

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



LONDON N. BREED
MAYOR

August 9, 2024

The Honorable Anne-Christine Massullo
Presiding Judge, Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco
400 McAllister Street, Room 008
San Francisco, CA 94102-4512

Dear Judge Massullo,

In accordance with Penal Code 933 and 933.05, the following is in response to the 2023-2024 Civil Grand Jury Report, *Come Hell or High Water: Flood Management in a Changing Climate*. We would like to thank the members of the 2023-2024 Civil Grand Jury for their interest in the City's flood management process and procedures, especially as it relates to San Francisco's ability to respond to the growing threats of climate change. Your role in holding the City accountable and facilitating learning from the implementation and management of flood mitigation projects across San Francisco is of utmost importance.

We agree with the Jury's six findings that the City can continue to improve governance structures, interdepartmental coordination, transparency, and public outreach, as well as better assess funding constraints and costs. However, the City has taken several steps to address many of the concerns presented in the report. While improvements can be made, the City's diligence in ensuring that flood mitigation responses, preparations, and concerns are continuously addressed, improved, and invested in is important for the Jury and public to understand. We have made significant progress and will continue to build upon the efforts of City departments and staff. The Mayor's Office will direct the departments listed in the report to learn from the findings and work collaboratively with all stakeholders to improve San Francisco's climate resiliency and mitigation efforts.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Civil Grand Jury report findings and recommendations. As we move forward, the City plans to continue working with all departments to enhance these procedures.

A detailed response from the Mayor's Office, the City Attorney, Public Utilities Commission, Port of San Francisco, Environment Department, the City Administrator, Office of Resilience and Capital Planning, and the Controller's Office is attached.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "London Breed".

London N. Breed
Mayor

1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, ROOM 200
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102-4681
TELEPHONE: (415) 554-6141


Greg Wagner
Controller




Katie Petrucione
Acting City Administrator



David Chiu
City Attorney

 for

Brian Strong
Director, Office of Resilience and Capital Planning



Dennis Herrera
General Manager, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission



Elaine Forbes
Executive Director, Port of San Francisco



Tyrone Jue
Director, San Francisco Environment Department



Sheryl Davis
Director, San Francisco Human Rights Commission

Report Title	F#	Finding	Respondent	Finding Response	Finding Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	F1	ClimateSF Governance and Coordination Are Inadequate. ClimateSF provides neither the necessary governance nor interdepartmental coordination of projects to address climate change because the currently configured Director level meeting cannot execute the recommendations generated from the staff level meetings.	Mayor [August 10, 2024]	Disagree wholly	The City agrees that it needs to continue to identify, develop, and implement structural governance and interdepartmental coordination improvements in support of climate resilience. ClimateSF is currently in the process of evaluating additional opportunities to improve coordination and effective decision-support, including at the Director level. However, it is not clear that Director engagement has wholly inhibited interdepartmental coordination of projects to address climate change. Despite the noted challenges in convening ClimateSF Director-level meetings, there are numerous examples of initiatives that have been successfully propagated through member departments and actions taken, including the shared (multi-department) resourcing of the ClimateSF Program Manager Position, an interdepartmental partnership with San Francisco Estuary Institute on a Regional Groundwater Study, a successful grant application for the Yosemite Slough Neighborhood Adaptation Plan, and critical decisions regarding the Waterfront Flood Study Draft Plan (Army Corps partnership). As a result, there is evidence of several ClimateSF initiatives, which have successfully been elevated and approved by Directors through existing formal governance structures.
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	F3	Funding of Climate Resilience Is Hampered by Debt Cap and Service Rate Constraints. Absent a citywide plan to fund the necessary adaptation infrastructure, the city is additionally hampered by a self-imposed limit on the use of general obligation bonds (\$0.1201 per \$100 of assessed value). Further, the jury finds the SFPUC, SFMTA, SFO, and Port face service rate constraints or competitive concerns that hamper additional use of revenue bonds.	Mayor [August 10, 2024]	Disagree partially	The City agrees that increased clarity on its anticipated resilience costs could better equip to evaluate its various funding options, including the expanded use of general obligation bonds. The City continuously works to develop cost estimates across its complex landscapes and infrastructure. It generates high-level cost estimates when it develops climate resilience plans (e.g. the Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan, the Climate Action Plan, the Waterfront Resilience Program, the Heat and Air Quality Resilience Plan). These estimates generally indicate the scale of funding needed to implement the overall strategy but also reflect significant uncertainty and lack the precision of a project-level cost estimate. Precise project-level cost estimates take significant resources and time to develop and are often produced over several years. Moreover, there is also a need to adaptively manage (i.e. right-size) future adaptation investments given the uncertainties associated with future climate impacts. Therefore, at any point in time, the City has an incomplete (and uncertain) understanding of its projected resilience costs, which make it challenging to support more precise funding strategies. The City also currently lacks evidence that voters would approve the higher property taxes necessary to raise debt limits and there are other capital investment needs. While the City agrees that increased debt financing is an option that merits further examination, staff continue to pursue numerous other funding options currently available to SF, such as state and federal funding programs.
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	F4	Flood Management Needs Interdepartmental Coordination. Flood management lacks a formal coordination process for an increasing environmental extremity that requires planning and implementation between multiple city departments.	Mayor [August 10, 2024]	Disagree partially	In anticipation of increased flood risks associated with climate change, the City agrees that it should seek additional opportunities to develop formal flood management procedures that foster better coordination and collaboration. The City has taken steps in recent years to establish improved flood management coordination. It currently coordinates flood management through the Sea Level Rise and Flood Hazards Coordinating Committee, which is chaired by the Chief Resilience Officer and Deputy Director of Planning, Citywide Division and meets bi-monthly. This working group is comprised of technical staff from several departments and agencies. It convenes on a regular basis to support the development of projects, plans, tools, and engagement on the topic of flood management and resilience. The group's recommendations are elevated to ClimateSF Directors as appropriate. For example, the Working Group developed the City's Sea Level Rise Guidance and supported the development of the City's Extreme Precipitation Study.

