

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Tom Paulino - All City Departments, via the Mayors Offices

FROM: Victor Young, Assistant Clerk *Victor Young*

DATE: November 12, 2024

SUBJECT: LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

The Board of Supervisors' Rules Committee received the following proposed Ordinance:

File No. 2401022 Version 2

Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish a process for creating a publicly available inventory of Artificial Intelligence ("AI") the City uses, reporting requirements, and enforcement measures.

If you have comments or reports to be included with the file, please forward them to Victor Young at the Board of Supervisors, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102 or by email at: victor.young@sfgov.org.

c: Andres Power, Mayor's Office



City and County of San Francisco

Master Report

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

File Number: 241022 **File Type:** Ordinance **Status:** Pending Committee Action

Enacted: _____ **Effective:** _____

Version: 2 **In Control:** Rules Committee

File Name: Administrative Code - Artificial Intelligence Inventory **Date Introduced:** 11/05/2024

Requester: _____ **Cost:** _____ **Final Action:** _____

Comment: _____ **Title:** Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish a process for creating a publicly available inventory of Artificial Intelligence (“AI”) the City uses, reporting requirements, and enforcement measures.

Sponsors: Ronen; Peskin,
Chan, Preston
and Walton

History of Legislative File 241022

Ver	Acting Body	Date	Action	Sent To	Due Date	Result
1	President	10/15/2024	ASSIGNED UNDER 30 DAY RULE	Rules Committee	11/14/2024	
1	Clerk of the Board	10/21/2024	REFERRED TO DEPARTMENT			
	<i>Referral to all city departments via the Mayor's Office for informational purposes.</i>					
1	President	11/05/2024	SUBSTITUTED AND ASSIGNED UNDER 30 DAY RULE	Rules Committee	11/14/2024	
	<i>11/05/24 - Supervisor Ronen introduced a substitute Ordinance bearing a new title.</i>					

[Administrative Code - Artificial Intelligence Inventory]

Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish a process for creating a publicly available inventory of Artificial Intelligence (“AI”) the City uses, reporting requirements, and enforcement measures.

NOTE: **Unchanged Code text and uncodified text** are in plain Arial font.
Additions to Codes are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*.
Deletions to Codes are in *strikethrough italics Times New Roman font*.
Board amendment additions are in double-underlined Arial font.
Board amendment deletions are in ~~strikethrough Arial font~~.
Asterisks (* * * *) indicate the omission of unchanged Code subsections or parts of tables.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding new Chapter 22J consisting of Sections 22J.1, 22J.2, 22J.3, 22J.4, and 22J.5, to read as follows:

CHAPTER 22J: ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TOOLS

SEC. 22J.1. BACKGROUND AND FINDINGS.

(a) Many technologists, historians, scientists, elected officials, and other societal leaders believe that the advent of Artificial Intelligence that has advanced significantly with the release of generative systems is revolutionizing, and will continue to revolutionize, our world.

(b) Local governments have been using AI products since the early 1990s. However, beginning in the 2010s, significant advancements in AI technology, including machine and deep learning, led to a surge in acquisition of various products by local governments. With the advent of Generative AI products like Chat GPT and others that produce original content, the potential benefits and risks to San Francisco residents and workers have increased.

1 (c) Policymakers are trying to avoid repeating past mistakes with technological developments,
2 like the failure to regulate social media before it led to many societal harms, and find ways to protect
3 human beings from the worst predictable problems of this newest wave of technological advancement.

4 (d) While the City government, as with all levels of government, continues to develop the best
5 tools for the City to both harness the benefits and protect against the harms of emerging AI technology,
6 it is important that policymakers and the public understand the AI technologies the City is using and
7 will use in the future.

8 (e) The City has a decentralized Information Technology (IT) system. Most City departments
9 have their own IT units and as of 2024 the City’s Department of Technology (“DT”) did not generally
10 know which AI products and systems were in use by departments.

11 (f) This Chapter 22J remedies this problem by requiring the City’s Chief Information Officer
12 (“CIO”) to create a public inventory of AI technologies used within City government. The inventory
13 will include basic facts about technologies including their purpose, accuracy, biases, and limits.

14 (g) As of 2024, the City used AI technologies in a variety of ways. Here are just a few
15 illustrative examples:

16 (1) The Department of Technology used AI to review activity on IT infrastructure for
17 network security, intrusion detection, and to identify other potential cybersecurity threats.

18 (2) The SF311 mobile application used AI to make upfront service type
19 recommendations based on the user’s description or picture of the issue. A model had been trained on
20 years of service request (SR) data.

