

2004-05 Civil Grand Jury Report:
Continuity Report (released June 2005)

California Penal Code Sections 933.05(a) and (b) requires the responding party to report for each recommendation of the Civil Grand Jury one of the following actions:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action | 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation | 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe (Not to exceed six months from date of publication of grand jury report) | 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|

For each recommendation below, indicate which action you have taken or plan to take and provide the required information.

| Recommendation | Responses Required From: | Response: 1, 2, 3, or 4 |
|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Part II: 1. The Mayor's Office should develop a standardized protocol that comports with PC 933.05 for responding to CGJ reports | Mayor's Office | |
| 2. The Mayor's Office should require all City departments, offices, and agencies to use such a standardized protocol in their responses. | Mayor's Office | |
| Part III: 1. The Controller should provide to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors an on-going annual status report of the agreed-to-be-implemented CGJ recommendations. Each agree-to-be implemented recommendation should be reported on, until the respondent indicates it is fully implemented or abandoned because it is no longer reasonable or warranted. Such a report should include suggestions of ways to (a) accelerate the implementation of the open items or (b) revise the implementation of the recommendation, if need be, based on changed circumstances. The Controller's annual status report should be submitted to the Mayor and the Board in sufficient time to allow for budgetary consideration for each upcoming fiscal year. | Office of the Controller Board of Supervisors Mayor's Office | The Board of Supervisors' Government Audit and Oversight Committee conducted a public hearing on October 17, 2005, to discuss the findings and recommendations of the Civil Grand Jury and the Mayor's Office and Planning Department's responses to the report. The Committee considered the actions requested by the Civil Grand Jury. The Committee filed this item. |
| 2. The Board of Supervisors should hold an annual hearing on all outstanding recommendations, where implementation is pending. | Board of Supervisors | See above response. |

2004-05 Civil Grand Jury Report:

Continuity Report (released June 2005)

California Penal Code Sections 933.05(a) and (b) requires the responding party to report for each recommendation of the Civil Grand Jury one of the following actions:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| <p>1. Recommendation Implemented</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action | <p>2. Will Be Implemented in the Future</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation | <p>3. Requires Further Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Explanation - Timeframe <p>(Not to exceed six months from date of publication of grand jury report)</p> | <p>4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|

For each recommendation below, indicate which action you have taken or plan to take and provide the required information.

| Recommendation | Responses Required From: | Response: 1, 2, 3, or 4 |
|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p><i>Part IV:</i></p> <p>1. The Planning Department should prepare a Work Plan that identifies steps the Planning Department will take to complete the implementation of the agreed-upon recommendations of the 2001/02 Civil Grand Jury report on Billboard Code Enforcement. Such a response should include the number of additional temporary and/or regular staff members required to carry out its implementation, the needed additional software capability to increase productivity in enforcing the plan, timelines for completing each plan element, and potential sources for funding the plan.</p> | <p>Planning Department Department of Building Inspection</p> | |
| <p>2. In order to ensure that the Planning Department can commence implementation of the Work Plan, including elimination of the billboard code enforcement backlogs, the Department should request and receive "start up" monies for adequate temporary additional staffing to complete the assignment.</p> | <p>Planning Department Mayor's Office Board of Supervisors</p> | <p>The Board of Supervisors' Government Audit and Oversight Committee conducted a public hearing on Monday, October 17, 2005, to discuss the findings and recommendations of the Civil Grand Jury and the Mayor's Office and Planning Department's responses to the report. The Committee considered the actions requested by the Civil Grand Jury. The Committee filed this item.</p> |

2004-05 Civil Grand Jury Report:
 Continuity Report (released June 2005)

California Penal Code Sections 933.05(a) and (b) requires the responding party to report for each recommendation of the Civil Grand Jury one of the following actions:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action | 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation | 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe (Not to exceed six months from date of publication of grand jury report) | 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|

For each recommendation below, indicate which action you have taken or plan to take and provide the required information.