Report Title	F#	Finding	Respondent	Finding Response	Finding Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	F6	The City Fails to Communicate Impacts of Climate Change. The city is failing to communicate the future impacts of climate change to the residents who will be most affected.	Mayor [August 10, 2024]	Disagree wholly	The City disagrees on this finding, as there are various interdepartmental projects that have been successful. Public engagement and outreach has been at the forefront in projects including the Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan, The Waterfront Resilience Program, Heat and Air Quality Resilience Plan, The Islais Creek Mobility and Resilience Strategy, Safety and Resilience Element, and Climate Action Plan. To engage the public, the Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan hosts an interactive storymap, in which the public can spatially explore identified climate hazards. The Department of the Environment also recently launched a web-based Climate Equity Hub, in which qualifying households can apply for free heat pump water heaters. Public engagement sessions associated with these plans have elicited a significant amount of feedback that influenced the respective adaptation plans, including how investments are developed, prioritized, and located. ClimateSF publishes a quarterly newsletter, which is available to the public and is intended to update the public on resilience planning and programs while also extending departmental outreach. Given the challenges associated with reaching residents who will be most affected by climate change, the City continues to explore and develop better and more effective communication methods, including through ClimateSF.

Report Title	R#	Recommendation	Respondent	Recommendation	Recommendation Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R1.1 [for F1]	Henceforth, the quarterly Director level meetings of ClimateSF shall be included as part of the monthly Capital Planning Committee meeting agenda.	Mayor [August 10, 2024]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	ClimateSF will continue to seek ways to improve Director level engagement in its activities, particularly through more effective interdepartmental governance structures. While the Capital Planning Committee (CPC) will continue to play an important role in interdepartmental coordination and governance, adding a new standing monthly CPC agenda item or developing a CPC sub-committee would not be effective for providing Director-level support to ClimateSF. Many ClimateSF initiatives, such as those related to joint planning, interdepartmental workflows, and communications, do not relate to the CPC's purpose. Secondly, not all ClimateSF Directors are on the CPC. Additionally, it would not be an efficient use of administrative resources to support a monthly meeting interval as capital planning initiatives require significant time to develop. As currently configured, many interdepartmental resilience initiatives are presented to the CPC (e.g., the Waterfront Resilience Program) as they achieve the appropriate level of maturity. The City anticipates that future capital investments in resilience will continue to be presented to the CPC as appropriate and as they are developed rather than through a new standing agenda item or an additional sub-committee.
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R3.1 [for F3]	By December 31, 2024, the Mayor and/or City Administrator shall develop and publish a cross-department financial plan to respond to the anticipated costs of climate change resilience and potential sources of funding.	Mayor [August 10, 2024]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	Significant resources, funding, and time are needed to develop robust cost estimates for the resilience projects that are developed to support the city's climate resilience plans. The cost estimate for the Waterfront Flood Study Draft Plan is just one example of one strategy in the Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan that has taken several years, hundreds of person-hours, and millions of dollars to develop. Therefore, the City currently lacks all the information and resources to accurately implement this recommendation, due in part to the uncertainty described in the Finding 3 Response. The City will continue to develop interdepartmental funding strategies for projects as cost estimates are developed over time (e.g. the Waterfront Flood Study Draft Plan) and incorporate these costs into the 10-Year Capital Planning Plan, which is updated on a 2-year basis. However, the City agrees it should continue to find ways to improve its ability to make informed resilience finance decisions. The City will also continue to seek opportunities to track its anticipated costs and ability to fund its resilience investments through the 10-year Capital Plan.
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R3.4 [for F3]	By December 31, 2024, the City Administrator shall direct the Capital Planning Committee to include in the 10-Year Capital Plan the likely property tax and enterprise service division rate increases that will be necessary to fund emerging climate resilience measures.	Mayor [August 10, 2024]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	The city agrees that increased clarity on its anticipated resilience costs could better equip it to evaluate its various funding options, including the expanded use of general obligation bonds. The City has a constantly evolving understanding of its projected resilience needs and estimated costs at any point in time. Second, the potential sources of funding that may be applied towards these needs are also constantly evolving. Finally, there are several other unfunded and emerging needs aside from climate resilience identified during each 10-year Capital Planning cycle. As a result, the City maintains that it is impractical to estimate the likely property tax and enterprise service division rate increases that would be necessary to specifically fund emerging climate resilience measures. As previously stated, The City prefers to develop interdepartmental funding strategies for projects as cost estimates are developed over time (e.g., the Waterfront Flood Study Draft Plan) and incorporate these costs into the 10-Year Capital Planning Plan. The City will continue to find ways to better understand its overall resilience financial strategy across its different plans and strategies so that it can continue to better right-size the funding options available to it.

2023-24 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Report Title	R#	Recommendation	Respondent	Recommendation	Recommendation Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R4.1 [for F4]	By December 31, 2024, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors shall request a report from the City Administrator, as Floodplain Administrator, on the optimal governance structure (for example, CPC, Deputy City Administrator, Floodplain Administrator) to implement interdepartmental flood adaptation procedures.	Mayor [August 10, 2024]	Requires further analysis	The City recognizes that climate change and the types of resilience investments currently under consideration may require changes to the way it manages flood risk and the governance structure that support effective interdepartmental collaboration. It also agrees that more formal structures are needed to effectively coordinate the implementation of flood resilience projects and initiatives. In addition to the Sea Level Risk and Flood Hazards Coordinating Committee, which currently coordinates flood management, the City is currently investigating additional flood resilience policy and governance options that enhance interdepartmental coordination. Before committing to structural governance changes, we intend to complete this investigation to determine what, if any, changes are needed. Upon completion of this analysis, staff will consider how potential changes should connect with shoreline resilience implementation structures being developed through the Waterfront Resilience Program and other coastal resilience efforts. This investigation will not be completed by the requested due date of this recommendation.
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R4.2 [for F4]	By December 31, 2025, the Mayor, the City Administrator, and all city agencies that interface with flood management planning shall sign a Memorandum of Understanding that specifies governance, budget, and priorities for Flood Management planning, and that clearly describes the responsibilities of core agencies and ancillary agencies.	Mayor [August 10, 2024]	Requires further analysis	Establishing a Memorandum of Understanding between agencies and departments with a role in flood management is one option that the City will consider implementing. Per the Finding 4 and Recommendation 4.1 Response Text, the City is currently in the process of evaluating different potential formal governance structures. Before responding to this finding, it intends to complete its investigation of flood resiliency policy and governance options to determine if a Memorandum of Understanding or a different option provides the most beneficial structure for interdepartmental flood adaptation management.
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R6.1 [for F6]	Starting October 1, 2024, ClimateSF shall coordinate the communication of the projected impacts of climate change and the city's mitigation and adaptation efforts.	Mayor [August 10, 2024]	Requires further analysis	A significant amount of material regarding projected impacts of climate change, including to those who will be most affected has been developed and disseminated in association with recent planning initiatives. ClimateSF is in the process of reviewing its communications strategy. To the extent that available resources allow, ClimateSF will assess opportunities to enhance its coordination role with agency communications teams and augment the distribution of information through its web presence and other available communications methods.