21 (3) The Department of Public Health (DPH) Radiology Department used an AI-based
22 medical imaging tool to support the confirmatory diagnosis of cerebrovascular events (strokes). The AI
23 system reviewed imaging studies (CT scans) and provided supporting information to the physicians
24 who make the diagnoses.

1 (h) The use of AI technologies by local governments can offer many benefits including but not
2 limited to increased efficiency and effectiveness of public services, quick and accurate analysis of large
3 volumes of data, automation of routine administrative tasks, facilitation of communication between
4 residents and their local government through chatbots and virtual assistants, and prediction of
5 potential hazards.

6 (i) However, with the increased use of AI technologies, local governments also potentially
7 subject their workers, residents, and visitors to new risks, including:

8 (1) Privacy Concerns: AI systems often collect, store, and analyze vast amounts of data,
9 which can include personal information of individuals. This raises concerns about privacy breaches,
10 unauthorized data sharing, and surveillance, potentially leading to a loss of anonymity in public
11 spaces.

12 (2) Bias and Discrimination: AI algorithms can perpetuate or amplify existing biases if
13 they are trained on data that reflects societal inequities. This can result in discriminatory outcomes in
14 areas such as law enforcement, housing, and public services, disproportionately affecting marginalized
15 communities.

16 (3) Lack of Transparency: Many AI systems operate as "black boxes," meaning the
17 processes and decision-making criteria are not transparent to the public. This can erode trust and
18 make it challenging for individuals to understand how decisions that affect their lives are made.

19 (4) Job Displacement: The automation of certain government functions through AI can
20 lead to job losses in the public sector or in industries reliant on those functions, impacting the
21 employment landscape and economic stability of communities.

22 (5) Security Risks: AI systems can be vulnerable to cyberattacks and exploitation. If
23 malicious actors gain access to these systems, they can manipulate data, disrupt services, or
24 compromise sensitive information, potentially leading to significant harm to individuals.

1 (6) Dependence on Technology: Increasing reliance on AI for critical services may
2 create vulnerabilities. Technical failures or misconfigurations can result in service interruptions or
3 errors that affect public safety and welfare.

4 (7) Legal and Ethical Concerns: The application of AI in sensitive areas (e.g., policing,
5 social services) raises legal and ethical concerns about the appropriateness of AI decisions in life-
6 altering contexts, such as risk assessment for individuals involved in the justice system or the allocation
7 of social support.

8 (8) Erosion of Constitutional Rights and Civil Liberties: Heightened surveillance and
9 data collection through AI can infringe on constitutional rights and civil liberties, prompting concerns
10 about the potential overreach of government authority and reduced freedoms for individuals.

11 (9) Public Mistrust: The combination of the above risks can lead to a general sense of
12 mistrust in government, where residents may feel that the government is not acting in their best
13 interests or that their rights are being compromised.

14 (j) In order to promote the ethical, responsible, and transparent use of AI tools, it is important
15 that policy makers and the public are aware of the AI technologies that the City uses, including
16 information critical to understanding those technologies.

17 **SEC. 22J.2. DEFINITIONS.**

18 For the purposes of this Chapter 22J, the following definitions shall apply:

19 “AI” means Artificial Intelligence.

20 “AI Technology” means logical and physical technology that uses Artificial Intelligence.

21 “Algorithms” means a set of rules that a machine follows to generate an outcome or a decision.

22 “Artificial Intelligence” means an engineered or machine-based system that varies in its level
23 of autonomy and that can, for explicit or implicit objectives, infer from the input it receives how to
24 generate outputs that can influence physical or virtual environments.

25 “Chatbot” means a computer program that simulates conversations.

1 "CIO" means the City's Chief Information Officer, or designee.

2 "City" means the City and County of San Francisco.

3 "COIT" means the Committee on Information Technology or one of its committees.

4 "Data" means information prepared, managed, used, or retained by a department or employee
5 of the City or a data user relating to the activities or operations of the City.

6 "Department" means any unit or component of City government, including but not limited to
7 boards and commissions, departments, offices, agencies, or officials.

8 "Department Head" means the head of a Department, or designee.

9 "DT" means the Department of Technology.

10 "Inventory" means the information collected and published in accordance with Section 22J.3.

11 "Training Data" means the dataset that is used by a machine learning model to learn the rules.

12 **SEC. 22J.3. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.**

13 (a) Chief Information Officer.

14 (1) Within six months of the effective date of this Chapter 22J, the CIO shall collect the
15 data requested under subsections (b)(1)-(22) from Departments using AI technology, and begin
16 publishing the Inventory responses on the DataSF platform.

