

1 [Board Response - Civil Grand Jury Report - Techs in the City: Government's Opportunity to  
2 Seize the AI Moment]

3  
4 **Resolution responding to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings**  
5 **and recommendations contained in the 2024-2025 Civil Grand Jury Report, entitled**  
6 **“Techs in the City: Government’s Opportunity to Seize the AI Moment;” and urging the**  
7 **Mayor to cause the implementation of accepted findings and recommendations**  
8 **through his department heads and through the development of the annual budget.**

9  
10 WHEREAS, Under California Penal Code, Section 933 et seq., the Board of  
11 Supervisors must respond, within 90 days of receipt, to the Presiding Judge of the Superior  
12 Court on the findings and recommendations contained in Civil Grand Jury Reports; and

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

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

23 WHEREAS, In accordance with San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 2.10(b),  
24 the Controller must report to the Board of Supervisors on the implementation of  
25

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

3 WHEREAS, The 2024-2025 Civil Grand Jury Report, entitled “Techs in the City:  
4 Government’s Opportunity to Seize the AI Moment” (“Report”) is on file with the Clerk of the  
5 Board of Supervisors in File No. 250647, which is hereby declared to be a part of this  
6 Resolution as if set forth fully herein; and

7 WHEREAS, The Civil Grand Jury has requested that the Board of Supervisors respond  
8 to Finding No. F4, as well as Recommendation Nos. R4.1 and R4.3, contained in the subject  
9 Report; and

10 WHEREAS, Finding No. F4 states: “The Committee on Information Technology (COIT)  
11 is comprised mostly of non-technical leaders and has insufficient authority and influence over  
12 departments’ technology plans. As a result, it is falling short of its objective to streamline ICT  
13 policy and roadmapping in San Francisco, which threatens current and emerging technology  
14 initiatives alike;” and

15 WHEREAS, Recommendation No. R4.1 states: “By June 30, 2026, the city should  
16 enact an ordinance amending the Administrative Code to eliminate COIT and centralize a  
17 replacement advisory body under DT. This ordinance could be enacted through the customary  
18 legislative process established in the Charter. In the alternative, by December 31, 2025, the  
19 mayor and the board of supervisors should each recommend to the Commission Streamlining  
20 Task Force (established by Proposition E, November 2024) that it include COIT in an  
21 ordinance the Task Force would introduce to eliminate certain commissions;” and

22 WHEREAS, Recommendation No. R4.3 states: “By December 31, 2025, the city  
23 should pass an ordinance amending the Administrative Code to create a permanent seat on  
24 COIT for the emerging technologies director, pending its action related to  
25 Recommendation 4.1;” and

1 WHEREAS, In accordance with California Penal Code, Section 933.05(c), the Board of  
2 Supervisors must respond, within 90 days of receipt, to the Presiding Judge of the Superior  
3 Court on Finding No. F4, as well as Recommendation Nos. R4.1 and R4.3 contained in the  
4 subject Report; now, therefore, be it

5 RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge of the  
6 Superior Court that they partially disagree with Finding No. F4 for the following reasons:  
7 members of COIT are appointed through the administrative code, and the individuals that  
8 routinely attend COIT and relevant subcommittees are departmental CIOs or other technical  
9 leads. Furthermore, COIT already publishes a coordinated technology roadmap in the form of  
10 its annual Information and Communications Technology (ICT) Plan; and, be it

11 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation  
12 No. R4.1 will not be implemented because it is unwarranted or unreasonable for the following  
13 reasons: COIT plays a valuable role in coordinating citywide IT projects and expenditures.  
14 Rather than eliminating COIT, we recommend focusing on structural improvements, such as  
15 clearer mandate definition, regular engagement with the Board of Supervisors to report on ICT  
16 policy goals, and enhanced authority to set standards for the deployment and procurement of  
17 emerging technologies; and, be it

18 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation  
19 No. R4.3 has not yet been implemented but will be implemented by December 31, 2025; and,  
20 be it

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