the ADU permit approval process.	Fire Department	Has been Implemented	DBI, Planning, SFFD, DPW, and PUC of members located together at a share fifth floor at 1660 Mission Street to approval process.
The Planning Department expects to establish a one-stop permit center in its new building, which would bring together all agencies involved in the permit process, and thereby expedite approvals, but the new building won't be ready until 2020; therefore, interim measures to expedite ADU approvals are needed.	Department of Public Works [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Disagree, partially	The Department is in agreement that interim measures to expedite ADU approvals are needed ahead of the opening of the one stop permit center in 2020. The Department disagrees with the characterization that the Planning Department will be the entity establishing the one stop permit center and the characterization that the new building will belong to the planning department. Rather, the one stop permit center will be established and run by the City Administrator. The building at 49 South Van Ness will belong to the City and will be managed by the Department of Real Estate.		Recommends the five agencies involved with ADU permitting establish a shared meeting space by January 1, 2019, and not wait for the completion of the new shared agency building. This space would be used by point persons from each of the five permitting agencies to expedite the ADU permit approval process.	Department of Public Works [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Has been Implemented	DBI, Planning, SFFD, DPW, and PUC c members located together at a share fifth floor at 1660 Mission Street to e approval process.
The Planning Department expects to establish a one-stop permit center in its new building, which would bring together all agencies involved in the permit process, and thereby expedite approvals, but the new building won't be ready until 2020; therefore, interim measures to expedite ADU approvals are needed.	Public Utilities Commission [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Disagree, partially	The Department is in agreement that interim measures to expedite ADU approvals are needed ahead of the opening of the one stop permit center in 2020. The Department disagrees with the characterization that the Planning Department will be the entity establishing the one stop permit center and the characterization that the new building will belong to the planning department. Rather, the one stop permit center will be established and run by the City Administrator. The building at 45 South Van Ness will belong to the City and will be managed by the Department of Real Estate.		Recommends the five agencies involved with ADU permitting establish a shared meeting space by January 1, 2019, and not wait for the completion of the new shared agency building. This space would be used by point persons from each of the five permitting agencies to expedite the ADU permit approval process.	Public Utilities Commission [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Has been Implemented	DBI, Planning, SFFD, DPW, and PUC c members located together at a share fifth floor at 1660 Mission Street to e approval process.

Finding	Respondent Assigned by	Finding Response	Finding Response Text	R#	Recommendation	Respondent Assigned by	Recommendation	Recommendation Re
(text may be duplicated due to spanning and	CGJ	(Agree/Disagree)		[for F#]	(text may be duplicated due to spanning and	CGJ	Response	
multiple respondent effects) The City's ADU program acknowledges the value	[Response Due Date]	Disagree, partially	More research is required on the reasons more		multiple respondent effects)	[Response Due Date]	(Implementation)	
to the City of increasing ADU construction.	Inspection	Disagree, partially	single-family homeowners are not applying for					
Homeowners who construct ADUs do so	[Response due: September	Albert March	ADUs in San Francisco, which may mirror larger					
voluntarily and at their own expense. The	3, 2018]		state and national trends. In our experience,					
additional burden of heavy permit fees is	3, 2010]		fees have not been noted as a key barrier. The				i a Nasak	
counterproductive to the City's goal of			cost of building materials and construction labor					
increasing the rate of ADU construction, in that		100 A 200 B	drive the cost of the ADU project, as these hard					
it represents an additional barrier to building			costs plus the soft costs such as designer fees					
ADUs for single family homeowners, and			and permit fees (which are often a percentage					*
therefore likely reduces the number of	·	14.6	of the hard costs) form a bulk of project costs;					
applications.			other project fees may include water and power					<u> </u>
			connection charges, development impact fees,					
		11 11 11 11 11 11	school district fees, which are dependent on					
		100	scope of project. Anecdotal reasons that are				1.0	
			discussed frequently as barriers include: the					
		1 4 4	lack of financing through existing mechanisms,					
		1.0	the burden of construction loan payments,					
			limited public outreach, and the duration of				100	
			permit review.				2.7	·