17 (2) Within one year of the effective date of this Chapter 22J, the Inventory shall be
18 complete, including any and all AI technology used by the City. In addition, within one year of the
19 effective date, the CIO shall update the Inventory with any AI technology that the City is in the process
20 of purchasing, borrowing, or receiving as a gift, with or without the exchange of compensation or other
21 consideration before acquiring the technology and/or putting the technology into use. If the technology
22 is never obtained or no longer used, it shall be removed from the Inventory.

23 (b) Department Head. The Department Head shall disclose and submit to the CIO for inclusion
24 on the Inventory the AI technologies the Department has procured, borrowed, or received as a gift.

1 with or without the exchange of money or compensation, and for each technology shall disclose the
2 following information:

3 (1) Name of the technology and vendor;

4 (2) A brief description of the technology's purpose and function;

5 (3) The intended use of the technology;

6 (4) The context or domain in which the technology is intended to be used;

7 (5) The data used to train the technology;

8 (6) An explanation of how the technology works;

9 (7) The data generated by the technology;

10 (8) A description of what the technology is optimizing for, and its accuracy, preferably
11 with numerical performance metrics;

12 (9) Conditions necessary for the technology to perform optimally;

13 (10) Conditions under which the technology's performance would decrease in
14 accuracy;

15 (11) Whether testing has been performed to identify any bias in the technology such as
16 bias based on race, gender, etc., and the results of those tests;

17 (12) A description of how and where people report bias, inaccuracies, or poor
18 performance of the technology;

19 (13) A description of the conditions or circumstances under which the technology has
20 been tested;

21 (14) A description of adverse incident monitoring and communication procedures;

22 (15) A description of the level of human oversight associated with the technology;

23 (16) A description of whether the data collected will or can be used for training of
24 proprietary vendor or third-party systems;

25 (17) The individuals and communities that will interact with the technology;

1 (18) How the information or decisions generated by the technology could impact the
2 public's rights, opportunities, or access to critical resources or services or could impact the
3 employment and/or working conditions of City workers;

4 (19) How people with diverse abilities will interact with the user interface of the
5 technology and whether the system integrates and interacts with commonly used assistive technologies;

6 (20) Whether the technology is expected to replace any jobs currently being performed
7 by human beings;

8 (21) Why it is important for the City to use the technology; and

9 (22) Potential risks of the technology and steps that would be taken to mitigate these
10 risks.

11 (c) COIT, at the recommendation of the CIO, may modify the information requested under
12 subsection (b).

13 (d) Exceptions. The requirements set forth subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply to the
14 following uses. COIT, at the recommendation of the CIO, may reevaluate and modify these exceptions:

15 (1) Internal Efficiencies: AI technology solely used to improve internal administrative
16 processes and enhance departmental productivity and that does not affect rights, staffing decisions, or
17 make substantive changes affecting Department decisions, rights, or services, including systems for
18 internal data management, coding support, data analysis and visualization, graphic design and image
19 creation, automation of manual processes, speech-to-text and transcription, email sorting, data entry,
20 file management, document organization, grammar and spellcheck and other text editing or text
21 formatting.

22 (2) Internal Cybersecurity: AI technology solely used for internal cybersecurity
23 purposes and that does not involve surveillance of the public, decision-making, or similar actions
24 otherwise impacting the public's rights or safety, including intrusion detection, threat monitoring, and
25 other cyber defense systems.

1 (e) Each Department shall:

2 (1) Complete and return the Inventory to the CIO;

3 (2) For subsections (b)(1)-(16), it is anticipated but not required that the department
4 will obtain the information requested directly from the AI Technology Vendor;

5 (3) For subsections (b)(17)-(22), it is anticipated but not required that the Department
6 will assess the intended use of the technology to answer the questions for the inventory;

7 (4) Notify DT of any updates to published Inventory information; and

8 (5) Participate in and facilitate a timely and accurate response to all information in
9 Section(b)(1)-(22).

10 (f) The Controller shall conduct an annual review of all Department inventory responses and
11 by letter addressed to the Board of Supervisors confirm each Department's compliance or
12 noncompliance with this Section 22J.3.

13 (g) In addition to the Inventory, the CIO shall submit to the Board of Supervisors and shall
14 make available on the DataSF platform an AI Technology Report for all AI technologies used by the
15 City within 12 months of the effective date of this Chapter 22J, and every two years thereafter. For
16 each report the CIO submits to the Board of Supervisors, the CIO shall include a resolution to accept
17 the report.

18 (h) The requirements of this Chapter 22J are in addition to any requirements in Chapter 19B,
19 "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology."