| Recommendation | Responses Required From: | Response: 1, 2, 3, or 4 |
|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|

| | | |
|---|--|---------------------|
| <p><i>Part IV:</i></p> <p>3. In order to limit the amount of "start up" funding needed before the billboard enforcement program can become self-sustaining, we suggest the following: The Board of Supervisors research major urban communities in California and elsewhere to identify "best practice" legislation to be used for collecting fees and penalties in matters of enforcement of illegal billboard signs. That information should be the basis for replacing or amending Planning Code Section 610 to enable the Planning Department to collect disincentive penalties from violators of the Billboard Ordinance. The legislation should have a fourfold purpose: to create an economic disincentive for future violations, to provide revenue for helping make billboard enforcement self-sustaining, to enhance other city revenues indirectly¹, and to eliminate the non-permitted billboards.</p> | Board of Supervisors | See above response. |
| <p>4. The Board of Supervisors should review the progress, including projected timelines, of the Department of Building Inspection Information Technology Exchange Project. Without such simultaneous tracking and coordinated action, it will be very difficult for the CPD enforcement staff to proceed as expeditiously as planned. The interface of information technology is essential for identifying targeted properties and billboards needing attention.</p> | Board of Supervisors Department of Building Inspection Planning Department | See above response. |

¹ In addition to charging an annual permit fee for all legal billboards, properties, with additional post-Prop 13 billboards, should be reviewed by the Tax Assessor to determine whether such improvements warrant a revised assessment of their present property taxes. After all, billboard income can have a significant impact on the income generation of commercial buildings. Such improvement should affect the value of the building and the city should be compensated accordingly.

2004-05 Civil Grand Jury Report:
Continuity Report (released June 2005)

*California Penal Code Sections 933.05(a) and (b) requires the responding party to report for each recommendation of the Civil Grand Jury **one** of the following actions:*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Recommendation Implemented - Date Implemented - Summary of Implemented Action | 2. Will Be Implemented in the Future - Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation | 3. Requires Further Analysis - Explanation - Timeframe (Not to exceed six months from date of publication of grand jury report) | 4. Will Not Be Implemented: Not Warranted or Not Reasonable - Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|

For each recommendation below, indicate which action you have taken or plan to take and provide the required information.

| | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Recommendation | Responses Required From: | Response: 1, 2, 3, or 4 |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|

| | | |
|---|--|---------------------|
| <i>Part IV:</i> 5. The Mayor, using SFStat and the Board President, using the Government Audit and Oversight Committee, should review the Planning Director's Report semi-annually for progress in meeting the program milestones and timelines, identified in the approved Work Plan. | Mayor's Office Board of Supervisors | See above response. |
|---|--|---------------------|



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
FINANCIAL AUDITS DIVISION

Ed Harrington
Controller
Monique Zmuda
Deputy Controller

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2006 APR 12 PM 2:30
BY: BE

Date: April 12, 2006

To: Gloria Young, Clerk of the Board
Board of Supervisors

From: Noriaki Hirasuna, Director
Financial Audit Division, Office of the Controller

Re: 2nd Request for Responses to the Recommendations of the Civil Grand Jury

This is a reminder that we have not yet received your responses to the Civil Grand Jury recommendations that we requested in our memo dated March 20, 2006. These responses are due into our office by Friday, April 21, 2006. Since we are required to submit our report to the Civil Grand Jury in May 2006, it is important that we receive all responses by the due date. We will not be able to include any late responses in the report, and will indicate in the report that the department elected not to respond. If you have any questions, please contact Winnie Woo at 415-554-7652.

We would appreciate receiving the responses in Word format and emailed to Patti.Erickson@sfgov.org.

Thank you for your cooperation.



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
FINANCIAL AUDITS DIVISION

Ed Harrington
Controller

Monique Zmuda
Deputy Controller

TO: Gloria Young, Clerk of the Board, Board of Supervisors
FROM: Noriaki Hirasuna, Director, Controller's Financial Audits Division
DATE: March 27, 2006
SUBJECT: Responses to the Recommendations of the Civil Grand Jury

RECEIVED
 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
 SAN FRANCISCO
 2006 MAR 27 PM 2:59
 BY [Signature]

The Office of the Controller is required by Section 2.10 of the San Francisco Administrative Code to report on the status of the implementation of the recommendations of the San Francisco Civil Grand Jury (Civil Grand Jury). The Civil Grand Jury has further requested the Controller to report on each agree-to-be implemented recommendation until the respondent indicates it is fully implemented or abandoned because it is no longer reasonable or warranted. We will be issuing a report summarizing the findings and recommendations of the Civil Grand Jury reports, and the current status of the implementation of those recommendations.