The City's ADU program acknowledges the value	Planning Department	Disagree, partially	More research is required on the reasons more	<u> </u>				
to the City of increasing ADU construction.	[Response due: September		single-family homeowners are not applying for					1
Homeowners who construct ADUs do so	3, 2018]		ADUs in San Francisco, which may mirror larger					
voluntarily and at their own expense. The	1		state and national trends. In our experience,		i			
additional burden of heavy permit fees is			fees have not been noted as a key barrier. The	į				
counterproductive to the City's goal of			cost of building materials and construction labor					
increasing the rate of ADU construction, in that		1 1 1 1 1 1 1	drive the cost of the ADU project, as these hard					1
it represents an additional barrier to building		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	costs plus the soft costs such as designer fees					
ADUs for single family homeowners, and			and permit fees (which are often a percentage					
therefore likely reduces the number of			of the hard costs) form a bulk of project costs;					
applications.			other project fees may include water and power	-				A Company of the Comp
		And the second	connection charges, development impact fees,					
			school district fees, which are dependent on		·			
			scope of project. Anecdotal reasons that are				I STATE AND A	
			discussed frequently as barriers include: the					
			lack of financing through existing mechanisms,					•
			the burden of construction loan payments,					
			limited public outreach, and the duration of					
			permit review.				N. Section	
Cities that lower permitting fees for ADUs, as	Department of Building	Agree with the						
Portland, Seattle and Vancouver, BC have done,	Inspection	finding						
see an increase in the number of permit	[Response due: September						TALL S	-
applications by single family homeowners; if	3, 2018]			ì				
San Francisco reduces permitting fees for that								:
type of ADU permit applications, they are likely								
to increase.								
Cities that lower permitting fees for ADUs, as	Planning Department	Agree with the						
Portland, Seattle and Vancouver, BC have done	[Response due: September	finding						1
see an increase in the number of permit	3, 2018]			1				
applications by single family homeowners; if							No. 1 de la	
San Francisco reduces permitting fees for that								
type of ADU permit applications, they are likely								
to increase.			1					
	1			_i	<u> </u>	1		

1	Finding	Respondent Assigned by	Finding Response	Finding Response Text	R#	Recommendation	Respondent Assigned by	Recommendation	Recommendation Re
	(text may be duplicated due to spanning and multiple respondent effects)	CGJ [Response Due Date]	(Agree/Disagree)		[for F#]	(text may be duplicated due to spanning and multiple respondent effects)	CGJ [Response Due Date]	Response (Implementation)	
	The City's Building and related construction codes place limitations on what can be built, inhibiting some homeowners from building ADUs. Allowing exceptions from these requirements, when it can be done without compromising safety, helps homeowners add ADUs to their homes.	Planning Department [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Disagree, partially	The ADU program aiready includes much flexibility from the Planning Code requirements, which regulates quality of life in the unit. Basic health and safety requirements are regulated by the Building Code which is also constrained by the State Code. The City is exploring ways to ease Building and Fire Code standards within the limitations of the State Law. This is difficult, however, because the City's discretion to change these codes is limited to making those codes more—not less—restrictive. Local jurisdictions cannot waive or be less restrictive than State mandate. A homeowner/ADU applicant may request an alternative means of protection equal to or greater than prescribed requirements.	R1 [F2, F8]	Recommends the Planning Department and the Department of Building Inspection jointly review their codes and submit joint recommendations to the Board of Supervisors no later than April 1, 2019 for code amendments designed to encourage homeowners to build more ADUs.	Planning Department	Will be implemented	Over the last six months, DBI, Plannil Public Works-BSM and representativ and Board of Supervisors have been and develop recommendations to er Through this interagency working griprelimenary checklists for each respirequirements to expedite and strear rounds of amendments have increas owners to add units to their propertional stream of the stream of