2023-24 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Report Title	F#	Finding	Respondent	Finding Response	Finding Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	F5	Flood Damage Claims Are Not Funded by Insurance. The city is compensating claims for flood damage from the General Fund that might be obtained by insurance underwriting.	City Attorney [August 10, 2024]	Disagree partially	Claims against the City for flood damage are evaluated by the City Attorney on a case-by-case basis. The source of any compensation depends on the nature of the claim. In circumstances where compensation is authorized for claims alleging flood damage associated with the combined sewer system, that compensation comes from SFPUC's Wastewater Enterprise rate payer revenue, not the General Fund. Settlements of such claims require submission by the property owner of an interest form to the SFPUC's Floodwater Grant Program. Under the Grant Program, eligible property owners can receive up to \$100,000 to install flood protection projects to reduce the risk of future flood damage.

Report Title	R#	Recommendation	Respondent	Recommendation	Recommendation Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R5.2 [for F5]	By December 31, 2024, the City Administrator, as Floodplain Administrator in coordination with the City Attorney and the Mayor, shall develop procedures to inform and encourage property owners to voluntarily purchase flood insurance.	City Attorney [August 10, 2024]	Has been implemented	Because there are no natural riverine flood sources within the county limits, San Francisco's Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) only includes coastal flood hazard data. The City is a participant in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). There are approximately 200 parcels (~1,400 people) located within FEMA FIRM Special Flood Hazard Areas of San Francisco. According to the NFIP Redacted Claims Dataset, there are no repetitively flooded properties within San Francisco. However, since 2017, 15 claims have been reported in San Francisco according to the NFIP Redacted Claims Dataset. The City is actively seeking to further reduce risk in these hazard zones, including through the WRP and other shoreline resilience initiatives. The SFPUC, along with city agency partners, has also been working to educate residents about their flood risk and raise awareness of tools available to reduce flood risk. The 100-year storm flood risk map was published in 2019 along with the Flood Risk Disclosure Ordinance, which requires sellers and lessors to disclose to buyers and tenants if they are in the flood risk zone. The 100-year storm flood risk map shows potential flooding from stormwater runoff only. There are approximately 2,000 parcels (~24,000 people) in the 100-year flood risk zone. To increase resilience in this zone, the SFPUC sends RainReadySF postcards to residents in the 100-year flood risk zone annually, before each rainy season, to remind them of their risk and responsibilities. These mailers reach 4,000 units and encourage recipients to purchase flood insurance and learn about the City's Floodwater Grant Program. The SFPUC has also previously engaged with local insurance brokers to increase the sale of NFIP insurance products within the 100-year storm flood risk zone. Additionally, the SFPUC has promoted the voluntary purchase of flood insurance through its website, press events, workshops, public meetings, one-on-one interactions, collateral for homeowners and brokers, and booths at resource fairs and neighborhood events.

2023-24 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Report Title	F#	Finding	Respondent	Finding Response	Finding Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	F1	ClimateSF Governance and Coordination Are Inadequate. ClimateSF provides neither the necessary governance nor interdepartmental coordination of projects to address climate change because the currently configured Director level meeting cannot execute the recommendations generated from the staff level meetings.	City Administrator [August 10, 2024]	Disagree wholly	The City agrees that it needs to continue to identify, develop, and implement structural governance and interdepartmental coordination improvements in support of climate resilience. ClimateSF is currently in the process of evaluating additional opportunities to improve coordination and effective decision-support, including at the Director level. However, it is not clear that Director engagement has wholly inhibited interdepartmental coordination of projects to address climate change. Despite the noted challenges in convening ClimateSF Director-level meetings, there are numerous examples of initiatives that have been successfully propagated through member departments and actions taken, including the shared (multi-department) resourcing of the ClimateSF Program Manager Position, an interdepartmental partnership with San Francisco Estuary Institute on a Regional Groundwater Study, a successful grant application for the Yosemite Slough Neighborhood Adaptation Plan, and critical decisions regarding the Waterfront Flood Study Draft Plan (Army Corps partnership). As a result, there is evidence of several ClimateSF initiatives, which have successfully been elevated and approved by Directors through existing formal governance structures.
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	F3	Funding of Climate Resilience Is Hampered by Debt Cap and Service Rate Constraints. Absent a citywide plan to fund the necessary adaptation infrastructure, the city is additionally hampered by a self-imposed limit on the use of general obligation bonds (\$0.1201 per \$100 of assessed value). Further, the jury finds the SFPUC, SFMTA, SFO, and Port face service rate constraints or competitive concerns that hamper additional use of revenue bonds.	City Administrator [August 10, 2024]	Disagree partially	The City agrees that increased clarity on its anticipated resilience costs could better equip to evaluate its various funding options, including the expanded use of general obligation bonds. The City continuously works to develop cost estimates across its complex landscapes and infrastructure. It generates high-level cost estimates when it develops climate resilience plans (e.g. the Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan, the Climate Action Plan, the Waterfront Resilience Program, the Heat and Air Quality Resilience Plan). These estimates generally indicate the scale of funding needed to implement the overall strategy but also reflect significant uncertainty and lack the precision of a project-level cost estimate. Precise project-level cost estimates take significant resources and time to develop and are often produced over several years. Moreover, there is also a need to adaptively manage (i.e. right-size) future adaptation investments given the uncertainties associated with future climate impacts. Therefore, at any point in time, the City has an incomplete (and uncertain) understanding of its projected resilience costs, which make it challenging to support more precise funding strategies. The City also currently lacks evidence that voters would approve the higher property taxes necessary to raise debt limits and there are other capital investment needs. While the City agrees that increased debt financing is an option that merits further examination, staff continue to pursue numerous other funding options currently available to SF, such as state and federal funding programs.