California Penal Code Sections 933.05(a) and (b) requires the responding party to report for each recommendation of the Civil Grand Jury one of the following actions:

- 1) The recommendation has been implemented, with a summary of the implemented action.
- 2) The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with an anticipated timeframe for implementation.
- 3) The recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of any analysis or study; and a timeframe for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or head of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.
- 4) The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or it is not reasonable, with an explanation thereof.

We have identified the reports in which a Civil Grand Jury required responses from your department in fiscal years 2003-04 and/or 2004-05. Enclosed is a listing of the specific recommendations that includes your department. Please respond only to those recommendations directed to your department. Please send us your responses on the status of the implementation of those recommendations:

No Later Than April 21, 2006

We would appreciate it if you would attach your responses in an email to:

Patti.Erickson@sfgov.org

If you have any questions, please contact Winnie Woo at 415-554-7652.



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

**OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
FINANCIAL AUDITS DIVISION**

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO

2006 MAR 21 AM 11:56

**Ed Harrington
Controller**

**Monique Zmuda
Deputy Controller**

TO: Gloria Young, Clerk of the Board, Board of Supervisors

FROM: Noriaki Hirasuna, Director, Controller's Financial Audits Division

DATE: March 20, 2006

SUBJECT: Responses to the Recommendations of the Civil Grand Jury

The Office of the Controller is required by Section 2.10 of the San Francisco Administrative Code to report on the status of the implementation of the recommendations of the San Francisco Civil Grand Jury (Civil Grand Jury). The Civil Grand Jury has further requested the Controller to report on each agree-to-be implemented recommendation until the respondent indicates it is fully implemented or abandoned because it is no longer reasonable or warranted. We will be issuing a report summarizing the findings and recommendations of the Civil Grand Jury reports, and the current status of the implementation of those recommendations.

California Penal Code Sections 933.05(a) and (b) requires the responding party to report for each recommendation of the Civil Grand Jury one of the following actions:

- 1) The recommendation has been implemented, with a summary of the implemented action.
- 2) The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with an anticipated timeframe for implementation.
- 3) The recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of any analysis or study; and a timeframe for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or head of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report.
- 4) The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or it is not reasonable, with an explanation thereof.

We have identified the reports in which a Civil Grand Jury required responses from your department in fiscal years 2003-04 and/or 2004-05. Enclosed is a listing of the specific recommendations that includes your department. Please respond only to those recommendations directed to your department. Please send us your responses on the status of the implementation of those recommendations:

No Later Than April 21, 2006

We would appreciate it if you would attach your responses in an email to:

Patti.Erickson@sfgov.org

If you have any questions, please contact Winnie Woo at 415-554-7652.

2004-2005 Civil Grand Jury Reports

| Report Name | Date Received | Hearing Date/Committee | 90-Day Response Date By |
|---|---------------|--|--|
| Compensation Issues in the SF Police Department | 3/29/05 | File 050557 Referred to Government Audit & Oversight Committee (GAO) Heard in committee 6/27/05. | Response to Presiding Judge: 6/27/05 Continued to Call of Chair Filed 1/24/06 |
| A New Chief of the Juvenile Department: An Opportunity for Reform | 5/10/05 | File 050870 Referred to GAO Heard in committee 7/25/05. | Response to Presiding Judge: 8/1/05 Filed |
| The San Francisco Ethics Commission Budgeting and Staffing Issues | 5/12/05 | File 050869 Referred to GAO Heard in committee 7/25/05. | Response to Presiding Judge: 8/1/05 Filed |
| What is the Difference Between a Contract and a Grant? | 5/19/05 | File 051152 Referred to GAO Heard in committee 9/12/05. | Response to Presiding Judge: 9/15/05 Filed |
| City Contracting and Affirmative Action | 5/23/05 | File 051153 Referred to GAO Heard in committee 9/26/05. | Response to Presiding Judge: 9/27/05 Filed |
| Employee or Independent Contractor? | 6/15/05 | NO HEARING REQUIRED | NO ACTION TO TAKE |
| Continuity Report | 7/5/05 | File 051295 Referred to GAO Heard in committee 10/17/05 | Response to Presiding Judge: 10/20/05 Filed |

Updated 1/24/06