	The City's Building and related construction codes place limitations on what can be built, inhibiting some homeowners from building ADUs. Allowing exceptions from these requirements, when it can be done without compromising safety, helps homeowners add ADUs to their homes.	Department of Building Inspection [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Disagree, partially	The ADU program already includes much flexibility from the Planning Code requirements, which regulates quality of life in the unit. Basic health and safety requirements are regulated by the Building Code which is also constrained by the State Code. The City is exploring ways to ease Building and Fire Code standards within the limitations of the State Law. This is difficult, however, because the City's discretion to change these codes is limited to making those codes more not less restrictive. Local jurisdictions cannot waive or be less restrictive than State mandate. A homeowner/ADU applicant may request an alternative means of protection equal to or greater than prescribed requirements.		Recommends the Planning Department and the Department of Building Inspection jointly review their codes and submit joint recommendations to the Board of Supervisors no later than April 1, 2019 for code amendments designed to encourage homeowners to build more ADUs.	Inspection [Response due: September	Will be implemented	Over the last six months, DBI, Plannii Public Works-BSM and representativ and Board of Supervisors have been and develop recommendations to er Through this interagency working graprelimenary checklists for each respirequirements to expedite and strear rounds of amendments have increas owners to add units to their property. Still, further analysis is warranted to further recommendations. Planning their codes and submit joint recomm Supervisors no later than April 1, 201 designed to encourage homeowners
	The City's Building and related construction codes place limitations on what can be built, inhibiting some homeowners from building ADUs. Allowing exceptions from these requirements, when it can be done without compromising safety, helps homeowners add ADUs to their homes.	Planning Department [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Disagree, partially	The ADU program already includes much flexibility from the Planning Code requirements, which regulates quality of life in the unit. Basic health and safety requirements are regulated by the Building Code which is also constrained by the State Code. The City is exploring ways to ease Building and Fire Code standards within the limitations of the State Law. This is difficult, however, because the City's discretion to change these codes is limited to making those codes more not less restrictive. Local jurisdictions cannot waive or be less restrictive than State mandate. A homeowner/ADU applicant may request an alternative means of protection equal to or greater than prescribed requirements.	R9 [F2, F8]	Recommends the Planning Department waive parking space requirements for ADUs built in single-family residences.	Planning Department [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Has been implemented	The Planning Code does not require unit to any building. This control was before the ADU program. The ADU p not requiring parking for ADUs, even is proposed at one property. The Pla through the provision of bicycle park through the granting of an administr parking requirement per the ADU pr made removing existing required pai provision was built into the ADU pro inception in 2014. The Planning Code provision of bicycle parking at the pr granting of an administrative except requirement per the ADU program.

Finding	Respondent Assigned by	Finding Response	Finding Response Text	R#	Recommendation	Respondent Assigned by	Recommendation	Recommendation Re
(text may be duplicated due to spanning and	CGJ	(Agree/Disagree)		[for F#]	(text may be duplicated due to spanning and	CG1	Response	
multiple respondent effects)	[Response Due Date]			1440,444,641,6	multiple respondent effects)	[Response Due Date]	(Implementation)	7 - 4x373-1345-223-134-134-134-134-134-134-134-134-134-13
The Planning Department's current public	Planning Department	Agree with the		R10	Recommends the Planning Department expand	Planning Department	Will be	To date, the Planning Department ha
outreach program is a good start, but the		finding		[F2, F9]	its public outreach on ADUs to increase	[Response due: September	implemented	to market and publicize the ADU pro
material needs to be updated, and it is not	3, 2018]				homeowner awareness of ADU opportunities.	3, 2018]		handbook that include six ADU proto
reaching enough people. Better outreach							1 3 A 1 A 1 A 1 A	video, created user friendly Fact She
directed to more homeowners will likely lead to								attended public events to present th
an increase in applications for construction of		S. 1	1					common public questions. Moving f
ADUs in single family homes.		100000						team received a grant for communit
		1.75						City Planning (FOCP) for \$29,000 to a
								materials, and facilitate community
								is for contracting a consultant to upc
							P. Parkerson M.	updated prototypes to reflect Code (
		1000 000 000					1 17 4 4 4 1	updated financial analysis. Anticipate
							12.54	is late Fall of 2018*. This ADU Handb
								resource, and is used by design profe
							Table 19 and 19	to learn about how an ADU could fit
								as used as a resource at outreach ev
		Maria Nati				-		
		I Mark the term						Furthermore, Planning will create a a
								resource portal anticipated by end o
			:					be aimed to single family homeowns
								unit homeowner audience.
		Jan 18 p. 1						differiorited wife addictice.
			1				2.25	The community outreach (Planning a
			4					timeline is as follows:
							1.50 (1.50)	o To design professionals fall 2018*.