2023-24 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Report Title	F#	Finding	Respondent	Finding Response	Finding Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	F4	Flood Management Needs Interdepartmental Coordination. Flood management lacks a formal coordination process for an increasing environmental extremity that requires planning and implementation between multiple city departments.	City Administrator [August 10, 2024]	Disagree partially	In anticipation of increased flood risks associated with climate change, the City agrees that it should seek additional opportunities to develop formal flood management procedures that foster better coordination and collaboration. The City has taken steps in recent years to establish improved flood management coordination. It currently coordinates flood management through the Sea Level Rise and Flood Hazards Coordinating Committee, which is chaired by the Chief Resilience Officer and Deputy Director of Planning, Citywide Division and meets bi-monthly. This working group is comprised of technical staff from several departments and agencies. It convenes on a regular basis to support the development of projects, plans, tools, and engagement on the topic of flood management and resilience. The group's recommendations are elevated to ClimateSF Directors as appropriate. For example, the Working Group developed the City's Sea Level Rise Guidance and supported the development of the City's Extreme Precipitation Study.
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	F5	Flood Damage Claims Are Not Funded by Insurance. The city is compensating claims for flood damage from the General Fund that might be obtained by insurance underwriting.	City Administrator [August 10, 2024]	Disagree partially	Claims against the City for flood damage are evaluated by the City Attorney on a case-by-case basis. The source of any compensation depends on the nature of the claim. In circumstances where compensation is authorized for claims alleging flood damage associated with the combined sewer system, that compensation comes from SFPUC's Wastewater Enterprise rate payer revenue, not the General Fund. Settlements of such claims require submission by the property owner of an interest form to the SFPUC's Floodwater Grant Program. Under the Grant Program, eligible property owners can receive up to \$100,000 to install flood protection projects to reduce the risk of future flood damage.

Report Title	F#	Finding	Respondent	Finding Response	Finding Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	F6	The City Fails to Communicate Impacts of Climate Change. The city is failing to communicate the future impacts of climate change to the residents who will be most affected.	City Administrator [August 10, 2024]	Disagree wholly	The City agrees that it should continue to improve its ability to coordinate climate change policy communications. However, the City respectfully disagrees that it is “failing to communicate the future impacts of climate change to the residents who will be most affected”. While it is generally true that “departments continue to rely on their own robust public affairs organs of communication” to disseminate information and engage with the public, this in and of itself does not constitute “failure”. There are numerous recent interdepartmental planning processes in which future impacts of climate change were communicated, including to the residents who will be most affected. Public engagement associated with the Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan, The Waterfront Resilience Program, Heat and Air Quality Resilience Plan, The Islais Creek Mobility and Resilience Strategy, Safety and Resilience Element, and Climate Action Plan have all occurred within the last three years. All these outreach efforts included purposeful engagement with vulnerable communities. The Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan hosts an interactive storymap, in which the public can spatially explore identified climate hazards. The Department of the Environment recently launched a web-based Climate Equity Hub, in which qualifying households can apply for free heat pump water heaters. Public engagement sessions associated with these plans have elicited a significant amount of feedback that influenced the respective adaptation plans, including how investments are developed, prioritized, and located. Various agencies and departments regularly update the public on resilience planning and programs. ClimateSF publishes a quarterly newsletter, which is available to the public and is intended to extend departmental outreach. Given the challenges associated with reaching residents who will be most affected by climate change, the City continues to explore and develop better and more effective communication methods, including through ClimateSF.

2023-24 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Report Title	R#	Recommendation	Respondent	Recommendation	Recommendation Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R1.1 [for F1]	Henceforth, the quarterly Director level meetings of ClimateSF shall be included as part of the monthly Capital Planning Committee meeting agenda.	City Administrator [August 10, 2024]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	ClimateSF will continue to seek ways to improve Director level engagement in its activities, particularly through more effective interdepartmental governance structures. While the Capital Planning Committee (CPC) will continue to play an important role in interdepartmental coordination and governance, adding a new standing monthly CPC agenda item or developing a CPC sub-committee would not be effective for providing Director-level support to ClimateSF. Many ClimateSF initiatives, such as those related to joint planning, interdepartmental workflows, and communications, do not relate to the CPC's purpose. Secondly, not all ClimateSF Directors are on the CPC. Additionally, it would not be an efficient use of administrative resources to support a monthly meeting interval as capital planning initiatives require significant time to develop. As currently configured, many interdepartmental resilience initiatives are presented to the CPC (e.g., the Waterfront Resilience Program) as they achieve the appropriate level of maturity. The City anticipates that future capital investments in resilience will continue to be presented to the CPC as appropriate and as they are developed rather than through a new standing agenda item or an additional sub-committee.
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R1.2 [for F1]	Henceforth, the monthly Capital Planning Committee meetings shall include a permanent agenda item with an update on the status of resilience plans.	City Administrator [August 10, 2024]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	As stated in the Finding 1 Response Text, the City will continue to seek ways to improve Director level engagement in its activities, including interdepartmental resilience planning. While the City agrees that Directors play an important role in the planning process, including a permanent agenda item on the status of resilience plans would not be the best means for providing Director-level support to ClimateSF for several reasons. Many ClimateSF initiatives, such as those related to joint planning, interdepartmental workflows, and communications, do not relate to the CPC's purpose. Secondly, not all ClimateSF Directors are on the CPC. Finally, it would not be an efficient use of administrative resources to support a monthly meeting interval as resilience plans are typically developed and implemented over multiple years. Directors are regularly updated on coordinated plan development through other communication channels and provide direction when requested. The City anticipates that future resilience plans will continue to be presented to the CPC as appropriate and as they are developed rather than through a new standing agenda item or an additional sub-committee.