20 **SEC. 22J.4. ENFORCEMENT.**

21 (a) If a person alleges that a Department has violated this Chapter 22J by failing to include
22 an AI technology in its inventory response, the person shall give written notice of the alleged
23 violation(s) to the CIO, and the CIO shall send a copy of the alleged violation to the Department. The
24 Department shall have an opportunity to correct such alleged violation(s) within 30 days of the CIO's
25 receipt of the notice.

1 (b) The CIO shall quarterly report to the Board of Supervisors the notices of alleged
2 violation that the CIO deemed valid and were not cured within 30 days of the notice.

3 (c) If the report described in subsection (b) identifies any Departments out of compliance
4 with this Chapter 22J, then the Board of Supervisors shall calendar within 60 days of receiving the
5 quarterly report a hearing on each such Department's noncompliance in the Government Audit and
6 Oversight Committee, or successor committee, of the Board of Supervisors, at which hearing the
7 Department Head shall report on the Department's plan for coming into compliance with this Chapter
8 22J.

9 (d) This Section 22J.4 shall not preclude the use of any other City process or program, such
10 as the Controller's Whistleblower Program, for raising an issue concerning compliance with this
11 Chapter 22J.

LEGISLATIVE DIGEST
(Substituted - 11/05/24)

[Administrative Code - Artificial Intelligence Inventory]

Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish a process for creating a publicly available inventory of Artificial Intelligence (“AI”) the City uses, reporting requirements and enforcement measures.

Existing Law

Existing law does not address the procurement of Artificial Intelligence (“AI”) systems or products by the City.

Amendments to Current Law

This ordinance would amend the Administrative Code by adding Section 22J to the San Francisco Administrative Code to:

- (i) establish a process for creating and publishing an inventory of AI technology currently in use and to be procured in the future by the City;
- (ii) establish a process for the public to provide written notice of an alleged violation of a department’s responsibility to include an AI technology in its inventory response; and
- (iii) delegate to the various responsibilities necessary to implement these tasks.

Background Information

Local governments have been using AI products since the early 1990s. However, beginning in the 2010s significant advancements in AI technology, including machine and deep learning, led to a surge in adoption of various products by local governments. With the recent advent of Generative AI products like Chat GPT and others that produce original content, the potential benefits and risks to San Francisco residents and workers has increased.

Policy makers are trying to avoid past mistakes, like the failure to regulate social media before it led to many societal harms and find ways to protect human beings from the worst predictable problems of this newest wave of technological advancement.

The City wants to both harness the benefits and protect against harms of emerging AI technology. To do that, it is important that policy makers and the public understand what AI technologies the City is using and will use in the future.

The City has a decentralized Information Technology (“IT”) system. Most City departments have their own IT units and as of 2024 the City’s Department of Technology (“DT”) did not generally know what AI products and systems were in use by departments.

Within six months of the effective date of this ordinance, the CIO shall collect the AI technology data from Departments. Within one year of the effective date of this ordinance, the Inventory shall be complete, including any and all AI technology used by the City. In addition, within one year of the effective date, the CIO shall update the Inventory with any AI technology that the City is in the process of purchasing, borrowing, or receiving as a gift, with or without the exchange of compensation or other consideration before acquiring the technology and/or putting the technology into use. This ordinance would require the City to publish an inventory of all AI systems currently in use by departments on the DataSF platform.

There is an enforcement provision that would allow people to allege if a department has failed to include an AI technology in its inventory response and if not cured within 30 days, a procedure for holding departments accountable for failure to comply. The CIO shall quarterly report to the Board of Supervisors the notices of alleged violation that the CIO deemed valid and were not cured within 30 days of the notice. If the report identifies any departments out of compliance, then a hearing on each such department's noncompliance shall be calendared as an agenda item of the Government Audit and Oversight Committee of the Board of Supervisors, at which hearing the Department Head shall report on the department's plan for coming into compliance. The Controller shall conduct an annual review of all department inventory responses and by letter addressed to the Board of Supervisors confirm each department’s compliance or noncompliance with this ordinance.