		1 2 2 2 2 2	•					o To single-family homeowners Q4 2
			•					o to single-lamily nomeowners Q4 2
		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1						to the land of the second of t
•		1.5						*Predicated on DBI & Fire mutually a
Spaces at the 1068 Mission and possibly the	Mayor's Office of Housing	15	While the idea to use the 1068 site for	R5	Recommends that MOHCD and OCII require the	Mayor's Office of Housing	Will not be	While the idea to use the 1068 site for
1 '	,	Disagree, wholly	81		1	and Community	implemented	training for residents is a good one, 1
Mission Bay Block 9 homeless housing projects	and Community		construction trades training for residents is a	[F10]	managers of 1068 Mission Street and possibly	1	1 '	
may be suitable for construction trade "soft	Development		good one, the space has already been		Mission Bay Block 9 to reserve ground floor	Development	because it is not	programmed to be used for the CHE
skills" training—preparatory training for	[Response due: September		programmed to be used for the CHEF's		space for use in training construction workers,	[Response due: September	warranted or	program is currently in operation at
construction work. This could be facilitated by	3, 2018]	The first Section 1	program. The CHEF's program is currently in	1	including training in ADU construction methods	3, 2018]	reasonable	by ECS at the 1068 site, and has a pre
DHSH as part of the CityBuild program. The end			operation at other locations, replicable by ECS		and modular unit construction work.			employment for formerly homeless
result could be a strengthened labor force.		1.75	at the 1068 site, and has a proven track record					restrictions bestowed on the site wh
			regarding employment for formerly homeless					federal government mandate that th
			persons. Additionally, restrictions bestowed on					formerly homeless individuals, which
	di di		the site when transferred from the federal					in a construction training program.
			government mandate that the site be used only					
		1 1 1 1 1	to serve formerly homeless individuals, which					Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly not a
		1 44 5	would limit participation in a construction					training program because the demar
			training program.					services at Mission Bay South Block 9
						1		the project's ground floor space not
	*		Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly not available for					mechanical and utility uses. The nor
			a construction training program because the	1			1 13104 1316	floor uses include suites to accommo
			demand for robust supportive services at					property management functions, exa
			Mission Bay South Block 9 requires the entirety					room and kitchen, and a lounge.
· ·	1		of the project's ground floor space not					
		1. 34. 3. 1.	otherwise used for mechanical and utility uses.					
			The non-mechanical/utility ground floor uses				Table Made	
			include suites to accommodate supportive					
			services, property management functions, exam				1 100	
			rooms, community room and kitchen, and a			1		N
	1	1	lounge.	1	1	1	1	1

Finding	Respondent Assigned by	Finding Response	Finding Response Text	R#	Recommendation	Respondent Assigned by	Recommendation	Recommendation R
(text may be duplicated due to spanning and	CGJ	(Agree/Disagree)		[for F#]	(text may be duplicated due to spanning and	CGJ.	Response	
multiple respondent effects)	[Response Due Date]			N-4444702	multiple respondent effects)	[Response Due Date]	(Implementation)	1,000,000,000,000
1 1 1	Department of	Disagree, wholly	While the idea to use the 1068 site for	R5	Recommends that MOHCD and OCII require the	Department of	Will not be	While the idea to use the 1068 site
Mission Bay Block 9 homeless housing projects	Homelessness and		construction trades training for residents is a	[F10]	managers of 1068 Mission Street and possibly	Homelessness and	implemented	training for residents is a good one,
1 '	Supportive Housing		good one, the space has already been		Mission Bay Block 9 to reserve ground floor	Supportive Housing	because it is not	programmed to be used for the CH
	[Response due: September	19-12-13	programmed to be used for the CHEF's		space for use in training construction workers,	[Response due: September	warranted or	program is currently in operation a
1	3, 2018]		program. The CHEF's program is currently in			3, 2018]	reasonable	by ECS at the 1068 site, and has a
DHSH as part of the CityBuild program. The end			operation at other locations, replicable by ECS		and modular unit construction work.			employment for formerly homeles
result could be a strengthened labor force.			at the 1068 site, and has a proven track record			•		restrictions bestowed on the site v
			regarding employment for formerly homeless					federal government mandate that
	1	10.00	persons. Additionally, restrictions bestowed on					formerly homeless individuals, wh
			the site when transferred from the federal					in a construction training program
			government mandate that the site be used only					
			to serve formerly homeless individuals, which			·		Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly no
		1	would limit participation in a construction					training program because the den
		1, 1	training program,		'			services at Mission Bay South Bloc
			:		1			the project's ground floor space n
		1	Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly not available for					mechanical and utility uses. The r
			a construction training program because the					floor uses include suites to accom
		A service of	demand for robust supportive services at				1, 5, 1, 1, 1	property management functions,
			Mission Bay South Block 9 requires the entirety					room and kitchen, and a lounge.
			of the project's ground floor space not					
			otherwise used for mechanical and utility uses.					