Report Title	R#	Recommendation	Respondent	Recommendation	Recommendation Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R1.3 [for F1]	Beginning 2025, ClimateSF shall prepare an annual report for the public, summarizing the status of the ongoing climate resilience projects, using standardized metrics, including a description of the project, the Core agency in charge, the intended climate resilience measures, a projected cost, budget status and project timeline. This recommendation may and should be implemented administratively.	City Administrator [August 10, 2024]	Requires further analysis	The City agrees that it could provide more clarity on the status of projects that support its resilience goals and that doing so could facilitate better climate change governance. However, ClimateSF is not currently resourced to implement this recommendation as stated within the recommended timeframe. Additionally, inserting ClimateSF into the City's project tracking and reporting structure may not be the most efficient workflow. ClimateSF is currently in the process of identifying alternate approaches for tracking resilience projects through existing budget and capital planning structures and processes. Resilience strategies are primarily developed and tracked through the Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan (by the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning) and the Climate Action Plan (by the Department of Environment). As projects are developed to support planned resilience strategies, they are formally incorporated into the budget and Capital Planning processes. Ideally, a robust tracking process would serve to connect resilience projects both 'backwards' to resilience plans and 'forwards' to the budget and the Capital Plan. ClimateSF will investigate the most efficient process changes necessary to build this in this connectivity and enable staff to track and report on the status of ongoing climate resilience projects.
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R3.1 [for F3]	By December 31, 2024, the Mayor and/or City Administrator shall develop and publish a cross-department financial plan to respond to the anticipated costs of climate change resilience and potential sources of funding.	City Administrator [August 10, 2024]		Significant resources, funding, and time are needed to develop robust cost estimates for the resilience projects that are developed to support the city's climate resilience plans. The cost estimate for the Waterfront Flood Study Draft Plan is just one example of one strategy in the Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan that has taken several years, hundreds of person-hours, and millions of dollars to develop. Therefore, the City currently lacks all the information and resources to accurately implement this recommendation, due in part to the uncertainty described in the Finding 3 Response. The City will continue to develop interdepartmental funding strategies for projects as cost estimates are developed over time (e.g. the Waterfront Flood Study Draft Plan) and incorporate these costs into the 10-Year Capital Planning Plan, which is updated on a 2-year basis. However, the City agrees it should continue to find ways to improve its ability to make informed resilience finance decisions. The City will also continue to seek opportunities to track its anticipated costs and ability to fund its resilience investments through the 10-year Capital Plan.

2023-24 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Report Title	R#	Recommendation	Respondent	Recommendation	Recommendation Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R3.4 [for F3]	By December 31, 2024, the City Administrator shall direct the Capital Planning Committee to include in the 10-Year Capital Plan the likely property tax and enterprise service division rate increases that will be necessary to fund emerging climate resilience measures.	City Administrator [August 10, 2024]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	The city agrees that increased clarity on its anticipated resilience costs could better equip it to evaluate its various funding options, including the expanded use of general obligation bonds. The City has a constantly evolving understanding of its projected resilience needs and estimated costs at any point in time. Second, the potential sources of funding that may be applied towards these needs are also constantly evolving. Finally, there are several other unfunded and emerging needs aside from climate resilience identified during each 10-year Capital Planning cycle. As a result, the City maintains that it is impractical to estimate the likely property tax and enterprise service division rate increases that would be necessary to specifically fund emerging climate resilience measures. As previously stated, The City prefers to develop interdepartmental funding strategies for projects as cost estimates are developed over time (e.g., the Waterfront Flood Study Draft Plan) and incorporate these costs into the 10-Year Capital Planning Plan. The City will continue to find ways to better understand its overall resilience financial strategy across its different plans and strategies so that it can continue to better right-size the funding options available to it.
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R4.1 [for F4]	By December 31, 2024, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors shall request a report from the City Administrator, as Floodplain Administrator, on the optimal governance structure (for example, CPC, Deputy City Administrator, Floodplain Administrator) to implement interdepartmental flood adaptation procedures.	City Administrator [August 10, 2024]	Requires further analysis	The City recognizes that climate change and the types of resilience investments currently under consideration may require changes to the way it manages flood risk and the governance structure that support effective interdepartmental collaboration. It also agrees that more formal structures are needed to effectively coordinate the implementation of flood resilience projects and initiatives. In addition to the Sea Level Risk and Flood Hazards Coordinating Commttee, which currently coordinates flood management, the City is currently investigating additional flood resilience policy and governance options that enhance interdepartmental coordination. Before committing to structural governance changes, we intend to complete this investigation to determine what, if any, changes are needed. Upon completion of this analysis, staff will consider how potential changes should connect with shoreline resilience implementation structures being developed through the Waterfront Resilience Program and other coastal resilience efforts. This investigation will not be completed by the requested due date of this recommendation.
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R4.2 [for F4]	By December 31, 2025, the Mayor, the City Administrator, and all city agencies that interface with flood management planning shall sign a Memorandum of Understanding that specifies governance, budget, and priorities for Flood Management planning, and that clearly describes the responsibilities of core agencies and ancillary agencies.	City Administrator [August 10, 2024]	Requires further analysis	Establishing a Memorandum of Understanding between agencies and departments with a role in flood management is one option that the City will consider implementing. The City is currently in the process of evaluating different potential formal governance structures. Before responding to this finding, it intends to complete its investigation of flood resiliency policy and governance options to determine if a Memorandum of Understanding or a different option provides the most beneficial structure for interdepartmental flood adaptation management.