The ordinance shall not preclude the use of any other City process or program, such as the Controller’s Whistleblower Program, for raising an issue concerning compliance with this Chapter 22J.

n:\legana\as2024\2500072\01797673.docx

Introduction Form

(by a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor)



I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

- 1. For reference to Committee (Ordinance, Resolution, Motion or Charter Amendment)
- 2. Request for next printed agenda (For Adoption Without Committee Reference)
(Routine, non-controversial and/or commendatory matters only)
- 3. Request for Hearing on a subject matter at Committee
- 4. Request for Letter beginning with "Supervisor inquiries..."
- 5. City Attorney Request
- 6. Call File No. from Committee.
- 7. Budget and Legislative Analyst Request (attached written Motion)
- 8. Substitute Legislation File No.
- 9. Reactivate File No.
- 10. Topic submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the Board on

The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following (please check all appropriate boxes):

- Small Business Commission Youth Commission Ethics Commission
- Planning Commission Building Inspection Commission Human Resources Department

General Plan Referral sent to the Planning Department (proposed legislation subject to Charter 4.105 & Admin 2A.53):

- Yes No

(Note: For Imperative Agenda items (a Resolution not on the printed agenda), use the Imperative Agenda Form.)

Sponsor(s):

Subject:

Long Title or text listed:

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor:

From: [Gutierrez, Margarita \(CAT\)](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#); [Chung Hagen, Sheila \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: RE: Substitute Legislation - Ronen - Artificial Intelligence Inventory
Date: Tuesday, November 5, 2024 2:42:16 PM
Attachments: [image003.png](#)
[AI Ordinance - Substitute Legislative Digest.docx](#)
[AI Ordinance - Substitute Legislation Final.docx](#)

Via the email I confirm the use of my electronic signature on the legislation and approve as to form.
Thanks,

Margarita Gutierrez
Pronouns: She/Her
Deputy City Attorney
Office of City Attorney David Chiu
(415) 638-3841 Mobile
(415)554-3944 Office
www.sfcityattorney.org

NOTE ** I am working remotely intermittently and email is the best way to reach me.

*****Confidentiality Notice*****

This electronic message transmission contains information that may be confidential or protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work product doctrine. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the content of this information is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify me immediately by email and delete the original message.

From: BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, November 5, 2024 2:34 PM
To: Chung Hagen, Sheila (BOS) <sheila.chung.hagen@sfgov.org>; Gutierrez, Margarita (CAT) <Margarita.Gutierrez@sfcityatty.org>
Cc: Ronen, Hillary (BOS) <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Yan, Calvin (BOS) <calvin.yan@sfgov.org>; Hsieh, Frances (BOS) <frances.hsieh@sfgov.org>; Kilgore, Preston (BOS) <preston.kilgore@sfgov.org>; Gee, Natalie (BOS) <natalie.gee@sfgov.org>; BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>
Subject: RE: Substitute Legislation - Ronen - Artificial Intelligence Inventory

Hello,

Please provide Word versions of the legislation and the digest.

Also, we are seeking the approval from Deputy City Attorney Margarita Gutierrez for use of her electronic signature and approval as to form for the attached proposed Ordinance, by reply to

this email. Thank you.

Lisa Lew

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
T 415-554-7718 | F 415-554-5163
lisa.lew@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

(VIRTUAL APPOINTMENTS) To schedule a “virtual” meeting with me (on Microsoft Teams), please ask and I can answer your questions in real time.



Click [here](#) to complete a Board of Supervisors Customer Service Satisfaction form

The [Legislative Research Center](#) provides 24-hour access to Board of Supervisors legislation, and archived matters since August 1998.

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Chung Hagen, Sheila (BOS) <sheila.chung.hagen@sfgov.org>

Sent: Tuesday, November 5, 2024 2:28 PM

To: BOS Legislation, (BOS) <bos.legislation@sfgov.org>

Cc: Ronen, Hillary (BOS) <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Preston, Dean (BOS) <dean.preston@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Yan, Calvin (BOS) <calvin.yan@sfgov.org>; Hsieh, Frances (BOS) <frances.hsieh@sfgov.org>; Kilgore, Preston (BOS) <preston.kilgore@sfgov.org>; Gee, Natalie (BOS) <natalie.gee@sfgov.org>

Subject: Substitute Legislation - Ronen - Artificial Intelligence Inventory

Attached is substitute legislation from Supervisor Ronen for File No. 241022 (Administrative Code - Artificial Intelligence Inventory). I have cc'ed the ordinance's co-sponsors.

Thank you,
Sheila

Sheila Chung Hagen
Legislative Aide | District 9
Supervisor Hillary Ronen
Pronouns: She/Her/Ella
[Website](#)

From: [Chung Hagen, Sheila \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Ronen, Hillary \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Yan, Calvin \(BOS\)](#); [Hsieh, Frances \(BOS\)](#); [Kilgore, Preston \(BOS\)](#); [Gee, Natalie \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Substitute Legislation - Ronen - Artificial Intelligence Inventory
Date: Tuesday, November 5, 2024 2:27:57 PM
Attachments: [2024-11-04 - AI Ordinance - Substitute Legislative Digest.pdf](#)
[2024-11-05 - Introduction Form - Ronen - Artificial Intelligence Inventory.pdf](#)
[2024-11-04 - AI Ordinance - Substitute Legislation Final.pdf](#)

Attached is substitute legislation from Supervisor Ronen for File No. 241022 (Administrative Code - Artificial Intelligence Inventory). I have cc'ed the ordinance's co-sponsors.