			The non-mechanical/utility ground floor uses					
			include suites to accommodate supportive					:
			services, property management functions, exam					
			rooms, community room and kitchen, and a					
ļ			lounge.				1 1 1	
Spaces at the 1068 Mission and possibly the	Office of Community	Disagree, wholly	While the idea to use the 1068 site for	R5	Recommends that MOHCD and OCII require the	Office of Community	Will not be	While the idea to use the 1068 sit
Mission Bay Block 9 homeless housing projects	Investment and	Disagree, Wholly	construction trades training for residents is a	[F10]	managers of 1068 Mission Street and possibly	Investment and	Implemented	training for residents is a good on
may be suitable for construction trade "soft	Infrastructure		good one, the space has already been	(110)	Mission Bay Block 9 to reserve ground floor	Infrastructure	because it is not	programmed to be used for the C
1 '	[Response due: September		programmed to be used for the CHEF's		space for use in training construction workers,	Response due: September	warranted or	program is currently in operation
	3, 2018]		1		including training in ADU construction methods	3, 2018]	reasonable	by ECS at the 1068 site, and has a
· 1						[3, 2010]	Teasoriable	
IDUSU as part of the CityBuild program. The and it	1 '		program. The CHEF's program is currently in		1 5			lamployment for formerly homele
DHSH as part of the CityBuild program. The end	1 '		operation at other locations, replicable by ECS		and modular unit construction work.			. 4
DHSH as part of the CityBuild program. The end result could be a strengthened labor force.	1 '		operation at other locations, replicable by ECS at the 1068 site, and has a proven track record		1 5			restrictions bestowed on the site
	1 '		operation at other locations, replicable by ECS at the 1068 site, and has a proven track record regarding employment for formerly homeless		1 5			restrictions bestowed on the site federal government mandate that
	1 '		operation at other locations, replicable by ECS at the 1068 site, and has a proven track record regarding employment for formerly homeless persons. Additionally, restrictions bestowed on		1 5			restrictions bestowed on the site federal government mandate that formerly homeless individuals, wh
	1 '		operation at other locations, replicable by ECS at the 1068 site, and has a proven track record regarding employment for formerly homeless persons. Additionally, restrictions bestowed on the site when transferred from the federal		1 5			restrictions bestowed on the site federal government mandate that formerly homeless individuals, where the strength of the str
	1 '		operation at other locations, replicable by ECS at the 1068 site, and has a proven track record regarding employment for formerly homeless persons. Additionally, restrictions bestowed on the site when transferred from the federal government mandate that the site be used only		1 5			restrictions bestowed on the site federal government mandate tha formerly homeless individuals, wh in a construction training program
	1 '		operation at other locations, replicable by ECS at the 1068 site, and has a proven track record regarding employment for formerly homeless persons. Additionally, restrictions bestowed on the site when transferred from the federal government mandate that the site be used only to serve formerly homeless individuals, which		1 5			restrictions bestowed on the site federal government mandate that formerly homeless individuals, whin a construction training program Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly no
, , , =	1 '		operation at other locations, replicable by ECS at the 1068 site, and has a proven track record regarding employment for formerly homeless persons. Additionally, restrictions bestowed on the site when transferred from the federal government mandate that the site be used only to serve formerly homeless individuals, which would limit participation in a construction		1 5			restrictions bestowed on the site of federal government mandate that formerly homeless individuals, whin a construction training program Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly no training program because the den
	1 '		operation at other locations, replicable by ECS at the 1068 site, and has a proven track record regarding employment for formerly homeless persons. Additionally, restrictions bestowed on the site when transferred from the federal government mandate that the site be used only to serve formerly homeless individuals, which		1 5			restrictions bestowed on the site of federal government mandate that formerly homeless individuals, whin a construction training program Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly no training program because the denservices at Mission Bay South Block
	1 '		operation at other locations, replicable by ECS at the 1068 site, and has a proven track record regarding employment for formerly homeless persons. Additionally, restrictions bestowed on the site when transferred from the federal government mandate that the site be used only to serve formerly homeless individuals, which would limit participation in a construction training program.		1 5			restrictions bestowed on the site federal government mandate that formerly homeless individuals, while a construction training program Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly not training program because the der services at Mission Bay South Block the project's ground floor space in
, , , =	1 '		operation at other locations, replicable by ECS at the 1068 site, and has a proven track record regarding employment for formerly homeless persons. Additionally, restrictions bestowed on the site when transferred from the federal government mandate that the site be used only to serve formerly homeless individuals, which would limit participation in a construction training program. Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly not available for		1 5			restrictions bestowed on the site of federal government mandate that formerly homeless individuals, whin a construction training program Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly no training program because the denservices at Mission Bay South Block the project's ground floor space no mechanical and utility uses. The restricts are size of the project's ground floor space of mechanical and utility uses.