Report Title	R#	Recommendation	Respondent	Recommendation	Recommendation Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R5.2 [for F5]	By December 31, 2024, the City Administrator, as Floodplain Administrator in coordination with the City Attorney and the Mayor, shall develop procedures to inform and encourage property owners to voluntarily purchase flood insurance.	City Administrator [August 10, 2024]	Has been implemented	Because there are no natural riverine flood sources within the county limits, San Francisco's Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) only includes coastal flood hazard data. The City is a participant in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). There are approximately 200 parcels (~1,400 people) located within FEMA FIRM Special Flood Hazard Areas of San Francisco. According to the NFIP Redacted Claims Dataset, there are no repetitively flooded properties within San Francisco. However, since 2017, 15 claims have been reported in San Francisco according to the NFIP Redacted Claims Dataset. The City is actively seeking to further reduce risk in these hazard zones, including through the WRP and other shoreline resilience initiatives. The SFPUC, along with city agency partners, has also been working to educate residents about their flood risk and raise awareness of tools available to reduce flood risk. The 100-year storm flood risk map was published in 2019 along with the Flood Risk Disclosure Ordinance, which requires sellers and lessors to disclose to buyers and tenants if they are in the flood risk zone. The 100-year storm flood risk map shows potential flooding from stormwater runoff only. There are approximately 2,000 parcels (~24,000 people) in the 100-year flood risk zone. To increase resilience in this zone, the SFPUC sends RainReadySF postcards to residents in the 100-year flood risk zone annually, before each rainy season, to remind them of their risk and responsibilities. These mailers reach 4,000 units and encourage recipients to purchase flood insurance and learn about the City's Floodwater Grant Program. The SFPUC has also previously engaged with local insurance brokers to increase the sale of NFIP insurance products within the 100-year storm flood risk zone. Additionally, the SFPUC has promoted the voluntary purchase of flood insurance through its website, press events, workshops, public meetings, one-on-one interactions, collateral for homeowners and brokers, and booths at resource fairs and neighborhood events.
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R6.1 [for F6]	Starting October 1, 2024, ClimateSF shall coordinate the communication of the projected impacts of climate change and the city's mitigation and adaptation efforts.	City Administrator [August 10, 2024]	Requires further analysis	A significant amount of material regarding projected impacts of climate change, including to those who will be most affected has been developed and disseminated in association with recent planning initiatives. ClimateSF is in the process of reviewing its communications strategy. To the extent that available resources allow, ClimateSF will assess opportunities to enhance its coordination role with agency communications teams and augment the distribution of information through its web presence and other available communications methods.

2023-24 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Report Title	F#	Finding	Respondent	Finding Response	Finding Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	F1	ClimateSF Governance and Coordination Are Inadequate. ClimateSF provides neither the necessary governance nor interdepartmental coordination of projects to address climate change because the currently configured Director level meeting cannot execute the recommendations generated from the staff level meetings.	Office of Resilience and Capital Planning [August 10, 2024]	Disagree wholly	The City agrees that it needs to continue to identify, develop, and implement structural governance and interdepartmental coordination improvements in support of climate resilience. ClimateSF is currently in the process of evaluating additional opportunities to improve coordination and effective decision-support, including at the Director level. However, it is not clear that Director engagement has wholly inhibited interdepartmental coordination of projects to address climate change. Despite the noted challenges in convening ClimateSF Director-level meetings, there are numerous examples of initiatives that have been successfully propagated through member departments and actions taken, including the shared (multi-department) resourcing of the ClimateSF Program Manager Position, an interdepartmental partnership with San Francisco Estuary Institute on a Regional Groundwater Study, a successful grant application for the Yosemite Slough Neighborhood Adaptation Plan, and critical decisions regarding the Waterfront Flood Study Draft Plan (Army Corps partnership). As a result, there is evidence of several ClimateSF initiatives, which have successfully been elevated and approved by Directors through existing formal governance structures.
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	F6	The City Fails to Communicate Impacts of Climate Change. The city is failing to communicate the future impacts of climate change to the residents who will be most affected.	Office of Resilience and Capital Planning [August 10, 2024]	Disagree wholly	The City disagrees on this finding, as there are various interdepartmental projects that have been successful. Public engagement and outreach has been at the forefront in projects including the Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan, The Waterfront Resilience Program, Heat and Air Quality Resilience Plan, The Islais Creek Mobility and Resilience Strategy, Safety and Resilience Element, and Climate Action Plan. To enage the public, the Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan hosts an interactive storymap, in which the public can spatially explore identified climate hazards. The Department of the Environment also recently launched a web-based Climate Equity Hub, in which qualifying households can apply for free heat pump water heaters. Public engagement sessions associated with these plans have elicited a significant amount of feedback that influenced the respective adaptation plans, including how investments are developed, prioritized, and located. ClimateSF publishes a quarterly newsletter, which is available to the public and is intended to update the public on resilience planning and programs while also extending departmental outreach. Given the challenges associated with reaching residents who will be most affected by climate change, the City continues to explore and develop better and more effective communication methods, including through ClimateSF.

2023-24 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Report Title	R#	Recommendation	Respondent	Recommendation	Recommendation Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R1.1 [for F1]	Henceforth, the quarterly Director level meetings of ClimateSF shall be included as part of the monthly Capital Planning Committee meeting agenda.	Office of Resilience and Capital Planning [August 10, 2024]	Will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable	ClimateSF will continue to seek ways to improve Director level engagement in its activities, particularly through more effective interdepartmental governance structures. While the Capital Planning Committee (CPC) will continue to play an important role in interdepartmental coordination and governance, adding a new standing monthly CPC agenda item or developing a CPC sub-committee would not be effective for providing Director-level support to ClimateSF. Many ClimateSF initiatives, such as those related to joint planning, interdepartmental workflows, and communications, do not relate to the CPC's purpose. Secondly, not all ClimateSF Directors are on the CPC. Additionally, it would not be an efficient use of administrative resources to support a monthly meeting interval as capital planning initiatives require significant time to develop. As currently configured, many interdepartmental resilience initiatives are presented to the CPC (e.g., the Waterfront Resilience Program) as they achieve the appropriate level of maturity. The City anticipates that future capital investments in resilience will continue to be presented to the CPC as appropriate and as they are developed rather than through a new standing agenda item or an additional sub-committee.
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R1.3 [for F1]	Beginning 2025, ClimateSF shall prepare an annual report for the public, summarizing the status of the ongoing climate resilience projects, using standardized metrics, including a description of the project, the Core agency in charge, the intended climate resilience measures, a projected cost, budget status and project timeline. This recommendation may and should be implemented administratively.	Office of Resilience and Capital Planning [August 10, 2024]	Requires further analysis	The City agrees that it could provide more clarity on the status of projects that support its resilience goals and that doing so could facilitate better climate change governance. However, ClimateSF is not currently resourced to implement this recommendation as stated within the recommended timeframe. Additionally, inserting ClimateSF into the City's project tracking and reporting structure may not be the most efficient workflow. ClimateSF is currently in the process of identifying alternate approaches for tracking resilience projects through existing budget and capital planning structures and processes. Resilience strategies are primarily developed and tracked through the Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan (by the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning) and the Climate Action Plan (by the Department of Environment). As projects are developed to support planned resilience strategies, they are formally incorporated into the budget and Capital Planning processes. Ideally, a robust tracking process would serve to connect resilience projects both 'backwards' to resilience plans and 'forwards' to the budget and the Capital Plan. ClimateSF will investigate the most efficient process changes necessary to build this in this connectivity and enable staff to track and report on the status of ongoing climate resilience projects.