Thank you,
Sheila

Sheila Chung Hagen
Legislative Aide | District 9
Supervisor Hillary Ronen
Pronouns: She/Her/Ella
[Website](#)

[Administrative Code - Artificial Intelligence Inventory]

Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish a process for creating a publicly available inventory of Artificial Intelligence (“AI”) the City uses, reporting requirements, and enforcement measures.

NOTE: **Unchanged Code text and uncodified text** are in plain Arial font.
Additions to Codes are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*.
Deletions to Codes are in *strikethrough italics Times New Roman font*.
Board amendment additions are in double-underlined Arial font.
Board amendment deletions are in ~~strikethrough Arial font~~.
Asterisks (* * * *) indicate the omission of unchanged Code subsections or parts of tables.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding new Chapter 22J consisting of Sections 22J.1, 22J.2, 22J.3, 22J.4, and 22J.5, to read as follows:

CHAPTER 22J: ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TOOLS

SEC. 22J.1. BACKGROUND AND FINDINGS.

(a) Many technologists, historians, scientists, elected officials, and other societal leaders believe that the advent of Artificial Intelligence that has advanced significantly with the release of generative systems is revolutionizing, and will continue to revolutionize, our world.

(b) Local governments have been using AI products since the early 1990s. However, beginning in the 2010s, significant advancements in AI technology, including machine and deep learning, led to a surge in acquisition of various products by local governments. With the advent of Generative AI products like Chat GPT and others that produce original content, the potential benefits and risks to San Francisco residents and workers have increased.

1 (c) Policymakers are trying to avoid repeating past mistakes with technological developments,
2 like the failure to regulate social media before it led to many societal harms, and find ways to protect
3 human beings from the worst predictable problems of this newest wave of technological advancement.

4 (d) While the City government, as with all levels of government, continues to develop the best
5 tools for the City to both harness the benefits and protect against the harms of emerging AI technology,
6 it is important that policymakers and the public understand the AI technologies the City is using and
7 will use in the future.

8 (e) The City has a decentralized Information Technology (IT) system. Most City departments
9 have their own IT units and as of 2024 the City’s Department of Technology (“DT”) did not generally
10 know which AI products and systems were in use by departments.

11 (f) This Chapter 22J remedies this problem by requiring the City’s Chief Information Officer
12 (“CIO”) to create a public inventory of AI technologies used within City government. The inventory
13 will include basic facts about technologies including their purpose, accuracy, biases, and limits.

14 (g) As of 2024, the City used AI technologies in a variety of ways. Here are just a few
15 illustrative examples:

16 (1) The Department of Technology used AI to review activity on IT infrastructure for
17 network security, intrusion detection, and to identify other potential cybersecurity threats.

18 (2) The SF311 mobile application used AI to make upfront service type
19 recommendations based on the user’s description or picture of the issue. A model had been trained on
20 years of service request (SR) data.

21 (3) The Department of Public Health (DPH) Radiology Department used an AI-based
22 medical imaging tool to support the confirmatory diagnosis of cerebrovascular events (strokes). The AI
23 system reviewed imaging studies (CT scans) and provided supporting information to the physicians
24 who make the diagnoses.

1 (h) The use of AI technologies by local governments can offer many benefits including but not
2 limited to increased efficiency and effectiveness of public services, quick and accurate analysis of large
3 volumes of data, automation of routine administrative tasks, facilitation of communication between
4 residents and their local government through chatbots and virtual assistants, and prediction of
5 potential hazards.

6 (i) However, with the increased use of AI technologies, local governments also potentially
7 subject their workers, residents, and visitors to new risks, including:

8 (1) Privacy Concerns: AI systems often collect, store, and analyze vast amounts of data,
9 which can include personal information of individuals. This raises concerns about privacy breaches,
10 unauthorized data sharing, and surveillance, potentially leading to a loss of anonymity in public
11 spaces.

12 (2) Bias and Discrimination: AI algorithms can perpetuate or amplify existing biases if
13 they are trained on data that reflects societal inequities. This can result in discriminatory outcomes in
14 areas such as law enforcement, housing, and public services, disproportionately affecting marginalized
15 communities.