	1 '		operation at other locations, replicable by ECS at the 1068 site, and has a proven track record regarding employment for formerly homeless persons. Additionally, restrictions bestowed on the site when transferred from the federal government mandate that the site be used only to serve formerly homeless individuals, which would limit participation in a construction training program. Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly not available for a construction training program because the		1 5	·		restrictions bestowed on the site federal government mandate that formerly homeless individuals, whim a construction training program Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly not training program because the der services at Mission Bay South Blot the project's ground floor space in mechanical and utility uses. The Ifloor uses include suites to accommend
	1 '		operation at other locations, replicable by ECS at the 1068 site, and has a proven track record regarding employment for formerly homeless persons. Additionally, restrictions bestowed on the site when transferred from the federal government mandate that the site be used only to serve formerly homeless individuals, which would limit participation in a construction training program. Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly not available for a construction training program because the demand for robust supportive services at		1 5	·		restrictions bestowed on the site federal government mandate that formerly homeless individuals, whin a construction training program Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly not training program because the der services at Mission Bay South Blot the project's ground floor space in mechanical and utility uses. The ifloor uses include suites to accomproperty management functions,
, , , =	1 '		operation at other locations, replicable by ECS at the 1068 site, and has a proven track record regarding employment for formerly homeless persons. Additionally, restrictions bestowed on the site when transferred from the federal government mandate that the site be used only to serve formerly homeless individuals, which would limit participation in a construction training program. Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly not available for a construction training program because the demand for robust supportive services at Mission Bay South Block 9 requires the entirety		1 5	·		restrictions bestowed on the site federal government mandate tha formerly homeless individuals, win a construction training program Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly not training program because the der services at Mission Bay South Blothe project's ground floor space in mechanical and utility uses. The floor uses include suites to accommend
, , , =	1 '		operation at other locations, replicable by ECS at the 1068 site, and has a proven track record regarding employment for formerly homeless persons. Additionally, restrictions bestowed on the site when transferred from the federal government mandate that the site be used only to serve formerly homeless individuals, which would limit participation in a construction training program. Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly not available for a construction training program because the demand for robust supportive services at Mission Bay South Block 9 requires the entirety of the project's ground floor space not		1 5	·		restrictions bestowed on the site federal government mandate that formerly homeless individuals, which is a construction training program Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly not training program because the deservices at Mission Bay South Blothe project's ground floor space in mechanical and utility uses. The floor uses include suites to accomproperty management functions,
	1 '		operation at other locations, replicable by ECS at the 1068 site, and has a proven track record regarding employment for formerly homeless persons. Additionally, restrictions bestowed on the site when transferred from the federal government mandate that the site be used only to serve formerly homeless individuals, which would limit participation in a construction training program. Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly not available for a construction training program because the demand for robust supportive services at Mission Bay South Block 9 requires the entirety of the project's ground floor space not otherwise used for mechanical and utility uses.		1 5			restrictions bestowed on the site federal government mandate that formerly homeless individuals, with a construction training program Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly not training program because the deservices at Mission Bay South Blothe project's ground floor space romechanical and utility uses. The floor uses include suites to accomproperty management functions,
	1 '		operation at other locations, replicable by ECS at the 1068 site, and has a proven track record regarding employment for formerly homeless persons. Additionally, restrictions bestowed on the site when transferred from the federal government mandate that the site be used only to serve formerly homeless individuals, which would limit participation in a construction training program. Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly not available for a construction training program because the demand for robust supportive services at Mission Bay South Block 9 requires the entirety of the project's ground floor space not otherwise used for mechanical and utility uses. The non-mechanical/utility ground floor uses		1 5			restrictions bestowed on the site of federal government mandate that formerly homeless individuals, whin a construction training program Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly not training program because the denservices at Mission Bay South Bloc the project's ground floor space not mechanical and utility uses. The infloor uses include suites to accomproperty management functions,