2023-24 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Report Title	R#	Recommendation	Respondent	Recommendation	Recommendation Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R6.1 [for F6]	Starting October 1, 2024, ClimateSF shall coordinate the communication of the projected impacts of climate change and the city's mitigation and adaptation efforts.	Office of Resilience and Capital Planning [August 10, 2024]	Requires further analysis	A significant amount of material regarding projected impacts of climate change, including to those who will be most affected has been developed and disseminated in association with recent planning initiatives. ClimateSF is in the process of reviewing its communications strategy. To the extent that available resources allow, ClimateSF will assess opportunities to enhance its coordination role with agency communications teams and augment the distribution of information through its web presence and other available communications methods.

2023-24 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Report Title	F#	Finding	Respondent	Finding Response	Finding Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	F2	Resilience Projects Are Not Easily Identifiable. The city infrastructure projects designed for climate resilience are not transparently identifiable, hindering management and audits.	Controller [August 10, 2024]	Disagree partially	The Controller's Office is conducting research on this topic.
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	F3	Funding of Climate Resilience Is Hampered by Debt Cap and Service Rate Constraints. Absent a citywide plan to fund the necessary adaptation infrastructure, the city is additionally hampered by a self-imposed limit on the use of general obligation bonds (\$0.1201 per \$100 of assessed value). Further, the jury finds the SFPUC, SFMTA, SFO, and Port face service rate constraints or competitive concerns that hamper additional use of revenue bonds.	Controller [August 10, 2024]	Disagree partially	The City agrees that increased clarity on its anticipated resilience costs could better equip to evaluate its various funding options, including the expanded use of general obligation bonds. The City continuously works to develop cost estimates across its complex landscapes and infrastructure. It generates high-level cost estimates when it develops climate resilience plans (e.g. the Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan, the Climate Action Plan, the Waterfront Resilience Program, the Heat and Air Quality Resilience Plan). These estimates generally indicate the scale of funding needed to implement the overall strategy but also reflect significant uncertainty and lack the precision of a project-level cost estimate. Precise project-level cost estimates take significant resources and time to develop and are often produced over several years. Moreover, there is also a need to adaptively manage (i.e. right-size) future adaptation investments given the uncertainties associated with future climate impacts. Therefore, at any point in time, the City has an incomplete (and uncertain) understanding of its projected resilience costs, which make it challenging to support more precise funding strategies. The City also currently lacks evidence that voters would approve the higher property taxes necessary to raise debt limits and there are other capital investment needs. While the City agrees that increased debt financing is an option that merits further examination, staff continue to pursue numerous other funding options currently available to SF, such as state and federal funding programs.

2023-24 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Report Title	R#	Recommendation	Respondent	Recommendation	Recommendation Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R2.1 [for F2]	By April 30, 2025, the Controller shall aggregate and publish departmental expenditures that address climate change adaptation and mitigation. This information shall be given consistent search tags describing resilience projects that allow for efficient tracking of expenditures.	Controller [August 10, 2024]	Requires further analysis	CON will work with the Capital Planning Committee (CPC) to conduct further analysis.
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R3.3 [for F3]	By December 31, 2024, the Controller's Office of Public Finance shall add a disclosure of the property tax limit to the Debt Policy of the City and County of San Francisco, Section VII Debt Limitations Section A General Obligation Bonds.	Controller [August 10, 2024]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	This recommendation will be added to the City's Debt Policy by the end of the calendar year of 2024.

2023-24 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Report Title	F#	Finding	Respondent	Finding Response	Finding Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	F4	Flood Management Needs Interdepartmental Coordination. Flood management lacks a formal coordination process for an increasing environmental extremity that requires planning and implementation between multiple city departments.	Port of San Francisco [August 10, 2024]	Disagree partially	In anticipation of increased flood risks associated with climate change, the City agrees that it should seek additional opportunities to develop formal flood management procedures that foster better coordination and collaboration. The City has taken steps in recent years to establish improved flood management coordination. It currently coordinates flood management through the Sea Level Rise and Flood Hazards Coordinating Committee, which is chaired by the Chief Resilience Officer and Deputy Director of Planning, Citywide Division and meets bi-monthly. This working group is comprised of technical staff from several departments and agencies. It convenes on a regular basis to support the development of projects, plans, tools, and engagement on the topic of flood management and resilience. The group's recommendations are elevated to ClimateSF Directors as appropriate. For example, the Working Group developed the City's Sea Level Rise Guidance and supported the development of the City's Extreme Precipitation Study.

2023-24 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Report Title	R#	Recommendation	Respondent	Recommendation	Recommendation Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R4.2 [for F4]	By December 31, 2025, the Mayor, the City Administrator, and all city agencies that interface with flood management planning shall sign a Memorandum of Understanding that specifies governance, budget, and priorities for Flood Management planning, and that clearly describes the responsibilities of core agencies and ancillary agencies.	Port of San Francisco [August 10, 2024]	Requires further analysis	Establishing a Memorandum of Understanding between agencies and departments with a role in flood management is one option that the City will consider implementing. The City is currently in the process of evaluating different potential formal governance structures. Before responding to this finding, it intends to complete its investigation of flood resiliency policy and governance options to determine if a Memorandum of Understanding or a different option provides the most beneficial structure for interdepartmental flood adaptation management.