16 (3) Lack of Transparency: Many AI systems operate as "black boxes," meaning the
17 processes and decision-making criteria are not transparent to the public. This can erode trust and
18 make it challenging for individuals to understand how decisions that affect their lives are made.

19 (4) Job Displacement: The automation of certain government functions through AI can
20 lead to job losses in the public sector or in industries reliant on those functions, impacting the
21 employment landscape and economic stability of communities.

22 (5) Security Risks: AI systems can be vulnerable to cyberattacks and exploitation. If
23 malicious actors gain access to these systems, they can manipulate data, disrupt services, or
24 compromise sensitive information, potentially leading to significant harm to individuals.

1 (6) Dependence on Technology: Increasing reliance on AI for critical services may
2 create vulnerabilities. Technical failures or misconfigurations can result in service interruptions or
3 errors that affect public safety and welfare.

4 (7) Legal and Ethical Concerns: The application of AI in sensitive areas (e.g., policing,
5 social services) raises legal and ethical concerns about the appropriateness of AI decisions in life-
6 altering contexts, such as risk assessment for individuals involved in the justice system or the allocation
7 of social support.

8 (8) Erosion of Constitutional Rights and Civil Liberties: Heightened surveillance and
9 data collection through AI can infringe on constitutional rights and civil liberties, prompting concerns
10 about the potential overreach of government authority and reduced freedoms for individuals.

11 (9) Public Mistrust: The combination of the above risks can lead to a general sense of
12 mistrust in government, where residents may feel that the government is not acting in their best
13 interests or that their rights are being compromised.

14 (j) In order to promote the ethical, responsible, and transparent use of AI tools, it is important
15 that policy makers and the public are aware of the AI technologies that the City uses, including
16 information critical to understanding those technologies.

17 **SEC. 22J.2. DEFINITIONS.**

18 For the purposes of this Chapter 22J, the following definitions shall apply:

19 “AI” means Artificial Intelligence.

20 “AI Technology” means logical and physical technology that uses Artificial Intelligence.

21 “Algorithms” means a set of rules that a machine follows to generate an outcome or a decision.

22 “Artificial Intelligence” means an engineered or machine-based system that varies in its level
23 of autonomy and that can, for explicit or implicit objectives, infer from the input it receives how to
24 generate outputs that can influence physical or virtual environments.

25 “Chatbot” means a computer program that simulates conversations.

1 "CIO" means the City's Chief Information Officer, or designee.

2 "City" means the City and County of San Francisco.

3 "COIT" means the Committee on Information Technology or one of its committees.

4 "Data" means information prepared, managed, used, or retained by a department or employee
5 of the City or a data user relating to the activities or operations of the City.

6 "Department" means any unit or component of City government, including but not limited to
7 boards and commissions, departments, offices, agencies, or officials.

8 "Department Head" means the head of a Department, or designee.

9 "DT" means the Department of Technology.

10 "Inventory" means the information collected and published in accordance with Section 22J.3.

11 "Training Data" means the dataset that is used by a machine learning model to learn the rules.

12 **SEC. 22J.3. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.**

13 (a) Chief Information Officer.

14 (1) Within six months of the effective date of this Chapter 22J, the CIO shall collect the
15 data requested under subsections (b)(1)-(22) from Departments using AI technology, and begin
16 publishing the Inventory responses on the DataSF platform.

17 (2) Within one year of the effective date of this Chapter 22J, the Inventory shall be
18 complete, including any and all AI technology used by the City. In addition, within one year of the
19 effective date, the CIO shall update the Inventory with any AI technology that the City is in the process
20 of purchasing, borrowing, or receiving as a gift, with or without the exchange of compensation or other
21 consideration before acquiring the technology and/or putting the technology into use. If the technology
22 is never obtained or no longer used, it shall be removed from the Inventory.

23 (b) Department Head. The Department Head shall disclose and submit to the CIO for inclusion
24 on the Inventory the AI technologies the Department has procured, borrowed, or received as a gift,

1 with or without the exchange of money or compensation, and for each technology shall disclose the
2 following information:

3 (1) Name of the technology and vendor;

4 (2) A brief description of the technology's purpose and function;

5 (3) The intended use of the technology;

6 (4) The context or domain in which the technology is intended to be used;

7 (5) The data used to train the technology;

8 (6) An explanation of how the technology works;

9 (7) The data generated by the technology;

10 (8) A description of what the technology is optimizing for, and its accuracy, preferably
11 with numerical performance metrics;

12 (9) Conditions necessary for the technology to perform optimally;

13 (10) Conditions under which the technology's performance would decrease in
14 accuracy;