	1 '		operation at other locations, replicable by ECS at the 1068 site, and has a proven track record regarding employment for formerly homeless persons. Additionally, restrictions bestowed on the site when transferred from the federal government mandate that the site be used only to serve formerly homeless individuals, which would limit participation in a construction training program. Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly not available for a construction training program because the demand for robust supportive services at Mission Bay South Block 9 requires the entirety of the project's ground floor space not otherwise used for mechanical and utility uses.		1 5	·		restrictions bestowed on the site federal government mandate that formerly homeless individuals, whin a construction training program Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly not training program because the der services at Mission Bay South Blot the project's ground floor space in mechanical and utility uses. The ifloor uses include suites to accomproperty management functions,
	1 '		operation at other locations, replicable by ECS at the 1068 site, and has a proven track record regarding employment for formerly homeless persons. Additionally, restrictions bestowed on the site when transferred from the federal government mandate that the site be used only to serve formerly homeless individuals, which would limit participation in a construction training program. Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly not available for a construction training program because the demand for robust supportive services at Mission Bay South Block 9 requires the entirety of the project's ground floor space not otherwise used for mechanical and utility uses. The non-mechanical/utility ground floor uses		1 5	·		restrictions bestowed on the site was federal government mandate that formerly homeless individuals, whin a construction training program Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly no training program because the dem services at Mission Bay South Bloc the project's ground floor space no mechanical and utility uses. The refloor uses include suites to accomproperty management functions,
	1 '		operation at other locations, replicable by ECS at the 1068 site, and has a proven track record regarding employment for formerly homeless persons. Additionally, restrictions bestowed on the site when transferred from the federal government mandate that the site be used only to serve formerly homeless individuals, which would limit participation in a construction training program. Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly not available for a construction training program because the demand for robust supportive services at Mission Bay South Block 9 requires the entirety of the project's ground floor space not otherwise used for mechanical and utility uses. The non-mechanical/utility ground floor uses include suites to accommodate supportive		1 5			employment for formerly homeles restrictions bestowed on the site w federal government mandate that formerly homeless individuals, wh in a construction training program. Mission Bay Block 9 is similarly not training program because the dem services at Mission Bay South Bloc the project's ground floor space not mechanical and utility uses. The n floor uses include suites to accomproperty management functions, or room and kitchen, and a lounge.

·	Finding (text may be duplicated due to spanning and multiple respondent effects)	Respondent Assigned by CGJ	Finding Response (Agree/Disagree)	Finding Response Text	R# [for F#]	Recommendation (text may be duplicated due to spanning and	Respondent Assigned by CGJ	Recommendation Response	Recommendation Re
1	When the City is building housing using factory- constructed modules from outside the City, the factory construction of those modules is subject to state building codes but not local building codes. If local building codes are not taken into account at the factory, there can be code compliance problems at the project site.	[Response due: September 3, 2018]	Disagree, partially	Factory-built housing is required to be certified and receive a State insignia of approval to show compliance with State building code requirements. The City's goal is to have fully code-compliant modular housing that is high quality and long lasting. To accomplish this, during production of housing modules bound for San Francisco, City codes will be adhered to at the factory to ensure there is no code compliance issue at the project site.	R8 [F11]	multiple respondent effects) Recommends the Department of Building Inspection regularly inspect modular factories outside the City, if those factories are building housing for the City, to ensure construction is built to comply with City codes.	Response Due Date! Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development [Response due: September 3, 2018]	(Implementation) Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable	It is critical that housing units built ir Francisco comply with our local code that ensures safety and quality. How efficient to have DBI participate in replans and inspection procedures at t manufacturing begins.