2023-24 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Report Title	F#	Finding	Respondent	Finding Response	Finding Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	F4	Flood Management Needs Interdepartmental Coordination. Flood management lacks a formal coordination process for an increasing environmental extremity that requires planning and implementation between multiple city departments.	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission [August 10, 2024]	Disagree partially	In anticipation of increased flood risks associated with climate change, the City agrees that it should seek additional opportunities to develop formal flood management procedures that foster better coordination and collaboration. The City has taken steps in recent years to establish improved flood management coordination. It currently coordinates flood management through the Sea Level Rise and Flood Hazards Coordinating Committee, which is chaired by the Chief Resilience Officer and Deputy Director of Planning, Citywide Division and meets bi-monthly. This working group is comprised of technical staff from several departments and agencies. It convenes on a regular basis to support the development of projects, plans, tools, and engagement on the topic of flood management and resilience. The group's recommendations are elevated to ClimateSF Directors as appropriate. For example, the Working Group developed the City's Sea Level Rise Guidance and supported the development of the City's Extreme Precipitation Study.

2023-24 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Report Title	R#	Recommendation	Respondent	Recommendation	Recommendation Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R4.2 [for F4]	By December 31, 2025, the Mayor, the City Administrator, and all city agencies that interface with flood management planning shall sign a Memorandum of Understanding that specifies governance, budget, and priorities for Flood Management planning, and that clearly describes the responsibilities of core agencies and ancillary agencies.	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission [August 10, 2024]	Requires further analysis	Establishing a Memorandum of Understanding between agencies and departments with a role in flood management is one option that the City will consider implementing. The City is currently in the process of evaluating different potential formal governance structures. Before responding to this finding, it intends to complete its investigation of flood resiliency policy and governance options to determine if a Memorandum of Understanding or a different option provides the most beneficial structure for interdepartmental flood adaptation management.

Report Title	F#	Finding	Respondent	Finding Response	Finding Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	F6	The City Fails to Communicate Impacts of Climate Change. The city is failing to communicate the future impacts of climate change to the residents who will be most affected.	Human Rights Commission [August 10, 2024]	Disagree wholly	The City disagrees on this finding, as there are various interdepartmental projects that have been successful. Public engagement and outreach has been at the forefront in projects including the Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan, The Waterfront Resilience Program, Heat and Air Quality Resilience Plan, The Islais Creek Mobility and Resilience Strategy, Safety and Resilience Element, and Climate Action Plan. To engage the public, the Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan hosts an interactive storymap, in which the public can spatially explore identified climate hazards. The Department of the Environment also recently launched a web-based Climate Equity Hub, in which qualifying households can apply for free heat pump water heaters. Public engagement sessions associated with these plans have elicited a significant amount of feedback that influenced the respective adaptation plans, including how investments are developed, prioritized, and located. ClimateSF publishes a quarterly newsletter, which is available to the public and is intended to update the public on resilience planning and programs while also extending departmental outreach. Given the challenges associated with reaching residents who will be most affected by climate change, the City continues to explore and develop better and more effective communication methods, including through ClimateSF.

2023-24 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Report Title	R#	Recommendation	Respondent	Recommendation	Recommendation Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R6.5 [for F6]	By December 31, 2025, the Human Rights Commission shall hold annual public hearings on the differential harms of climate change resilience projects within the impacted communities. The annual public hearing may, but need not, occur in conjunction with the annual public hearing of the Commission on the Environment referenced in	Human Rights Commission [August 10, 2024]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	The Human Rights Commission will hold at least one annual hearing on the differential harms of climate change resilience projects with the City's impacted communities, in conjunction and coordination with other City and County of San Francisco agencies and departments as appropriate, and will report out as to outcomes as requested.

Report Title	F#	Finding	Respondent	Finding Response	Finding Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	F6	The City Fails to Communicate Impacts of Climate Change. The city is failing to communicate the future impacts of climate change to the residents who will be most affected.	Commission on the Environment [August 10, 2024]	Disagree wholly	The City agrees that it should continue to improve its ability to coordinate climate change policy communications. However, the City respectfully disagrees that it is “failing to communicate the future impacts of climate change to the residents who will be most affected”. While it is generally true that “departments continue to rely on their own robust public affairs organs of communication” to disseminate information and engage with the public, this in and of itself does not constitute “failure”. There are numerous recent interdepartmental planning processes in which future impacts of climate change were communicated, including to the residents who will be most affected. Public engagement associated with the Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan, The Waterfront Resilience Program, Heat and Air Quality Resilience Plan, The Islais Creek Mobility and Resilience Strategy, Safety and Resilience Element, and Climate Action Plan have all occurred within the last three years. All these outreach efforts included purposeful engagement with vulnerable communities. The Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan hosts an interactive storymap, in which the public can spatially explore identified climate hazards. The Department of the Environment recently launched a web-based Climate Equity Hub, in which qualifying households can apply for free heat pump water heaters. Public engagement sessions associated with these plans have elicited a significant amount of feedback that influenced the respective adaptation plans, including how investments are developed, prioritized, and located. Various agencies and departments regularly update the public on resilience planning and programs. ClimateSF publishes a quarterly newsletter, which is available to the public and is intended to extend departmental outreach. Given the challenges associated with reaching residents who will be most affected by climate change, the City continues to explore and develop better and more effective communication methods, including through ClimateSF.

2023-24 CIVIL GRAND JURY FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Report Title	R#	Recommendation	Respondent	Recommendation	Recommendation Response Text
Come Hell or High Water Flood Management in a Changing Climate [June 11, 2024]	R6.4 [for F6]	By December 31, 2025, the Commission on the Environment shall hold annual public hearings on the differential harms of climate change resilience projects within the impacted communities. The annual public hearing may, but need not, occur in conjunction with the annual public hearing of the Human Rights Commission referenced in	Commission on the Environment [August 10, 2024]	Has not yet been implemented but will be implemented in the future	The Commission on the Environment will hold an annual hearing on the differential harms of climate change resilience projects within the impacted communities.