15 (11) Whether testing has been performed to identify any bias in the technology such as
16 bias based on race, gender, etc., and the results of those tests;

17 (12) A description of how and where people report bias, inaccuracies, or poor
18 performance of the technology;

19 (13) A description of the conditions or circumstances under which the technology has
20 been tested;

21 (14) A description of adverse incident monitoring and communication procedures;

22 (15) A description of the level of human oversight associated with the technology;

23 (16) A description of whether the data collected will or can be used for training of
24 proprietary vendor or third-party systems;

25 (17) The individuals and communities that will interact with the technology;

1 (18) How the information or decisions generated by the technology could impact the
2 public's rights, opportunities, or access to critical resources or services or could impact the
3 employment and/or working conditions of City workers;

4 (19) How people with diverse abilities will interact with the user interface of the
5 technology and whether the system integrates and interacts with commonly used assistive technologies;

6 (20) Whether the technology is expected to replace any jobs currently being performed
7 by human beings;

8 (21) Why it is important for the City to use the technology; and

9 (22) Potential risks of the technology and steps that would be taken to mitigate these
10 risks.

11 (c) COIT, at the recommendation of the CIO, may modify the information requested under
12 subsection (b).

13 (d) Exceptions. The requirements set forth subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply to the
14 following uses. COIT, at the recommendation of the CIO, may reevaluate and modify these exceptions:

15 (1) Internal Efficiencies: AI technology solely used to improve internal administrative
16 processes and enhance departmental productivity and that does not affect rights, staffing decisions, or
17 make substantive changes affecting Department decisions, rights, or services, including systems for
18 internal data management, coding support, data analysis and visualization, graphic design and image
19 creation, automation of manual processes, speech-to-text and transcription, email sorting, data entry,
20 file management, document organization, grammar and spellcheck and other text editing or text
21 formatting.

22 (2) Internal Cybersecurity: AI technology solely used for internal cybersecurity
23 purposes and that does not involve surveillance of the public, decision-making, or similar actions
24 otherwise impacting the public's rights or safety, including intrusion detection, threat monitoring, and
25 other cyber defense systems.

1 (e) Each Department shall:

2 (1) Complete and return the Inventory to the CIO;

3 (2) For subsections (b)(1)-(16), it is anticipated but not required that the department
4 will obtain the information requested directly from the AI Technology Vendor;

5 (3) For subsections (b)(17)-(22), it is anticipated but not required that the Department
6 will assess the intended use of the technology to answer the questions for the inventory;

7 (4) Notify DT of any updates to published Inventory information; and

8 (5) Participate in and facilitate a timely and accurate response to all information in
9 Section(b)(1)-(22).

10 (f) The Controller shall conduct an annual review of all Department inventory responses and
11 by letter addressed to the Board of Supervisors confirm each Department's compliance or
12 noncompliance with this Section 22J.3.

13 (g) In addition to the Inventory, the CIO shall submit to the Board of Supervisors and shall
14 make available on the DataSF platform an AI Technology Report for all AI technologies used by the
15 City within 12 months of the effective date of this Chapter 22J, and every two years thereafter. For
16 each report the CIO submits to the Board of Supervisors, the CIO shall include a resolution to accept
17 the report.

18 (h) The requirements of this Chapter 22J are in addition to any requirements in Chapter 19B,
19 "Acquisition of Surveillance Technology."

20 **SEC. 22J.4. ENFORCEMENT.**

21 (a) If a person alleges that a Department has violated this Chapter 22J by failing to include
22 an AI technology in its inventory response, the person shall give written notice of the alleged
23 violation(s) to the CIO, and the CIO shall send a copy of the alleged violation to the Department. The
24 Department shall have an opportunity to correct such alleged violation(s) within 30 days of the CIO's
25 receipt of the notice.

1 (b) The CIO shall quarterly report to the Board of Supervisors the notices of alleged
2 violation that the CIO deemed valid and were not cured within 30 days of the notice.

3 (c) If the report described in subsection (b) identifies any Departments out of compliance
4 with this Chapter 22J, then the Board of Supervisors shall calendar within 60 days of receiving the
5 quarterly report a hearing on each such Department's noncompliance in the Government Audit and
6 Oversight Committee, or successor committee, of the Board of Supervisors, at which hearing the
7 Department Head shall report on the Department's plan for coming into compliance with this Chapter
8 22J.

9 (d) This Section 22J.4 shall not preclude the use of any other City process or program, such
10 as the Controller's Whistleblower Program, for raising an issue concerning compliance with this
11 Chapter 22J.