1	When the City is building housing using factory- constructed modules from outside the City, the factory construction of those modules is subject to state building codes but not local building codes. If local building codes are not taken into account at the factory, there can be code compliance problems at the project site.	Inspection [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Disagree, partially	Factory-built housing is required to be certified and receive a State insignia of approval to show compliance with State building code requirements. The City's goal is to have fully code-compliant modular housing that is high quality and long lasting. To accomplish this, during production of housing modules bound for San Francisco, City codes will be adhered to at the factory to ensure there is no code compliance issue at the project site.		Recommends the Department of Building Inspection regularly inspect modular factories outside the City, if those factories are building housing for the City, to ensure construction is built to comply with City codes.	Department of Building Inspection [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable	It is critical that housing units built in Francisco comply with our local code that ensures safety and quality. How efficient to have DBI participate in n plans and inspection procedures at t manufacturing begins.
1	When the City is building housing using factory- constructed modules from outside the City, the factory construction of those modules is subject to state building codes but not local building codes. If local building codes are not taken into account at the factory, there can be code compliance problems at the project site.	Investment and Infrastructure [Response due: September	Disagree, partially	Factory-built housing is required to be certified and receive a State insignia of approval to show compliance with State building code requirements. The City's goal is to have fully code-compliant modular housing that is high quality and long lasting. To accomplish this, during production of housing modules bound for San Francisco, City codes will be adhered to at the factory to ensure there is no code compliance issue at the project site.	R8 [F11]	Recommends the Department of Building Inspection regularly inspect modular factories outside the City, if those factories are building housing for the City, to ensure construction is built to comply with City codes.	Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable	It is critical that housing units built ir Francisco comply with our local code that ensures safety and quality. How efficient to have DBI participate in replans and inspection procedures at t manufacturing begins.
2	Some current trade union contracts prevent the City from using modular construction for City- sponsored below market housing projects, and further slow progress on below market housing.	and Community Development	Disagree, partially	While opposition from some building trades has slowed adoption of modular housing technologies, no specific trade contracts exist that prevent the City's use of modular housing.					
2	Some current trade union contracts prevent the City from using modular construction for City- sponsored below market housing projects, and further slow progress on below market housing.	[Response due: September 3, 2018]	Disagree, partially	While opposition from some building trades has slowed adoption of modular housing technologies, no specific trade contracts exist that prevent the City's use of modular housing.	R11 [F12, F14]	Recommends the Mayor support the establishment of a union-staffed modular housing factory in San Francisco.	Mayor [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Has been implemented	In January 2018, Mayor Breed annot development of a plan to establish a within the City limits staffed by unior consultant to review whether a mod union workers is feasible. The city ex work to conclude by the end of this
3	It may take as many as five residential modular construction projects for the City to accurately assess this alternate construction method, including an assessment of cost and time benefits. In addition to the 1068 Mission project, it will be helpful to this assessment if the pending homeless housing project at Mission Bay Block 9 is built using modular construction methods.	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Agree with the finding						

Ī	Finding (text may be duplicated due to spanning and multiple respondent effects)	Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]	Finding Response (Agree/Disagree)	Finding Response Text	R# [for F#]	Recommendation (text may be duplicated due to spanning and multiple respondent effects)	Respondent Assigned by CGJ [Response Due Date]	Recommendation Response (Implementation)	Recommendation Re
3	including an assessment of cost and time	Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Agree with the finding		[F13]	Recommends the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure make its best effort to encourage the developer to use modular construction for the Mission Bay Block 9 homeless housing project.	Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Has been implemented	In OCII's Request for Proposals for M issued in 2017, OCII included a requi pursue alternative construction tech As a result, the selected developer to designed the project for modular couthe RFP.
4	construction in San Francisco, staffed by union workers, and committed to best practices, and	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Agree with the finding		-	·			
4	The building trade unions are open to talks with the City to establish a factory for modular unit construction in San Francisco, staffed by union workers, and committed to best practices, and this is a promising start to trade union acceptance of modular construction technology.	Mayor [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Agree with the finding		[F12, F14]	Recommends the Mayor support the establishment of a union-staffed modular housing factory in San Francisco.	Mayor [Response due: September 3, 2018]	Has been Implemented	In January 2018, Mayor Breed annou development of a plan to establish a within the City limits staffed by unio consultant to review whether a mod union workers is feasible. The City e) work to conclude by the end of this